

The Transformation Of The National Security Paradigm In Indonesia's Border Regions: From A Militaristic Approach To Human Security

Yulius Ida Bagus Suselo¹; Bambang Kustiawan²; Guntur Eko Saputro³.

^{1,2,3}Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, Indonesia

E-mail: (yulius.suselo@doktoral.idu.ac.id, bkustiawan168@gmail.com,

guntur.saputro@idu.ac.id)

Manuscripts received : 10/03/2026, Revision and Review : 20/04/2026, Approved 29/04/2026

Abstract

This research examines the paradigm shift in Indonesia's national security within border regions, moving from a traditional militaristic focus toward a more holistic human security approach. The analysis was conducted using qualitative methods, policy reviews, and case studies from December 2025 to February 2026. The findings highlight the limitations of conventional military strategies in addressing non-traditional threats, such as illegal trafficking, socio-economic inequality, and community vulnerability. Recent initiatives—most notably the Motaain Border Expo 2025 (a strategic event organized by the National Agency for Border Management (BNPP) through the Motaain Integrated Border Post (PLBN) on December 16–17, 2025, in Belu Regency, East Nusa Tenggara)—along with integrated services at border posts, serve as primary examples of a human-centric security approach that fosters local welfare and cross-border cooperation. This study proposes an integrative model that synergizes securitization with human security, emphasizing both territorial protection and community empowerment. The results suggest that a multidimensional security policy, supported by measurable social and economic indicators, significantly strengthens border stability and resilience. This framework provides a strategic roadmap for policymakers in designing sustainable national security strategies.

Keywords: National Security, Human Security, Border Policy, Indonesia, Securitization, Community Empowerment.

A. Introduction

Border areas are geographical spaces with complex social, economic, and political dynamics that are strategic for national security¹. For Indonesia, as an archipelagic country with extensive land and sea borders, border issues are not only related to territorial security from external threats, but also to the welfare of local communities as part of national resilience. Until now, Indonesia's national security policy has tended to be militaristic, with an emphasis on military strength, strict surveillance, and formal enforcement of

¹ Bangun et al., "Economic Security in Border Areas: The Fulfillment of Community Welfare."

sovereignty². However, criticism of the dominance of the military approach has increased in line with the changing nature of threats in the contemporary era. Non-traditional threats such as illegal trade, resource smuggling, cross-border cybercrime, local social conflicts, and development inequalities have a significant impact on border communities³.

An excessive emphasis on military aspects often neglects the daily needs of the community, even though local communities play an important role in sustainable national security⁴. The human security approach places people at the center of security, viewing threats from the perspective of citizens' welfare and the capacity of communities to deal with vulnerabilities⁵. With this perspective, security policies do not only focus on physical protection and military control, but also take into account the social, economic, and cultural factors that shape life on the border⁶.

The integration of human security into Indonesia's border policy is not merely a theoretical requirement, but a real necessity. Border communities often experience limited access to basic services such as education, health, and economic infrastructure⁷. If these inequalities are not addressed, they have the potential to exacerbate social instability and make the border a vulnerable area that threatens national stability.

Since independence, Indonesia's national security policy has emphasized defending sovereignty from military and colonial threats. Early policy documents placed national defense as the main pillar, with the military as the primary instrument for protecting the territory and society from foreign intervention⁸. This approach later became the basis for border area management.

In recent decades, the complexity of threats has increased in line with geopolitical dynamics, technological advances, urbanization, and climate change⁹. Threats are now not limited to armed conflicts between countries, but also arise in the form of competition for resources, the black economy, and cross-border social challenges¹⁰. Many empirical studies show that overly militaristic policies have limitations in dealing with multidimensional non-

² C. N. Siregar et al., "Analysis of Factual and Potential Threats in the Border Region of the Republic of Indonesia and the Democratic Republic of East Timor," *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2019)*, 2020, 108-13, <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200320.021>.

³ A. A. Rahman et al., "Traditional and Non-Traditional Security Issues in Southern Thailand: Impacts on Malaysian Border Development and Governance," *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change* 10, no. 2 (2025): 4272-87, <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.2249>.

⁴ M. Kaldor, *Human Security* (Polity, 2007), https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=human-security--9780745638539.

⁵ UNDP, *Human Development Report 1993* (United Nation Development Programme, 1993).

⁶ J. Esteve, "Migration, Security Challenges, and National Security," in *Handbook of Security Science* (2022), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91875-4_79.

⁷ U. Pakasi et al., "Border Governance through Local Community Empowerment: Insights from Indonesia-Papua New Guinea Borderline," *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan* 14, no. 3 (2024): 693-711, <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v14i3.15399>.

⁸ W. Mujiono, "The Legal Politics of State Defense in the Concept of Sovereignty of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia," *Journal of Social Research* 2, no. 2 (2023): 319-28, <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v2i2.583>.

⁹ N. Ugbo, "Contemporary Geopolitical Dynamics and Global Security: Projections for Sustainable Development," *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS*, ahead of print, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i09-51>.

¹⁰ P. Vesco et al., "The Impacts of Armed Conflict on Human Development: A Review of the Literature," *World Development* 187, no. 11 (2025): 106806, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106806>.

traditional threats¹¹.

Local communities with limited access to resources are often trapped in structural poverty, which increases their vulnerability to various threats¹². This shows that focusing solely on territorial stability is not sufficient to build comprehensive national resilience. Therefore, national security studies need to broaden their perspective by incorporating human welfare, social empowerment, and sustainable development in border areas. This paradigm shift is important to create a national security model that is responsive to both traditional and non-traditional threats.

Given the complexity of these threats, the main problem facing Indonesia today is how security policy in border areas is still dominated by a militaristic approach that emphasizes territorial security¹³. In reviewing the theory of securitization, this dominance occurs because border issues are often framed solely as threats to state sovereignty that require extraordinary measures in the form of physical control¹⁴. In fact, empirical realities in various regions, such as the land borders in Kalimantan, Papua, and East Nusa Tenggara, show that communities and the state are actually more often confronted with non-traditional threats, such as development inequality, smuggling, and environmental and health crises¹⁵. Therefore, the question arises as to what is the appropriate direction for a paradigm shift to move the focus from merely guarding physical borders to a human security approach.

The human security paradigm offers a solution by placing humans as the referent object or center of security, in order to guarantee freedom from fear and freedom from want¹⁶. Although conventional securitization and human security are often seen as contradictory, in the era of globalization, the two actually complement each other in formulating effective non-traditional security governance¹⁷. This integration is crucial; the securitization approach provides legitimacy for relevant agencies to deploy surveillance resources, while the human security framework guides policy direction so that it is not militarily biased, but rather integrates defense policy with economic and social policies for the welfare of local communities¹⁸.

Based on these theoretical and empirical gaps, this study specifically aims to analyze the construction of border security policies that have been based on physical control and the

¹¹ B. Barry et al., "Security: A New Framework for Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 93, no. 4 (1998): 1010–11, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2586187>.

¹² Vesco et al., "The Impacts of Armed Conflict on Human Development: A Review of the Literature."

¹³ L. H. Kurnia et al., "Borderlines and Beyond: Strengthening Indonesia's Land Borders Through Global Insights," *Jurnal Pertahanan: Media Informasi Tentang Kajian Dan Strategi Pertahanan Yang Mengedepankan Identity, Nasionalism Dan Integrity* 11, no. 1 (2025): 151–72, <https://doi.org/10.33172/jp.v11i1.19853>.

¹⁴ Barry et al., "Security: A New Framework for Analysis."

¹⁵ F. B. Aryo et al., *Papua Bioregion: The Forest and Its People "The Result of Baseline Study About Forest and People in Papua Bioregion"* (Forest Watch Indonesia, 2019), <http://fwi.or.id>.

¹⁶ UNDP, *Human Development Report 1993*.

¹⁷ M. Caballero-Anthony, "Non-Traditional Security Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC)," in *ASEAN and the Institutionalization of East Asia* (2011), <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203804650-4>.

¹⁸ I. Nyoman et al., "The Role of Indonesia to Create Security and Resilience in Cyber Spaces [Peran Indonesia Dalam Membentuk Keamanan Dan Ketahanan Di Ruang Siber]," *Jurnal Politica Dinamika Masalah Politik Dalam Negeri Dan Hubungan Internasional* 13, no. 1 (2022): 43–66, <https://doi.org/10.22212/JP.V13I1.2641>.

deployment of security personnel ¹⁹, as well as to identify various weaknesses in responding to the dynamics of non-traditional threats. Furthermore, this study aims to formulate a realistic paradigm shift model by integrating territorial securitization and human security. Through this integrative model, it is hoped that border governance will no longer be measured solely in terms of administrative patrols, but will also be holistically assessed based on improvements in social and economic indicators and the empowerment of border communities.

Through the formulation of this transformation model, this study is expected to contribute theoretically to expanding the scientific horizon of national security studies, while also providing practical benefits as a strategic reference for institutions such as the National Border Management Agency (BNPP) and other related institutions. To facilitate readers in understanding the entire research process, this paper is systematically organized, beginning with a reinforcement of the theoretical foundations of securitization and human security, an elaboration of qualitative methodology through case studies at three strategic border points, and finally culminating in the presentation of empirical findings followed by applicable policy recommendations in the conclusion.

B. Research Method

This study uses a qualitative approach with a case study method to examine complex and multidimensional issues regarding the transformation of the national security paradigm in Indonesia's border regions. The qualitative approach and case study method were chosen on the grounds that both are capable of capturing the social, cultural, and political context in the field, which is difficult to measure quantitatively, while also allowing researchers to identify best practices and weaknesses in border management. This case study specifically focuses on local dynamics in three border regions with unique characteristics, namely the Indonesia–Malaysia border in Kalimantan, the Indonesia–Papua New Guinea border in Papua, and the Indonesia–Timor Leste border in East Nusa Tenggara.

To support this study, this research relies on three main sources of data: policy and regulatory documents, academic literature and empirical studies, as well as interviews and field observations. In line with these data sources, the data collection techniques and instruments applied include document analysis using content analysis (to extract policy focus and securitization narratives), semi-structured interviews with officials, government, and community leaders (to understand local implementation and perceptions), as well as observations and field notes at border posts, markets, and health facilities (to verify practices in the field). The integration of document collection, interviews, and observations is intended to make the research findings comprehensive, realistic, and applicable to policy.

Next, the data analysis process and techniques were carried out systematically, starting from the data collection stage to producing recommendations. This qualitative data analysis

¹⁹ M. Syaifei et al., "The Evaluation of the Indonesian Government Authority in Managing the Border Area of West Kalimantan-Sarawak," *International Journal of Environment, Architecture, and Societies* 3, no. 02 (2022): 120–31, <https://doi.org/10.26418/ijeas.2023.3.02.120-131>.

was processed through data reduction stages to filter relevant information, followed by data presentation by grouping the findings into main themes such as militaristic domination and human security transformation. After that, a verification and triangulation stage is carried out to compare various findings, which leads to interpretation and conceptualization in order to develop an integrative framework for border security management.

During the process, this study applied strict standards regarding data validity and research ethics. To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, the researchers applied source triangulation, member checking by conveying preliminary findings to respondents to reduce bias, and audit trails through systematic record keeping so that procedures could be audited. The field research also fully complied with academic ethics principles, which included obtaining informed consent from informants prior to interviews, ensuring the confidentiality of informants' identities to protect personal data, and secure data storage dedicated solely to academic purposes.

C. Results and Discussion

1. The Hegemony of Securitization: The Dominance of a Militaristic Approach in Current Border Governance

An analysis of policy documents and operational dynamics in Indonesia's border regions shows that the militaristic paradigm remains deeply rooted and will continue to be the main foundation of national security governance until the end of 2025. Through the lens of securitization theory, this dominance represents a state-centric view, in which border areas are narrowly constructed solely as lines of demarcation of sovereignty that are vulnerable to foreign intervention and existential threats to the state. This is in line with the operational mandate of the Indonesian National Border Management Agency (BNPP), as a cross-sectoral coordination agency, which confirms that asserting territorial position and administrative control remains a priority and main focus in the regional security scheme. This is especially true along strategic land borders that directly intersect with Malaysia, Timor Leste, and Papua New Guinea, where the manifestation of national security is heavily influenced by conventional state protection efforts.

The manifestation of this securitization hegemony is clearly visible in the physical security architecture in the field. State sovereignty is maintained through the massive deployment of Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) personnel who are members of the Border Security Task Force (Satgas Pamantas), the centralization of surveillance at State Border Crossing Posts (PLBN), and the implementation of routine armed patrols along the border²⁰. This operational framework clearly shows that physical control, strict surveillance, and the legality of administrative border lines remain the main framework of Indonesia's border policy. This approach, termed the hard-border security regime, continues to be maintained because it is historically considered the most effective in providing deterrence against military threats, territorial disputes, or conventional

²⁰ Nyoman et al., "The Role of Indonesia to Create Security and Resilience in Cyber Spaces [Peran Indonesia Dalam Membentuk Keamanan Dan Ketahanan Di Ruang Siber]."

sovereignty violations that could undermine the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI)²¹.

However, the dominance of this traditional security framework tends to reduce the sociological essence of the region itself. Policy construction that is overly oriented towards physical defense ultimately creates an anomaly, where borders are only seen as restrictive gates or military buffer zones, rather than as a forum for social interaction. In fact, empirical reality proves that border management is not merely a matter of defending imaginary lines on a map of sovereignty. More than that, border areas are complex spaces of social, cultural, and daily economic activity, whose stability greatly requires the recognition and direct involvement of all elements of the local community. An attitude that relies too heavily on military force and instruments often creates a psychological distance between state officials and grassroots communities whose livelihoods depend on informal cross-border networks.

The long-term implication of this territorial securitization dominance is the emergence of an uneven governance architecture in translating the fundamental meaning of “security.” When institutional attention and state budget priorities are absorbed by strengthening physical defenses, non-traditional dimensions of security—which are actually closest to the daily realities of citizens—are often overlooked in strategic calculations²². Strong national resilience in border areas cannot be dictated solely by the presence of the military and the establishment of border markers, because true sovereignty requires a foundation of social and economic welfare and resilience rooted in the community. It is this existing structural condition that is the crucial point of the border governance problem, which in turn demands a comprehensive shift so that state policies are more relevant to the complexity of 21st-century threats.

2. The Reality of Non-Traditional Threats and the Limitations of Conventional Security Approaches: Empirical Evidence from Three Regions

The militaristic approach adopted by the Indonesian government has proven effective in reducing traditional threats, such as military infiltration and arms smuggling that threaten territorial sovereignty. However, contemporary realities show that this conventional strategy has significant limitations when faced with escalating non-traditional threats and local welfare issues. Security threats in the 21st century have mutated into multidimensional issues that transcend the boundaries of physical state sovereignty. The inability of military instruments to read and respond to the anatomy of these new threats creates a vulnerability gap that actually leads to social instability. This is because the root of the problem lies in the structural dimensions of the economy and the fulfillment of basic human rights, not in the absence or lack of armed forces in border areas.

²¹ Syafei et al., “The Evaluation of the Indonesian Government Authority in Managing the Border Area of West Kalimantan-Sarawak.”

²² Caballero-Anthony, “Non-Traditional Security Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC).”

The limitations of the old paradigm have been empirically validated through the dynamics occurring in Indonesia's three main border areas. On the Indonesia–Malaysia land border (Kalimantan), the dominant threat today is not foreign military aggression, but transnational crimes such as illegal logging, drug trafficking, and the potential for local social conflict. In the east, the Indonesia–Papua New Guinea border faces the complexity of undocumented migration and massive wildlife trade. Meanwhile, in the Indonesia–Timor Leste (East Nusa Tenggara) border region, the main problem manifests itself in the form of informal cross-border trade triggered by the high level of economic vulnerability of the community. All of these phenomena are in fact direct consequences of gaps in public services and low levels of welfare. Due to the severe limitations of basic infrastructure such as education, health, and economic access, border communities are often forced to rely on informal cross-border trade simply to meet their daily needs. In this context, a rigid security approach often criminalizes the survival strategies of poor communities²³.

Furthermore, the emphasis on administrative boundaries in policy does not guarantee meaningful community involvement. The development of modern Cross-Border Posts (PLBN) and the implementation of strict administrative supervision often run asymmetrically, as they are not balanced with comprehensive community empowerment strategies. An approach that is too focused on militaristic control tends to marginalize social interaction spaces that can support organic, community-based security governance. When the state's presence is only represented by security forces and formal checkpoints, local communities in borderlands will feel alienated from the national development agenda. This condition hinders the growth of a sense of belonging, which is crucial as a pillar of universal defense.

Another structural weakness of conventional securitization dominance is the lack of comprehensive anticipation of non-territorial threats. Essential issues such as food security, waves of illegal migration, and fluctuations in socio-economic stability are often only given peripheral priority in border management architecture. In fact, analysis of the quarantine function in border areas explicitly proves that threats to the food sector are non-military issues that have direct implications for national security. The matrix of weaknesses in the militaristic approach—which includes economic integration deficits in welfare fulfillment, lack of empowerment in the governance system, and suboptimal handling of economic and food threats—cumulatively confirms that the old paradigm has reached a saturation point. These systemic weaknesses underlie the urgency of a radical shift towards a human security framework.

3. Shifting the Security Referent Object: The Urgency and Challenges of the Human Security Paradigm

The systemic failure of the militaristic approach in responding to non-traditional

²³ M. Eilenberg, "Frontier Constellations: Agrarian Expansion and Sovereignty on the Indonesian-Malaysian Border," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 41, no. 2 (2014): 157–82, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.885433>.

threats demands a fundamental reorientation of Indonesia's border policy architecture. This reorientation centers on a shift in the referent object—that is, the main entity that must be protected—from one that originally idolized state territorial sovereignty (state-centric) to one that focuses on the individuals and communities inhabiting the region (human-centric)²⁴. This globally conceived human security paradigm places humans at the epicenter of security governance, with two main pillars: freedom from fear of physical violence and freedom from material deprivation or structural suffering²⁵. This ontological shift is crucial because the concept of security is no longer narrowly defined as the absence of foreign military aggression, but is expanded to include economic resilience, access to health care, environmental sustainability, and the socio-political stability of local communities²⁶.

In the context of Indonesia's borders, the urgency of implementing human security is absolutely critical given the sociological reality of peripheral communities that are often marginalized from national development. Border areas are often characterized by limited access to adequate education, a lack of preventive and curative health facilities, and fragile essential economic infrastructure. When these basic rights and needs are not met, communities are trapped in a cycle of structural poverty, which in turn reproduces new vulnerabilities. It is this socio-economic vulnerability that then mutates into real security threats, such as rampant smuggling, human trafficking, and other transnational crimes. Therefore, the human security framework emphasizes that regional security strategies will never be sustainable if the state neglects the welfare of its citizens; national security must be built from the bottom up by positioning border communities as active agents of sovereignty, not merely as victims of central gove. Threats are now not limited t.

This paradigm shift is slowly taking shape through various inclusive policy initiatives launched by the government at the forefront of the country. The strengthening of the function of the State Border Crossing Post (PLBN) is no longer seen solely as a rigid immigration and customs checkpoint, but has been revitalized as a hub for economic growth and a space for cross-border social interaction. The integration of holistic public services—ranging from the organization of traditional markets, MSME bazaars, mobile population administration services, to the provision of free health check-ups for early childhood—is a strong indicator that the state is beginning to present a more humanistic face. The implementation of strategic initiatives such as the Motaain Border Expo 2025 in Belu Regency, East Nusa Tenggara, sets a precedent and ideal prototype for how border areas can be utilized as instruments of economic diplomacy and catalysts for cross-border cooperation that ultimately improve the standard of living of local communities.

²⁴ S. Tadjbakhsh and A. M. Chenoy, *Human Security: Concepts and Implications* (Routledge, 2006), <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203965955>.

²⁵ UNDP, *Human Development Report 1993*.

²⁶ D. Gasper, "Securing Humanity: Situating 'Human Security' as Concept and Discourse," *Journal of Human Development* 6, no. 2 (2005): 221-45, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880500120558>.

However, the operational implementation of the human security concept in the field is not without structural challenges. Changing the bureaucratic culture and mindset of defense officials who have been accustomed to a hard-security regime for decades presents institutional inertia that is not easy to overcome²⁷. In addition, harmonizing the authorities of various agencies within the CIQS (Customs, Immigration, Quarantine, and Security) framework requires an extraordinarily complex synchronization of visions. The biggest challenge for the government at present is how to balance the demands of law enforcement and strict territorial control on the one hand, with the obligation to provide empathetic and empowering public services on the other. Without a measured and integrated policy design, the good intentions of prioritizing human security risk becoming nothing more than political jargon without sufficient empirical impact in the field.

4. Integrative Border Management Model: Synergizing State Securitization and Community Empowerment

In response to the complexity of threats in border areas, this study proposes a transformative policy model in the form of Security Integration and Human Security. This model departs from the premise that the state-centric approach to defense and the human-centric approach to security are not two entities that must negate each other, but rather strategic instruments that operate in complementary domains. Within this integrative framework, militaristic or physical securitization approaches are proportionally maintained as a deterrence function to respond to traditional threats, such as border disputes, military infiltration, or armed activities that threaten territorial sovereignty. However, at the same time, the human security paradigm is massively injected to dismantle and address the root causes of non-traditional structural problems, such as poverty, illegal migration, smuggling, and community vulnerability²⁸. The synergy of these two poles creates a border security posture that is not only protective in safeguarding the territory, but also promotive in uplifting the dignity and welfare of its citizens.

The operational manifestation of this integrative model can be clearly seen in the optimization and transformation of the management of State Border Crossing Posts (PLBN). PLBNs are no longer reduced to their function as military checkpoints or administrative boundaries, but are encouraged to become the inclusive front door of the country through the strengthening of CIQS (Customs, Immigration, Quarantine, and Security) coordination, which operates with a more human face. Quarantine instruments, for example, are now positioned as an essential layer of defense to prevent biosecurity threats and maintain national food security from the flow of cross-border goods. Through comprehensive CIQS coordination, the state is able to control the flow of

²⁷ Caballero-Anthony, "Non-Traditional Security Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC)."

²⁸ A. Collins, *Contemporary Security Studies* (Oxford University Press, 2016), <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/contemporary-security-studies-9780198895442>.

people and goods for national security, while still facilitating smooth social interaction and the economic wheels of the border-crossing community in a legal and orderly manner²⁹.

More than just facilitating formal traffic, this model places socio-economic empowerment as the most fundamental resilience strategy. Empirical evidence of this shift can be seen in initiatives to provide basic public services and direct economic stimulus in border areas, such as the establishment of traditional markets, free health services, and education. Strategic initiatives such as the Motaain Border Expo 2025, initiated by the National Border Management Agency (BNPP), serve as an ideal blueprint for how a border region can be managed, combining the interests of state oversight with the circulation of the people's economy. Through the provision of legal financial services (money changers) and the creation of cross-border MSME exhibition spaces, the state has directly mitigated the community's urge to turn to the shadow economy or risky cross-border informal trade practices³⁰.

The main novelty of this integrative model lies in the recalibration of metrics or indicators of successful national security governance. The success of regional protection is no longer measured solely by the number of military personnel on standby or the frequency of territorial patrols. Instead, success indicators have been expanded to include measurable socio-economic achievements, such as improvements in the basic services access index, the level of financial inclusion of local communities, and the volume of communal economic activity. Through the multidimensional framework recommended in various development studies³¹, the government is essentially building a "belt of prosperity" that will organically strengthen national resilience. This integrative model ultimately provides a strategic roadmap for policymakers to formulate an adaptive, sustainable national defense architecture that is truly rooted in the resilience of the people.

D. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on an analysis of the dynamics of Indonesia's border management, this study concludes that the construction of national security governance has so far remained trapped in a state-centric hegemony of securitization. Although the militaristic approach through a hard-border regime has proven effective in providing deterrence against traditional threats that undermine sovereignty, this strategy has significant structural gaps in responding to contemporary non-traditional threats. Real problems such as poverty, inequality in public services, and the economic vulnerability of local communities at the border are often alienated by an excessive focus on securing administrative borders. Therefore, this study emphasizes the urgency of policy transformation towards a model of Security Integration

²⁹ W. Wahyudi, "Peran Kader Bela Negara Di Kawasan Perbatasan Dalam Dinamika Hubungan Lintas Batas Negara: Studi Tentang Peran Forum Bela Negara Di Sebatik, Kabupaten Nunukan, Provinsi Kalimantan Utara," *Jurnal Pertahanan Dan Bela Negara* 7, no. 3 (2017): 1-22, <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v7i3.227>.

³⁰ Eilenberg, "Frontier Constellations: Agrarian Expansion and Sovereignty on the Indonesian-Malaysian Border."

³¹ Gasper, "Securing Humanity: Situating 'Human Security' as Concept and Discourse."

and Human Security. Adaptive border governance must be able to synergize territorial defense functions with a humanitarian approach that places community welfare as the main pillar of national resilience, manifested through the transformation of State Border Crossing Posts (PLBN) into centers of economic growth and integrated public services (CIQS) that are humanistic.

As a strategic implication of this paradigm shift, the government, through the National Border Management Agency (BNPP), is recommended to immediately recalibrate the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for border management. Success metrics should no longer rely solely on routine physical patrols, but must integrate socio-economic achievements, such as improvements in the Human Development Index (HDI) of border areas and the level of local financial inclusion. Furthermore, strengthening inter-agency synergy (Customs, Immigration, Quarantine, and Security) needs to be directed towards real economic facilitation and assistance initiatives, such as organizing a Border Expo agenda, providing legal money changers, and creating cross-border people's markets to mitigate the shadow economy ecosystem. To complement and expand the scientific horizon of national defense in the future, it is highly recommended for academics to test the implementation of this integrative model on the characteristics of vulnerability in Indonesia's maritime (sea) border areas, as well as to conduct quantitative research to measure the direct correlation between the improvement of citizens' welfare and the effectiveness of territorial stability.

References

- Aryo, F. B., A. Condro, I. Apriani, et al. *Papua Bioregion: The Forest and Its People "The Result of Baseline Study About Forest and People in Papua Bioregion."* Forest Watch Indonesia, 2019. <http://fwi.or.id>.
- Bangun, B. H., F. M. Kinanti, and M. R. Darajati. "Economic Security in Border Areas: The Fulfillment of Community Welfare." *Lampung Journal of International Law* 6, no. 2 (2024): 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.25041/lajil.v6i2.3355>.
- Barry, B., O. Weaver, and J. de Wilde. "Security: A New Framework for Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 93, no. 4 (1998): 1010–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2586187>.
- Caballero-Anthony, M. "Non-Traditional Security Challenges, Regional Governance, and the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC)." In *ASEAN and the Institutionalization of East Asia*. 2011. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203804650-4>.
- Collins, A. *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford University Press, 2016. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/contemporary-security-studies-9780198895442>.
- Eilenberg, M. "Frontier Constellations: Agrarian Expansion and Sovereignty on the Indonesian-Malaysian Border." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 41, no. 2 (2014): 157–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.885433>.
- Estevens, J. "Migration, Security Challenges, and National Security." In *Handbook of Security Science*. 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91875-4_79.
- Gaspar, D. "Securing Humanity: Situating 'Human Security' as Concept and Discourse." *Journal of Human Development* 6, no. 2 (2005): 221–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880500120558>.
- Kaldor, M. *Human Security*. Polity, 2007. https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=human-security--9780745638539.
- Kurnia, L. H., P. Yusgiantoro, T. Rudyansjah, A. Madjid, and G. E. Saputro. "Borderlines and Beyond: Strengthening Indonesia's Land Borders Through Global Insights." *Jurnal Pertahanan: Media Informasi Tentang Kajian Dan Strategi Pertahanan Yang Mengedepankan Identity, Nasionalism Dan Integrity* 11, no. 1 (2025): 151–72. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jp.v11i1.19853>.
- Mujiono, W. "The Legal Politics of State Defense in the Concept of Sovereignty of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia." *Journal of Social Research* 2, no. 2 (2023): 319–28. <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v2i2.583>.
- Nyoman, I., A. S. Rai, D. Heryadi, A. Kamaluddin, and R. Artikel. "The Role of Indonesia to Create Security and Resilience in Cyber Spaces [Peran Indonesia Dalam Membentuk Keamanan Dan Ketahanan Di Ruang Siber]." *Jurnal Politika Dinamika Masalah Politik Dalam Negeri Dan Hubungan Internasional* 13, no. 1 (2022): 43–66. <https://doi.org/10.22212/JP.V13I1.2641>.
- Pakasi, U., M. Faridz, H. Majid, and S. Susilawati. "Border Governance through Local Community Empowerment: Insights from Indonesia-Papua New Guinea Borderline." *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan* 14, no. 3 (2024): 693–711. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v14i3.15399>.
- Rahman, A. A. A., M. N. B. M. Noh, M. S. R. B. M. Yusof, et al. "Traditional and Non-Traditional Security Issues in Southern Thailand: Impacts on Malaysian Border Development and Governance." *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change* 10, no. 2 (2025): 4272–87. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.2249>.

- Siregar, C. N., E. Saepudin, N. Kurniasih, and A. W. Jatnika. "Analysis of Factual and Potential Threats in the Border Region of the Republic of Indonesia and the Democratic Republic of East Timor." *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2019)*, 2020, 108–13. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200320.021>.
- Syafei, M., M. R. Darajati, and A. D. Sudagung. "The Evaluation of the Indonesian Government Authority in Managing the Border Area of West Kalimantan-Sarawak." *International Journal of Environment, Architecture, and Societies* 3, no. 02 (2022): 120–31. <https://doi.org/10.26418/ijeas.2023.3.02.120-131>.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., and A. M. Chenoy. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. Routledge, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203965955>.
- Ugbo, N. "Contemporary Geopolitical Dynamics and Global Security: Projections for Sustainable Development." *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS*, ahead of print, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i09-51>.
- UNDP. *Human Development Report 1993*. United Nation Development Programme, 1993.
- Vesco, P., G. Baliki, T. Brück, et al. "The Impacts of Armed Conflict on Human Development: A Review of the Literature." *World Development* 187, no. 11 (2025): 106806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106806>.
- Wahyudi, W. "Peran Kader Bela Negara Di Kawasan Perbatasan Dalam Dinamika Hubungan Lintas Batas Negara: Studi Tentang Peran Forum Bela Negara Di Sebatik, Kabupaten Nunukan, Provinsi Kalimantan Utara." *Jurnal Pertahanan Dan Bela Negara* 7, no. 3 (2017): 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v7i3.227>.