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It is with great pleasure that, on behalf of the Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR), I welcome all readers to the 2nd Edition of the Mahidol Migration Centre’s (MMC) Newsletter.

Formed in 2010, MMC has firmly grounded migration studies at the forefront of IPSR’s multidisciplinary research. During 2010 and 2011, MMC has continued to conduct migration research and collaborate with institutions across the globe in doing so. Our distinguished faculty continues to work strenuously to shed light on migration trends throughout Thailand, in the ASEAN region and globally. MMC researchers and academics continue to demonstrate excellence in academic and action-oriented research on migration with the goal of improving the quality of life of marginalised migrant populations everywhere. All MMC staff continue to be a source of pride to IPSR.

With initial funding support from the Rockefeller Foundation, MMC continues to be a lead stakeholder in disseminating timely information about migration, particularly in Thailand. MMC staff continue to be well known amongst and influential with key decision makers engaging in migration policy making in Thailand’s government and we seek to engage all sectors of society impacted by migration holistically, critically and constructively.

This 2nd Edition of MMC’s newsletter was prepared by our staff in IPSR’s New Building – Prachasangkom Udompatthana - at Mahidol University’s Salaya Campus. As a shining beacon of hope and modernity, our new home is becoming more lived in. It is with profound gratitude and excitement that the official opening of our new home shall be presided over by Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn on 1st September 2011. On behalf of IPSR, I cordially invite all of you to share with us this special day. As always, I hope all of our readers will also attend our monthly MMC meetings and providing valuable input to all MMC staff for future collaboration and research.

This 2nd edition of this MMC newsletter features articles by the leading figures in existing Thai migration policy debates. It touches on key challenges facing Thai society today including statelessness, refugees and displaced persons, migration policy and the impact on migration trends that result from the Southern violence that continues to expose deep wounds in our every more fragmented and conflict stained society. All contributors are frank in their analysis of the challenges facing Thai policy on these issues and the need to integrate in future policy making national, economic and human security concerns in order to find just and sustainable solutions. It is with hope that all authors seek to share ideas on debates that continue to make up some of the key policy making challenges of our time.

...........................................................

IPSR’s New Building – Prachasangkom Udompatthana
Towards Effective Management of Stateless Persons in Thailand

By Kritaya Archavanitkul

The official terms used by the Thai Government for stateless and/or rootless persons are ‘aliens’ or ‘people without Thai nationality’. As they do not possess personal identification documents, such persons are presumed to be undocumented migrant workers who are not included in civil registration records. Stateless and/or rootless persons were registered at different times and in different situations but they can be classified into 4 groups, that is: (1) ethnic minorities; (2) rootless persons/those without civil registration records; (3) migrant workers from Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar; and (4) displaced persons residing in Thailand from Myanmar.

Faced with widespread violations against stateless people’s rights, the Thai Government has slowly welcomed the role of civil society in the protection of their rights. Many non-governmental organisations (NGO’s) have worked to provide assistance to stateless persons when their rights are violated. There has also been an effective network of scholars, human rights defenders, NGO’s, civil servants, politicians and high-ranking officials in the NSC focusing specifically on the personal legal status and rights of marginalised groups such as ethnic minorities, stateless/rootless persons and migrant workers. Since 1997, this network has been advocating for a ‘Strategic Plan for the Personal Legal Status and Rights of Marginalised People’ so as to provide systematic solutions to personal legal status and rights of these groups of people who have been living in Thailand for a long period of time, as well as for their children born on Thai soil.

### Table: Statistics on Stateless and Rootless Persons in Civil Registration Records (June 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Stateless and Rootless Persons in Thailand</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘6’</td>
<td>233,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘7’ (children of group A born in Thailand)</td>
<td>69,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootless persons (13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘0’)</td>
<td>210,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular migrant workers from Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar (13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘00’)</td>
<td>2,487,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced persons from Myanmar residing in Thailand (13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘000’)</td>
<td>102,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,103,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kritaya Archavanitkul (2011, forthcoming)  
(Calculated from unpublished data of the Bureau of Registration Administration, Ministry of Interior).

The first law to require every Thai citizen to carry national identification was enacted in 1943 and Thailand’s civil registration system became fully operational in 1956. Considering the civil registration processes in Thailand, stateless personhood may result from the following situations:

1. Those left out of the first and subsequent civil registration surveys
2. Non-notified births
3. Removal from Thai civil registration (thus not recognized by any state).

Before 2005, Thailand did not have well thought out policies to manage stateless/rootless persons. Prior efforts to address stateless persons prioritised national security and linked with policies to manage irregular migration from neighbouring countries. The National Security Council (NSC), responsible for protecting and promoting national security both domestically and internationally, was the key agency. The NSC’s conceptual framework was based on control rather than governance and deeply tied in with protection of national sovereignty. Such narrow conceptual framework is the root cause of systemic prejudice against stateless and ethnic minorities and results in multiple rights violations against those concerned, including their inability to access government systems.

2005 under a new paradigm of national security management which emphasised a balance of human security and national security. The strategy contained three key components, namely: (1) A strategic plan for status determination; (2) A strategic plan for fundamental rights protection; and (3) A proactive and creative strategic plan to prevent further immigration into Thailand.

Status determination is principally based on the notion that in order to be considered for personal legal status, an applicant must be well-behaved and/or have legal work and present no threat to the national security of Thailand. According to this strategy, the target group of this strategy can be classified into 6 subgroups, as follow: (1) Immigrants; (2) Those studying in Thai educational systems without personal legal status; (3) Rootless persons; (4) Those with benefaction to Thailand; (5) Registered migrant workers from Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar who have been rejected by their origin countries; and (6) other ‘aliens’ who cannot return to origin countries.
Even though Thailand has a strategic plan to solve stateless person’s problems, the methods and procedures to give personal legal status remain unchanged and can be explained as follows:

(A) Categorised in the Tor-Ror 13 Registration since 1972
The parent generation of this group have 13-digit ID numbers beginning with ‘6’ while children born of this group have ID numbers beginning with ‘7’. Previously holding colour-coded group-specific cards, these people now have ‘non-national ID Cards’. Most are nationality-less but not stateless as their parent’s generation has been granted certificates of residence or ‘alien cards’ which entitle them to permanent residency in Thailand but not Thai nationality. Children of this generation born in Thailand are to be given Thai nationality. However, some groups are only given temporary residency without time limits yet it seems likely that they will eventually be granted permanent residency and their children born in Thailand will receive Thai nationality. This pathway to personal status can be summarised as follow:

However, in practice it is found that those who fit these criteria must individually apply for Thai nationality with registration officers in their areas of residency. Such application is relayed from the district level to provincial level to the Department of Provincial Administration which will then send it to the Ministry of Interior for approval on a case by case basis. The exact amount of time required for this already lengthy process also depends on the incumbent Interior Minister’s opinion and attitude. Some cases take up to ten years.

(B) Categorised after 2005
These persons whom the Thai Government officially term ‘people without civil registration records’ have never appeared in any country’s civil registration systems. Once the strategic plan to categorise stateless people was in place, the Thai Government ordered a Ministry of Education survey of stateless students and since expanded the coverage of this survey to areas where a large number of uncategorised persons were reported to be living. Most in this group are descendants of ethnic minorities who have lived in Thailand for a long time. However, since their births have not been registered, their names cannot be added into the Tor-Ror 13 document. Similar problems arise with children of Thai nationals who have not registered their children’s birth. Unregistered children of Thai nationals can get Thai nationality with a DNA test. For stateless or rootless persons, the pathway to personal status can be summarised as follows:

Considering Thailand’s management of stateless persons for many decades now, the most important obstacles to ensuring a solution to the difficult situations faced by stateless persons, as well as the need to ensure national and personal security for all those concerned in Thailand, are the different interpretations by various government officials in the field of these processes and the systematic corruption involved when too many officials involved fail to act transparently. As a result, some people who are entitled to personal legal status still cannot obtain it while others who are not genuinely entitled to it can do so. Thailand’s biggest challenge in managing statelessness is to come up with practical guidelines on how to grant personal legal status to all those within its borders which is accurate, appropriate, fair, all-encompassing and rapid.

\(^1\)The Tor Ror 13 is the household registration document for ethnic minorities

Reference
During 2010, Thailand’s Government insisted there could be no return to amnesty programmes of the past 2 decades whereby ‘irregular’ migrant workers from Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar who entered Thailand ‘illegally’ could register and work legally. As a result, a non-transparent and ineffective crackdown on unregistered migrants was undertaken by special committees set up by Prime Minister Abhisit Vejjajiva to combat irregular migration and trafficking. However, systems for regularising low skilled migrants from Thailand’s 3 neighbouring countries (‘nationality verification’ and ‘import’) continued to face serious challenges and numbers of registered migrants in Thailand could not meet labour market demand for low skilled workers.

During 2010, Thailand’s migration policies were strongly criticised by all stakeholders, including the ILO and the UN, as prioritising national security and economic security over human security. In addition, with widespread low skilled labour shortages, employers complained the policies were unrealistic. In the face of such criticism, the Thai Government u-turned on its migrant worker policies in 2011. On 26th April, the Cabinet approved a resolution ‘Measures to Systematically Solve the Problem of Illegal Migrant Workers.’ Key features of this resolution were:

1. A new registration for undocumented workers from Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar currently working and residing in Thailand. Registration extended to accompanying children not over 15 years of age also. Once registered, such persons would be granted permission to stay in Thailand for no more than 1 year to work legally, pending deportation for ‘illegal’ entry.
2. An emphasis on strict and continued interception, suppression, arrest and prosecution of undocumented migrants and the prevention of new arrivals before, during and after the new registration. Similar punitive measures would be taken against employers and those providing work or refuge to undocumented migrants.
3. An increased focus on ‘legal’ import of migrants from Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia to respond to the low skilled labour needs of employers in Thailand.
4. Restructuring of the Illegal Alien Workers Management Committee (Kor Bor Ror) to allow wider coverage of migrant issues and decentralisation to the provinces.

In response to this resolution, a new migrant registration/amnesty will be conducted between 15th June and 14th July 2011. The Ministry of Labour (MoL), the focal agency, has set a target of registering 2 million undocumented migrants (or those currently without work permits) in 30 days.

To the credit of the policy makers concerned, registration processes this time seem more considered than in the past with the use of ‘one-stop’ services for simplicity and convenience and an increased focus on public awareness. However, registering 2 million migrants in a short 30 day period seems unrealistic and public awareness measures by MoL has focused almost exclusively on employers.

The u-turn in re-opening registration for migrants with unregistered status in Thailand is commendable as one potential means to address systematic exploitation of migrant workers in Thailand. The Government’s moves forward in terms of prioritising legal worker import and nationality verification can likewise be praised as potential ways to ensure regularised migration and provide migrants with a stronger status that can empower them to demand rights and better treatment at the hands of their employers. But migration management systems in Thailand remain fundamentally flawed. Thailand remains without a
long term migration policy that integrates human, national and economic security. Kor Bor Ror remains weak and its capacity low to tackle Thailand’s mounting migration challenges.

ASEAN should have a central role to play in Thailand’s migration debate, despite its regional framework on migration at a standstill and the sensitivities surrounding its most problematic member Myanmar, the source of 80% of all low skilled migrants in Thailand. UN agencies and foreign embassies supporting migration policy development should continue, perhaps by widening frames of debate on what is acceptable, to find more innovative ways to assist the Thai government in the challenges ahead, particularly through capacity building assistance. The embassies of the home countries of the millions of migrants in Thailand should increasingly help too.

There are genuine challenges for the Thai Government in moving forward with migration policies. But benefits of low cost workers contributing much to Thailand’s economic development and social fabric comes with responsibilities, particularly when such workers come from Myanmar. Much more effort is required if the concerning situation of migrants in Thailand is to improve. Central to solving these migration challenges should be a human rights perspective that ensures benefits for the migrants behind this complex social and economic debate are not forgotten.

By Aphichat Chamratrithirong and Kerry Richter*

The Prevention of HIV/AIDS among Migrant Workers in Thailand (PHAMIT-2) is part of the Global Fund Round 8 prevention programme targeting at most risk populations (MARPs). The PHAMIT-2 project follows on from PHAMIT-1 (2004-2008) and continues the expansion of HIV prevention activities targeting foreign migrant workers in Thailand. IPSR’s Mahidol Migration Center (MMC) conducted a baseline survey for the PHAMIT-2 project in the latter half of 2010.

This survey found that foreign migrant workers are young and their average age is in the early stage of the active reproductive years. Many workers live with their spouses but a significant proportion are single. The majority of migrants have low levels of education and take low skilled jobs in factories, fisheries, construction and agriculture. Although migrants encounter language barriers and earn low wages in Thailand, more than half remit money back to their home countries.

Fig. 1: Percent of Male Migrants Reporting Seeing a Sex Worker or Having a Non-regular partner in the Last 12 Months

More than 60% of surveyed migrants reported sexual experiences. Laotian made up the highest proportion of migrants with sexual experiences followed by Cambodian and Myanmar migrants (78.5, 75.7 and 63.6% respectively). Among those reporting ever to have had sex, ages at first experience were not young - median ages for first experiences for men and women respectively were 20/19 for Cambodians and Laotians and 21/20 for migrants from Myanmar. Most importantly, the survey found that self-reported risk behavior among male migrants is an issue of concern. 34% of Cambodian men reported visiting a sex worker in the past year (Figure 1). For Laotian men, the figure was lower (10.5%) and only a small proportion of men from Myanmar (2.7%) reported doing so. The proportion of male migrants reporting sex with non-regular partners was significant - 15.9% of Laotian migrants reported a non-regular partner followed by Cambodian/Myanmar migrants at 10.2/52% respectively.
As shown in Figure 2, the proportion of male and female migrants reporting use of condoms with last sexual partners was high. 95% of male migrants from Cambodia and Myanmar said that they used a condom the last time they went to a sex worker also, but only 67% of Laotian men reported doing so. While condom use with regular partners is reported to be low in surveys of this type, 89% of Laotian men and women reported they used condoms with regular partners. It is not known whether these are co-resident partners in Thailand such as spouses or whether this condom use refers to their visit returns to their home countries. It is also likely many of the ‘partners’ were Thai where they just lived together as couples but did not register their marriages. Of concern is the percentage of persons using a condom with their last non-regular partner - only 76% of migrants from Myanmar only 81% of Laotian migrants reported doing so.

Fig. 2: Percent of Male and Female Migrants Reporting Condom Use at Last Sex by Partner Type and Country of Origin

General knowledge of HIV/AIDS of migrants was high. Approximately 90% of those surveyed had heard of HIV/AIDS. Moreover, one fourth of migrants knew a HIV+ person. Knowledge relating to condoms was high also. Almost all those surveyed said that they had seen condoms, with the exception of female migrants from Myanmar. The majority of migrants knew that condoms were used for HIV/AIDS protection, family planning and sexually transmitted infection (STI) prevention.

However, knowledge of STIs among migrants was not comprehensive. Even though many migrants knew of or had heard about STIs, their knowledge was relatively low when compared with their knowledge related to HIV/AIDS. For example, 45% of male migrant from Myanmar did not know about STIs. There also remained certain gaps in knowledge of HIV testing, especially regarding trust in the confidentiality of testing results. This was especially true for migrants from Myanmar, of whom 49.4% thought that the confidentiality of test results was impossible. However, more than 80% of Cambodian migrants said that they trusted the confidentiality of test results.

Overall, results of this survey indicate levels of knowledge related to HIV prevention based on the UN General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS) Guidelines are not yet satisfied. Only 24.1% of migrant workers had good and comprehensive knowledge related to HIV prevention and regarding transmission and availability of prevention methods. HIV prevention programmes to raise risk awareness and make prevention methods available is essential for migrants.

Self-reports of STI infections among migrant workers showed that Cambodian migrants (3.5%) had the highest infection rates followed by Laotian migrants (2.0%). Only 0.3% of migrants from Myanmar reported having STI infections. The majority of migrant workers said they preferred public hospitals for treatment when infected with STIs. Other health facilities such as pharmacies, NGOs clinics, private hospitals or private clinics were infrequently mentioned. Unfortunately, a significant proportion of migrant reported that they did not want to get treatment at any health facilities, especially Cambodians (17%) and Laotians (18%), as they preferred home treatment.

Approximately half of migrant workers from Cambodia and Myanmar knew about an outlet for HIV screening. However, more than 60% of Laotian migrant workers knew where to get a test and also made up the highest proportion for migrants reporting ever to have had a HIV test (39%), as compared to 5% and 16% among migrants from Myanmar and Cambodia respectively. Among those migrants who had a HIV test, about half of migrants from Myanmar and Cambodia had it recently or in the last year as compared to only 26% of Laotian migrants. Most Laotian migrants (74%) had their HIV test more than a year ago. A higher proportion of female migrants knew an outlet for HIV screening, with the exception of migrants from Myanmar. Amongst those migrants who knew of a testing outlet, public hospitals were the most often mentioned site for screening.

Around 50-70% of migrant workers who said they were tested in the past year for HIV received pre-test counseling. Only 88% of migrants from Laos and Myanmar voluntarily tested received their test results and the proportion of Cambodian migrants receiving results was lower still (72.4%).

Despite areas of concern found in these survey results, progress has been made in making HIV prevention knowledge and services available and accessible to migrants. Many migrants surveyed reported knowledge of programmes on HIV/AIDS that were tailored for them. The Raks Thai Foundation, World Vision Foundation of Thailand, Foundation for AIDS Rights (FAR), Pattanarak Foundation and AIDSNET have been actively providing information and services related to HIV/AIDS for migrants in Thailand. Programmes conducted include condom promotion through group conversation, education campaigns, meetings and NGO-run clinics. MMC will be investigating the effectiveness of these programmes in increasing migrant knowledge and prevention behavior through further analysis of PHAMIT data.

*The PHAMIT Survey Research Team at MMC includes Aphichat Chamratrithong, Wathinee Boonchalaksi, Charamporn Holumyong, Chalempol Chamchan and Kanya Apipornchaisakul.
Survey of Thai Public Opinion on Refugees and Displaced Persons from Myanmar

By Sakkarin Niyomsilpa

Displaced persons are a major concern to the global community. At the end of 2009, there were 15.2 million refugees, 1 million asylum seekers and 27.1 million internally displaced persons around the world. However, only 26.2 million displaced persons were either protected and/or assisted by the UNHCR, out of the total 43.3 million people. More concerning was the fact that more than 4 million refugees were not provided any assistance by the UNHCR (Table 1).

Asian countries are a major source of global refugees and displaced persons. According to the UNHCR, there were over 5 million refugees, over 1 million people in refugee-like situations, almost 200,000 asylum seekers and over 5 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) originating from Asia in 2009. Among major countries of origin for Asian refugees and displaced persons in 2009 were Afghanistan, Iraq, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Vietnam and China. Afghanistan and Iraq were the source countries for over 3 million displaced persons each. Among Southeast Asian countries, Myanmar was the origin of almost half a million displaced persons, among whom 206,650 people were refugees and another 200,019 were people in refugee-like situations. Most refugees and displaced persons from Myanmar were camped in Western Thailand’s border areas. There were also 339,289 Vietnamese refugees sheltered in Southern China. China was the country of origin for 180,558 refugees and 18,337 asylum seekers.

For many years, refugees and displaced persons from Myanmar have been camped in Western Thailand’s border areas. According to the Thailand Burma Border Consortium (TBB), in April 2011 there were 143,315 Myanmar displaced persons in 10 camps in 5 provinces in Thailand (Chiangmai, Mae Hong Son, Tak, Kanchanaburi, and Ratchaburi). Tak and Mae Hong Son Provinces provide refugee to over 130,000 of these persons. Most of the people currently residing in these camps are not recognised as refugees by Thailand’s government and many have been waiting for return to Myanmar once peace and stability returns to the country. However, many more of these people have lived in the camps for many years with little hope for a safe return to Myanmar in the near future. They will continue to live in Thai camps for the foreseeable future.

Thailand’s National Security Council (NSC) made recommendations to the Thai government in April 2011 that Thailand should talk to the new government of Myanmar concerning the safe return of the displaced persons to pave the way for the closure of all camps. Thailand would also ask the UNHCR to resettle those who could not return to Myanmar for safety reasons in third countries. Such policy is a cause of concern for displaced persons and humanitarian agencies as the political situation in Myanmar is still far from certain.

With a view to exploring the possibility of improving the livelihood of displaced persons from Myanmar and their access to social services, particularly healthcare services, the Mahidol

Table 1: Global Displaced Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Displaced Population</th>
<th>Total (millions of people)</th>
<th>Protected/Assisted by UNHCR (millions of people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum-seekers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-generated IDPs</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR 2010

Table 2: Countries of Origin for Asian Refugees and Asylum Seekers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>People in refugee-like situations</th>
<th>Asylum seekers</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5,198,717</td>
<td>1,194,483</td>
<td>173,028</td>
<td>5,434,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1,905,804</td>
<td>981,319</td>
<td>30,412</td>
<td>297,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>180,558</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,337</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,786,212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,383</td>
<td>1,552,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>145,712</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,566</td>
<td>434,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>206,650</td>
<td>200,019</td>
<td>22,583</td>
<td>67,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>339,289</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR, 2010

Painting by Muang Muang Tinn
Migration Center (MMC) is now undertaking a survey of Thai public opinion on Myanmar displaced persons (DPs) to identify the current attitudes of Thai society towards these people. This project aims to find out Thai community views on public health policy improvements targeting Myanmar DPs and to provide intervention recommendations necessary to improve Thai public attitudes towards them. As healthier Myanmar DPs will help control contagious diseases and also benefit Thai communities living in Thailand’s Western borders provinces, this project is funded by the World Health Organization (WHO) and will be completed by November 2011. Malee Sunpuwan and Sakkarin Niyomsilpa will lead the research team for this project. The survey will cover 2,000 people in four provinces of Western Thailand including Kanchanaburi, Ratchaburi, Tak and Maehongson. In-depth interviews and focus-group discussions will also be conducted among community leaders and healthcare workers.

Table 3: Displaced Persons from Myanmar (April, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province of Thailand</th>
<th>Displaced Persons from Myanmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiangmai</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wieng Heng (Ethnic Shan)</td>
<td>51,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Hong Son</td>
<td>14,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Mai Nai Soi</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Mae Surin</td>
<td>15,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae La Oon</td>
<td>17,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Ra Ma Luang</td>
<td>79,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tak</td>
<td>45,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae La</td>
<td>17,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu Po</td>
<td>15,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanchanaburi</td>
<td>4,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Don Yang</td>
<td>7,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratchaburi</td>
<td>143,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TBBC, April 2011

Muslim Women’s Migration to Malaysia as a Response to the Unrest in the Three Southernmost Provinces of Thailand

By Aree Jampaklay, Aphichat Chamratrithirong and Kathy Ford

The Mahidol Migration Centre (MMC) is undertaking a research study to understand how difficulties due to the on-going unrest in the three southernmost provinces of Thailand affect women in terms of socio-economic wellbeing. Researchers are particularly interested in investigating whether and how women move across the Malaysian border to work as a response to the conflict situation. Experiencing the loss of men (fathers, brothers or sons) leaves women to shoulder all of the stay-behind burdens. Women are forced to support not only themselves but also their children, parents and others in their families. Violence experienced by neighbours or co-villagers is also likely to indirectly affect women’s economic and psychological well being. This research project is funded by the Thai Research Foundation (TRF) and the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at the University of Michigan.

A preliminary study has been conducted in April 2011 in preparation for a larger study expected to commence in 2012. In April 2011, researchers from MMC visited the three concerned provinces to learn about how difficulties due to the ongoing unrest affect women, as compared to men, in terms of socio-economic wellbeing. Information was gathered from interviews with key informants to develop plans for the larger study. The eventual study design will attempt to include a longitudinal and multi-level approach. As the study site is considered ‘unsafe’, the data collection procedures must take local cultural and security issues into account. The fieldwork will be a collaboration between MMC and an academic institution in each province.

The results from a literature review and MMC’s preliminary research indicate several questions need to be answered regarding Muslim women’s short and long term migration to Malaysia. There are several reasons why women may migrate. First, due to stress on the Muslim population resulting from ongoing unrest in the South, women may seek a safer environment. Second, the unrest has led to reduced economic development with an associated decrease in job opportunities in the Southern provinces. The need to migrate for economic wellbeing has increased.

Documentation shows that migration to Malaysia has been occurring for several decades as a traditional way of life amongst border populations and that migration would occur even in the absence of unrest. This on-going way of life needs to be understood in the midst of difficulties due to the unrest. Migrants may be suspected by authorities or villagers to be linked to the unrest and this may lead to problems for those migrating. In this situation, the unrest may actually deter migration. Such

2 According to UNHCR, this term includes groups of persons who are outside their country or territory of origin and who face protection risks similar to those of refugees but for whom refugee status has, for practical or other reasons, not been ascertained.
suspicions may become increasingly dangerous for the government and border communities and add to the difficulty in obtaining a peaceful solution to the Southern conflict.

Muslim women are in a difficult situation because of the multiple roles that they must take on due to the combination of unrest and migration. Some key informants reported to MMC’s research team that because of the unrest, Thai Muslim women are expected by the community and religious groups to maintain their traditional and religious roles in the family while they also receive pressure from the government to take new social and economic roles and to participate in the peace movement. Data is needed on how Thai Muslim women make adjustments in this changing economic and social environment. A study of the impact of migration during the unrest would help to define the complicated and emerging needs of these women and design the most appropriate assistance programmes for them.
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• Muslim Women’s Migration to Malaysia as a Response to the Unrest In the Three Southernmost Provinces of Thailand (Thai Research Foundation/University of Michigan)
• Social Cost of Migration on Children of International Migrant Parents (Miriam Colleage Phillipines)
• Survey of Myanmar Migrants in Thailand (World Bank)
• Survey of Thai Public Opinions on Myanmar Refugees and Displaced Persons (WHO)
• Thailand’s Regulatory, Institutional and Governance System for Managing Foreign Workers: The Focus on Bilateral Agreement on Migration (World Bank)
• The Impact of Internal Migration on “Children Left-Behind” in Thailand (UNICEF)
Established in 1971, the Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR) at Mahidol University is one of Asia’s premier population research and training hubs. The Institute conducts research and provides training in population and development and explores their relationship to the social, economic, reproductive health, medical and public health fields. This allows the Institute to help address emerging issues for Thailand and neighboring countries in south-east Asia and beyond, with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of life for all. The demographic transition throughout Asia has emerged at different stages in recent decades as political and economic change has swept the region, and the Institute is uniquely positioned to keep abreast with these changes through our timely research. This knowledge and technical support is widely disseminated to scholars and policymakers internationally, regionally, and at the country and local levels.


Graduate research programmes/courses currently offered by IPSR include:

- MA Programme in Population and Social Research (Thai)
- PhD Programme in Demography (International)
- MA Programme in Population and Reproductive Health Research (International)
- MA Programme in Population and Social Gerontology (International Joint Programme with Miami University, United States)
- Short courses in research methods, monitoring and evaluation of policy implementation and gender
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