Development of the Concept Human Security in the Southern Border Provinces of Thailand

Thampitug, S.

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanity, Mahidol University, 73170 Salaya, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

ABSTRACT

This research was to develop the concept of human security in the southern border provinces of Thailand. Its concept found by the researcher differed from many scholars and other organizations in some issues because each area marked its own different contexts. Human security needed developed within the contexts of each area. Reflecting the human security concept developed by Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, the Baldwin-based model was related to individual and community security while security for values covered the safety of lives and property, peace and a better quality of life. On the other hand, the security from threats involved being freed from fears of mass media, poverty, narcotics, influential smuggling groups, politics, insurgencies, local people, and the state. In tandem with these findings, security by what means revealed the two elements of the public sector and civilian sector. The public sector involved protection, empowerment, the improvement of local administrative processes and the improvement of policy process based on local areas in development. The civilian sector included involvements in activities, news report and self protection.

Keywords: Development, human security concept, southern border provinces

INTRODUCTION

Thailand established the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security authorized to develop society, encouraging fairness and equality in society, while promoting and developing the quality of life and security of families and the communities. The Ministry conceptualized the framework of Human Security founded in the United Nations Development Programme Human

Development Report 1994 with two aims, that is, (1) freedom from fear and (2) freedom from want (United Nation Development Program [UNDP], 1994). It shifted the national security concept to the security of the populace since it was the national cornerstone. The Ministry later conducted research to develop standards and indicators of human security utilized as the tools to evaluate social situations and to be a channel and a destiny to achieve human security in general. Identifying standards and indicators of human security had been the west and the UNDP oriented. They had also been developed from brainstorming by those involved through discussion platforms and opinion surveys, included with prioritizing oriental lifestyles to adequately engage with the Thai context. There were mediations on quality of life and threats, which identified the indicators that cover freedom from want, equal opportunities, and freedom from fear. There were limitations with some indicators that were inaccessible and this needed replacement by other indicators. However, they were unable to directly and clearly mirror human security (Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards, 2012). The actual situation of human security, therefore, required surveys and data collection using methods directly covered systems and meetings and regular revision.

The southern-border insurgencies seemed endless and prolonged with more surging violence. This insurgency brought economic and social losses to the three southern-border provinces. Data from Deep South Watch (DSJ) were the violence recurred within the past 101 months during May 31 2012 to 4th January 2014 was incremental and entered the 9th year of violence. There were 11,754 insurgencies in the three southern border provinces leading to an alarming number of 14,343 deaths and injuries. Of this number, 5,206 were dead and 9,137 were injured. The insurgency was therefore seen deadly and affecting the way of life and the very existence of the people, threatening human security, and slamming the national security. Therefore, it was hard to establish human security to cool down conflicts and to develop the southern-border provinces. Baldwin (1997) advocated that to establish the concept of human security, it needed to begin with defining human security since its definition varied distinctively from one country to another. In Thailand, the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security had defined human security since 2005 but it was varied by year. Thailand applied this definition as "the people have been warranted on rights, safety, responsiveness to basic needs, ability to live in society with honour and equal opportunities of latency development of oneself" (Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards, 2014). This definition had become the basis for the development of human security nationwide.

In examining the deep-south areas with their contexts and situations, they differed from other areas of the country. The human security concept was certainly different. This corresponded with Sukhothaithammathirat

University's (2006) prediction that the diverse definitions of human security might confuse defining human security, and that it should not be inclusively interpreted because it might create complexity in accessing information and became useless in solving problems. In fact, it should be specifically and clearly defined to target different groups so as to gain pertinent ideas and lead to more precise solutions. Therefore, the concept of human security requires considerations within a specific context. This was also corresponded with Wattanasiritham (2006) who stated that the deep-south insurgency was a clear and challenging problem in applying the concepts and principles of human security for authentic outcomes. Rationally, they were recurrent, violent and more complex for the state to address only by using state power or the traditional understanding which emphasized only national unity but disregarded the necessities of human security.

What should then be the characteristics of the concept of human security in the southern border provinces of Thailand? The researcher has determined to develop a human security concept to meet the context of these deep-south areas.

Research Objective

To conceptualize the human security in the deep-south areas.

Expected Benefits

Knowledge gained from this study could provide ways to promote human security that was important to develop citizens and the country, to design human security policy and further strengthen the deep-south areas.

Scope of the Study and the Conceptual Framework

The researcher has adopted the concept of Baldwin (1997) as the conceptual framework. The module involved four questions as follows:

- Security for whom?
- Security for which values?
- Security from what threats?
- Security by what means?

Literature Review

International security was the measurable amalgamation adopted by countries and world organizations like the UN, EU, ASEAN, and other nations to ascertain mutual safety and survival. These magnitudes involved military missions and diplomatic understandings like conventions and treaties. National and international security was unchangeably linked. Global security was domestic security or national security in the international arena. When World War II ended, global safety hiked, and research flooded from 1950 when peace studies, security studies, strategic studies and the like were established (Buzan & Hansen, 2009; Sheehan, 2005). The definition of "security" is treated as a common sense terminology that could be implicit with "unacknowledged consensus" (Sheehan, 2005). The international security contents covered various interconnected issues worldwide affecting survival ranging

from the conventional military power modes, roots and results of war between countries, economies, ethnicity, ideological and religious conflicts, economic and trade conflicts, energy supply, technology and science, food, including human security threats and state stability from environmental degradation, climate change, contagious diseases, and non-state actors' activities (Buzen, Waever, & de Wilde, 1998; Doty & Carnesale, 1976)

Human Security by UNDP (1994) pinpointed: (1) investing in human development, not in arms; (2) engaging policy makers to address the emerging peace dividend; (3) giving the United Nations a clear mandate to promote and sustain development; (4) enlarging the concept of development cooperation so that it includes all flows, not just aid; (5) agreeing that 20% of national budgets and 20% of foreign aid be used for human development, and (6) establishing an economic security council.

The seven components to human security by UNDP as Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2007) list them, are: *first*, economic security was defined as an assured basic income because it was threatened by poverty, unemployment, indebtedness, and lack of income. *Second*, food security referred to physical and economic access to basic food due to being threatened by hunger, famines and the lack of physical and economic access to basic food. *Third*, health security meant protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles, jeopardized by inadequate health care, new and recurrent diseases including epidemics and pandemics, poor nutrition and unsafe environments and lifestyles. *Fourth*, environmental security was defined as a healthy physical environment cowed by environmental degradation, natural disasters, pollution and resource depletion. *Fifth,* personal security referred to security from physical violence endangered by the state (torture), other states (war), groups of people (ethnic tension), individuals or gangs (crime), industrial, workplace or traffic accidents. *Sixth*, community security meant safe membership in a group threatened by the group (oppressive practices), between groups (ethnic violence), or from dominant groups (e.g., indigenous people vulnerability). *Seventh*, political security was defined as living in a society that honors basic human rights threatened by political or state repression, including torture, disappearance, human rights violations, detention and imprisonment.

Baldwin (1997) proposed dividing human security into four questions, that was, Security for whom?, Security for which values?, Security from what threats?, and Security by what means?. *First*, Security for whom was defined by Baldwin as for the individual (some, most, or all individuals), the state (some, most, or all states), the international system (some, most, or all international systems), and so on. Second, security for which values included physical safety, economic welfare, autonomy, psychological wellbeing, political independence, territorial integrity, the maintenance of "economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms" as national security. *Third*, security from

what threats included potential burglars or home threats, different state conflicts or national threats, ideological threats, economic threats, military threats, and some combination thereof. *Fourth,* security by what means involved a variety of means, that is, international politics, international relations, threat, use, and control of military force.

The Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards (2014) involved *first, security for whom*, which included, individuals, community and state. *Second, security for what values* including security, good quality of life, personal freedom, human dignity, freedom from fear, freedom from want, economic development, social fairness, respect of human rights and laws, political rights, environmental protection, equal opportunities, and following democracy. *Third, security from what threats* involved violence against life and a property/criminal problems, violation of human rights/destroying human dignity/oppression, discrimination, the fall of community/local migration, absence of involvement, uncertain income, and career/economic problems. *Fourth, security by what means* included protection and empowerment.

METHODS

The researcher aimed to develop the human security concept in the Southern border provinces of Thailand. The findings would further be used in crafting policy to meet human security development. The methodology was as follows:

Research Design

From literature reviews, it was found that the issues in creating human security were people-centered concepts of development. Therefore, qualitative research was the most relevant to this concept because the social and cultural contexts involved people needed to be analyzed for interpretation to acquire knowledge and truth. However, the more significance was human security development that allowed the local people to reflect on the facts of their own experiences. As such, knowledge and truth related to human security could reflect the very fact of local security by real situations. Qualitative research had therefore been selected for this research and the methods used were as follows:

1. Document Study—to explore documents from secondary data.
2. Field Research—in-depth interviews and focus group discussions had been conducted with key informants in the two field research interviews as below.

The first field research—150 key informants were interviewed with a structured interview as a tool. The objectives of the first field research were to collect data raised in the research objectives and to prepare a temporary synopsis.

The second field research—46 key informants were interviewed and attended focus group discussions. They were categorized as 16 key informants from the in-depth interviews while 30 key informants attended six focus group discussions. The

objectives of the second field research were to collect data raised in the research objectives and to assert the synopsis of the first field research while validating all the data.

Key Informants

Informants have been divided into two groups by field research as follows.

Group 1: The First Field Research. 150 residents living in the provinces of Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat were distributed as in Table 1.

Table 1
The key informants of the first field research

Provinces	Districts (N)	Sub-districts (N)	Villages (N)	Total (N)
Pattani	5	13	21	50
Yala	5	13	21	50
Narathiwat	7	15	37	50
Total	12	41	79	150

Group 2: The Second Field Research. Forty-six key informants were people of the provinces of Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat who were administrators in the Southern Border Provinces Administrative Centers, administrators of the Internal Security Operations Command Region 4, former politicians, scholars, religious leaders, district chiefs, village chiefs, village deputy chiefs, Thai-Buddhists, and Thai-Muslims. They were divided into 17 Thai-Buddhists and 29 Thai-Muslims as shown in Table 2.

Table 2
The key informants of the second field research

Provinces	Religions		Total
	Buddhism	Islam	
Pattani	5	9	14
Yala	4	11	15
Narathiwat	8	9	17
Total	17	29	46

The Research Instruments

The first one employed a structured interview format while the second one employed in-depth interviews and the in-depth interview guide. The format and the guide were adopted from Baldwin's four key questions (*security for whom?, security for which values?, security from what threats?, and security by what means?*) but the contents had been adopted form the Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards (2014). They involved *first, security for whom*, which included, individuals, community and state. Secondly*, security for what values* includes security, good quality of life, personal freedom, human dignity, freedom from fear, freedom from want, economic development, social fairness, respect of human rights and laws, political rights, environmental protection, equal opportunities, and following

democracy. Thirdly, *security from what threats* involved violence against life and a property/criminal problems, violation of human rights/destroying human dignity/ oppression, discrimination, the fall of community/local migration, absence of involvement, uncertain income and career/ economic problem. Fourthly, *security by what means* included protection and empowerment. The researcher specified the process of developing the conceptual framework which was divided into three steps: (1) development of the draft on human security concepts; (2) a test of the human security concept, and (3) the assertion of the human security concept.

The Instrument Quality Check

To check the quality of the instruments used in the study was focused on the content validity of all the three types through testing their validity by three experts. The content validity was tested on its accountability, measurability, clarity, and the instruments have been improved according to the instruction of the experts to meet the research objectives.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

This research collected data through in-depth interviews conducted with 150 key informants and 46 participants for focus group discussions during the two field research trips. Data from the in-depth interviews and from the focus group discussions were analyzed with content analysis of contextual units and by categories.

RESULTS

Analysis of the Responses to the Four Questions According to Baldwin by Domestic and International Scholars

In analyzing responses to the four questions based on Baldwin (1997) by international scholars, the researcher proposed the concepts of the workplace, scholars, and the country, which were the pivots for human security. They were found in the UNDP (1994), Thiprat (2001), Bajpai (2002), Otaga (1999), Thomas (2000), Chaikeaw (2009), Sudjit (2010), Osman, Udomlamul, Masor, and Wuttiwong (2011), Musika (2014) and Thampitug (2016). In Thailand, the researcher adopted the concept from the Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards (2014) as the data for analysis and could be seen in Table 3.

The researcher applied the draft of human security concepts in the southern border provinces and the analysis of which was summarized in Table 4

From Table 4, it was found that the analysis of data from field work were differed from the draft of human security concept in the southern border provinces as the researcher had analyzed in the first step so that it would correspond with the local context. The researcher utilized the analyzed data gained from the Baldwin-based four questions with the contents from Ministry of Social Development and Human Security.

The researcher used the analyzed concepts from Table 5 in order to assert the concepts formed by the researcher. Structured interviews had been conducted with 46 informants. The results of analysis correspond with the conceptual framework.

Table 3
The human security concept in the southern border provinces

Security for Whom?	Security for What Values?	Security from What Threats?	Security by What Means?
- individuals -community -state	- security - good quality of life - personal freedom - human dignity - freedom from fear - freedom from want	- violence against life and property/criminal problems - violation of human rights/ destroying human dignity/ oppression	- Protection - Empowerment
	- economic development - social fairness - respect of human rights and laws - political rights - environmental protection - equal opportunities - following democracy	- discrimination - the fall of community/local migration - absence of involvement - uncertain income and career/economic problem	

Table 4
The human security concepts collected by field work

Questions	The concept	Data of field work	
		Analysis results	Frequency
Security for whom?	- individual - community - state	- individual - community	97 (64.7%) 66 (43.9%)
Security for what values?	- security - good quality of life - personal freedom	- safety of life and property - peace	134 (89.3%) 97 (64.7%)
	- human dignity - freedom from fear - freedom from want - economic development - social fairness - respect of human rights and laws - political rights - environmental protection - equal opportunities - following democracy	- good quality of life	102 (67.9%)
Security from what threats?	- violence against life and property/ criminal problems - violation of human rights/destroying human dignity/oppression - discrimination - the fall of community/local migration - absence of involvement - uncertain income and career/ economic problem	- mass media - poverty - narcotics - influential groups of trafficking - politics - insurgencies - local people - state	35 (23.3%) 104 (69.3%) 72 (47.9%) 34 (22.6%) 32 (21.3%) 129 (85.9%) 63 (41.9%) 52 (34.6%)

Table 4 *(continue)*

Questions	The concept	Data of field work	
		Analysis results	Frequency
Security by what means?	- protection - empowerment	Public Sector - protection - empowerment - improvement of local administration process - improvement of policy process based on local areas in development	89 (59.3%) 72 (47.9%) 51 (33.9%) 28(18.6%)
		Civilian Sector - involvement in activities -involvement in news report -involvement in self-protection	73(48.6%) 43(28.6%) 64(42.6%)

Table 5
Creating human security concept gained from fieldwork

Security for Whom?	Security for What Values?	Security from What Threats?	Security by What Means?
- individual - community	- safety of life and property - peace - good quality of life	- mass media - poverty - narcotics - influential groups of trafficking - politics - insurgencies - local people - state	Public Sector - protection - empowerment - improvement of local administration processes - improvement of policy processes based on local areas in development Civilian Sector - involvement in activities -involvement in news report -involvement in self-protection

The researcher found that 134 or 89.3% participants valued the safety of life and property (SWV). 129 or 85.9% participants agreed that insurgencies and poverty (104 or 69.3%) threatened their daily life. 102 or 67.9% participants valued their decent quality of life. Ninety-seven participants or 64.7% needed individuals to be secure. Ninety-seven participants or 64.7% valued peace. Eighty-nine participants or 59.3% needed protection as the means from the public sector. Seventy-three (48.6%) participants needed involvement in activities as the means from civilian

sectors. Seventy-two (47.9%) participants agreed narcotics were a threat. Seventy-two (47.9%) participants needed empowerment as a means from public sectors. Sixty-six (43.9%) participants needed to secure their communities. Sixty-three (41.9%) participants needed involvement in self-protection as a means from civilian sectors. Fifty-two (34.6%) participants perceived that the state was a threat. Fifty-one (33.9%) participants needed improvement of local administration process as a means from the public sector. Forty-three (28.6%)

participants needed involvement in news reports as a means from the civilian sector. Thirty-five (23.3%) participants thought that mass media was a threat. Thirty-four (22.6%) participants thought that influential groups of traffickers were a threat. Thirty-four (22.6%) participants thought that politics was a threat. Finally, 28 (18.6%) of participants needed improvement of policy processes based on local area development as a means from the public sector as presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Ranking demands of human security

Development Needs in Human Security in the Southern Border Provinces of Thailand	Freq. (%)
1. Safety of life and property (SWV)	134 (89.3%)
2. Insurgencies (SFT)	129 (85.9%)
3. Poverty (SFT)	104 (69.3%)
4. Good quality of life (SWV)	102 (67.9%)
5. Individual (SFW)	97 (64.7%)
6. Peace (SWV)	97 (64.7%)
7. Protection (PS-SWM)	89 (59.3%)
8. Involvement in activities (CS-SWM)	73 (48.6%)
9. Narcotics (SFT)	72 (47.9%)
10. Empowerment (PS-SWM)	72 (47.9%)
11. Community (SFW)	66 (43.9%)
12. Involvement in self-protection (CS-SWM)	64 (42.6%)
13. Local people (SFT)	63 (41.9%)
14. State (SFT)	52 (34.6%)
15. Improvement of local administration process (PS-SWM)	51 (33.9%)
16. Involvement in news report (CS-SWM)	43 (28.6%)
17. Mass media (SFT)	35 (23.3%)
18. Influential groups of trafficking (SFT)	34 (22.6%)
19. Politics (SFT)	32 (21.3%)
20. Improvement of policy process based on local areas in development (PS-SWM)	28 (18.6%)

Notes: **SFW**: *security for whom*; **SFV**: *security for which values*: **SWT**: *security from what threats,* and **SWM**: *security by what means.* (Very low: 0-20%; low: 21-0%; moderate: 41-60%; high: 61-80%; very high: 81-100%)

DISCUSSIONS

Security for Whom

Based on Baldwin's "*Security for Whom*"; human security was the concept counted individuals or people were the major referral targets in security but not rejected the state security yet views the state plays the key roles in protecting its citizens in its own state. State security was not its own end but the tool or a medium leading to human security. The three–border provincial southerners of Thailand highly agreed (64.7%) with individual security whereas they moderately agreed (43.9%) with community security. Jongstitman, (2003) advocated that the target should consider the levels of family, communities, villages, locality, society, and nation, which meant the common security of people in a country was national security itself. However, the concept of human security does not place importance on just individuals as being the referral targets of security but gives importance to the players such as communities, localities and societies. The researcher observed that security has highly prioritized individuals and communities which meant that southern insurgents seemed to take personal vengeance which the communities knew well. Authorities should conduct informal investigation on deep-rooted-vengeance-led southern insurgencies in order to bring freedom from fear and sustainable peace to the areas more quickly.

Security for Which Values

Human security with regards to *Security for Which Values* is people-centered with its core value of having protection (unrestricted physical safety) yet including other values such as wellbeing, human dignity, equity, rights and freedom. It was imperative to begin considering at the individual level as security targets, which meant creating involvement to set human security values before considering the group level. The three–border provincial southerners of Thailand very highly agreed with the values of safety of life and property (89.3%), good quality of life (67.9%) and peace in the area (64.7%). However, Boonthum (2010), Haq (1995) and Otaga (1999) argued that to protect security values, it was important to strengthen human security values through empowerment. Here, the researcher observed that had the three–border provincial southerners of Thailand achieved safety of life and property, their quality of life and peace in the area would be growing, which meant that both the state and local authorities should have extraordinary intimate collaboration and trust to bring safety of life and property to the three southern border provinces of Thailand, and all southerners would achieve a decent quality of life and peaceful lives.

Security from What Threats

Human security is a concept placing importance on individual protection; herewith, what had to be considered was when the focus of security in on humans. Threats to human security were possible

with physical violence or direct violence which means violence against the body such as genocide, terrorism, crimes and narcotics and so on. The three-border provincial southerners of Thailand very highly feared insurgencies (85.9%) and highly feared poverty while moderately fearing narcotics (47.9%) and local people (41.9%). It could be the violence that Galthung (1969) called structural violence or indirect violence, for example, inequality of economy and society, discrimination between genders, and educational disadvantages. However, the core value is not then fixed on safety alone but includes other values, too, including wellbeing, human dignity and others. The researcher claims that threats come from diverse and different dangers with formless models but human security was the only key to pervasively countering various threats terrorizing human daily survival and dignity.

In addition, threats to human security were possible as objective threats such as unemployment, inadequate income and inability to access health services and so on. The subjective threats were feelings of the absence of human dignity, fear of radical conflict and powerlessness to control one's fate and so on. Threats against human security are possibly traditional threats or military threats such as wars, battles and deployment of nuclear weapons and so on. Non-traditional threats are such threats as those against the economy, society, the environment and quality of life.

It could be good signs that the three-border provincial southerners of Thailand, at a low level, feared the state (34.6%),

mass media (23.3%), influential groups of trafficking (22.6%), and politics (21.3%). This means that the local people gradually trusted the state more. Trusting the state would bring more cooperation from local people, which allows them to gain safety of life and property more effectively. With state development projects, their fear of poverty would be gradually lessened. However, a low fear of mass media and influential traffickers might signal that the local southerners knew the mass media launched propaganda for self-gain and who the influential traffickers who dragged Thailand into Tier 3 were, which also destroyed the southerners' fishery careers. The researcher would recommend that the time is ripe for the state authorities to bring freedom from fear and freedom from want to the local southerners.

Security by What Means

Human security is not a concept only expanding the scope of threats but to alter the focus more deeply through transferring the security analysis agency to individuals. With this perspective, it transformed local people from "state citizens" to key "players"—equating the state and other players on the stage of international relations and its implication also affected international security. Nef (1999) claimed that if individual safeties were the key for global security, then individual insecurity had been threatened, which meant that international security was also threatened. However, public sectors regarding protection (59.3%), and

empowerment (47.9%) by the public sector are seen as just moderate. Improvement of local administration processes (33.9%) and improvement of policy processes based on local area development (18.6%) were low and very low respectively. The researcher observed that "security by what means" referred to the southerners having no objection to any measures and most of them sensing that the government had fulfilled its masons and the existing process and development were advantageous to locals. This means that the government has to take the advantage to end the southern insurgencies since most people accept the administration, processes and measures the government has taken. Southerners soundly trusted the government and such an opportune time might not return a second time.

With regards to the civilian sector as a man; values become the ultimate target such as survival; wellbeing and human dignity such that all structures, regardless of the state, political institution or market system, have been transferred into the second class or becoming channels leading to human security. When the concept of human security is enlarged and the context is changed, the creation of human security should at least be different in four ways from its traditional form (Bajpai, 2002), that is, humans and human governance, sustainability, soft power to create understanding and peaceful cooperation, and entire cooperation between all parties. However, the three-border provincial southerners moderately agree with involvement in activities (48.6%),

involvement in self-protection (42.6%), and at least agreed with involvement with news reports (28.6%). The researcher observed that the southerners were indifferent to involvement in any claimed peace-led activities and to self-protection and news reports, which signals that if the government disregards security of life and poverty (89.3%), ending insurgencies (85.9%), ameliorating poverty (69.3%), and quality of life (67.9%), even though they may disregard influential trafficking groups, politicians and local-based development. This indicates that southerners were frustrated with the absurdity of the government trying to end insurgencies when they trusted and wanted to cooperate with the state administration.

CONCLUSION

It was found that the concept of human security in the southern border provinces according to the responses to the four questions proposed by Baldwin was:

1. Security for Whom? The three-border provincial southerners of Thailand highly agreed (64.7%) with individual security, whereas they moderately agreed (43.9%) with community security.

2. Security for What Values? The three-border provincial southerners of Thailand very highly agreed with the values of safety of life and property (89.3%), good quality of life (67.9%), and peace in the area (64.7%).

3. Security from What Threats? The three-border provincial southerners

of Thailand very highly feared insurgencies (85.9%) and highly feared poverty but moderately feared narcotics (47.9%), and local people (41.9%). It could be a good sign that the three–border provincial southerners of Thailand, at a low level, feared the state (34.6%), mass media (23.3%), influential groups of traffickers (22.6%), and politics (21.3%). This indicates that the local people are gradually trusts the state more.

4. Security by What Means?
   4.1. Public sector: protection, empowerment, improvement of local administration process, improvement of policy processes based on local area development.
   4.2 Civilian sector: involvement in activities, involvement in news reporting, and involvement in self-protection.

Recommendations

The state should strengthen measures to reduce mistrust and to increase cooperation between the state and the people-prioritizing selection of agents to work in the southern border provinces.

Administrators of public agencies working in the area should be encouraged to have a working knowledge and understanding of, and awareness of the values, lifestyle, religion, cultures and local identity with training in knowledge-sharing. They should work with a deeper understanding and awareness while accepting and respecting cultural particulars and the local ways of life in order to eliminate and prevent new conditions leading to insurgencies.

REFERENCES

Bajpai, K. (2002). Beyond comprehensive security: Human security. In *Comprehensive security: Perspectives from India's regions*. New Delhi, India: New India Foundation.

Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies, 23,* 13–16.

Boonthum, N. (2010). *Viewing the definitions of human security of Brazil, India, and Thailand through the issuance of pharmaceutical compulsory licensing* (Masters thesis), Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.

Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Buzen, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. H. (1998). *Security: A new frame work for analysis*. Boulder, USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Doty, P., & Carnesale, A. (1976). Foreword. *International Security*, 1(1).

Chaikeaw, A. (2009). The appropriated-administrative model of the three southernmost provinces and application under the social institution linkage. *Journal of Ubon Rajathanee University, 11*(4), 75–79.

Galthung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.

Haq, M. U. (1995). *Reflections on human development*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Jongstitman, J. (2003). *Tribal social welfare*. Bangkok, Thailand: Thammasart University Press.

Musika, T. (2014). *Violence in southern border provinces in contemporary literary works by southern authors*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Chiang Mai University.

Nef, J. (1999). *Human security and mutual vulnerability: An exploration into the global political economy of development and underdevelopment*. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre.

Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards. (2012). *Human security in Thailand in 2012*. Bangkok, Thailand: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security .

Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards. (2014). *Human security in Thailand in 2014*. Bangkok, Thailand: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security .

Otaga, S. (1999, May 19). *Human security: A refugee perspective* [Transcript]. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from https://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fc00/human-security-refugee-perspective-keynote-speech-mrs-sadako-ogata-united.html

Osman, T., Udomlamul, S., Masor, Z., & Wuttiwong, V. (2011). *Education economic and social development in three southern border provinces in insurgency situation*. Yala, Thailand: Yala Rajabhat University.

Sheehan, M. (2005). *International security: An analytical survey*. London, England: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Sudjit, S. (2010). The Islamic leaders' opinion toward implementing the government's policy for solving the crisis in three southernmost provinces. *Journal of Yala Rajabhat University, 5*(2), 164–169.

Sukhothaithammathirat University. (2006). *Human security index*. Nonthaburi, Thailand: Office of Social Development and Human Security Standards.

Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy A. (2007). *Human security: Concepts and implications*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Thampitug, S. (2016). *An analysis of internal security policy on the border provinces of Southern Thailand between 2004-2013*. Chonburi, Thailand: Graduate School of Public Administration, Burapha University.

Thiprat, P. (2001). The quest for human security: The next phase of ASEAN? *Conference on ASEAN: Human Security in the Twenty-First Century*. Bangkok, Thailand: Institute of Security and International Studies.

Thomas, C. (2000). *Global governance, development and human security*. London, Egland: Pluto Press.

United Nation Development Program (UNDP). (1994). *Human development report: New dimensions of human security*. New York, USA: United Nation Development Program.

Wattanasiritham, P. (2006). *What is human security*. Bangkok, Thailand: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security.