

Impact of Population Registration on Hilltribe Development in Thailand

By Joseph L. Aguetant *

** This article was written while the author served as an intern with the ESCAP Population Division. The author would like to acknowledge with gratitude the useful suggestions and comments made by members of the Division and those of Ronald D. Renard and Roque C. Raymundo on an earlier version of this article.*

Improving the process of registration and provision of citizenship are the first steps towards highland development

Ethnic minority groups traditionally live on the fringes of society. In Thailand, an increasing number of them in recent decades have shown willingness to participate in the country's development and to take their place closer to the mainstream of society. From the Government's perspective, the main concern has been to address the major problems traditionally associated with the hilltribe population, i.e. opium cultivation and drug addiction, national security issues, conservation of natural resources and environmental degradation. Throughout the past few decades, population registration has become one of the most important issues related to the hilltribe people of Thailand, together with the general question of whether or not indigenous people or ethnic minority groups may become full citizens.

The need for their recognition as citizens has been stressed by the hilltribe people themselves. Almost all (90 per cent) of them declare that holding Thai citizenship is first on their list of priorities, for it provides access to land rights, education and professions open only to Thai nationals (Renard, personal communication).¹ However, when an official survey recorded the hilltribe population at just over 500,000 persons during the period 1985-1988, only half of them were holders of Thai citizenship. A more recent survey (1995) indicates that more than one-third are still not citizens despite increasing efforts by the Government and various development agencies to provide them with citizenship. The aim of this study therefore is to review the past and current picture of development policy for the highlands and to assess some legal aspects of the Government's integration policy with regard to population registration and citizenship.²

At the international level, the perspectives of ethnic minority groups have gained increasing recognition, especially those of indigenous people,³ as reflected, inter alia, in the presence of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, and the proclamation by the General Assembly of the year 1993 as the International Year of the World's Indigenous People. Moreover, the decision of the international community to proclaim the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People, commencing on 10 December 1994, represents a further important step towards fulfilment of the aspirations of indigenous populations. The role of the Decade is to strengthen international cooperation for solving problems faced by indigenous people in areas such as human rights, the environment, development, education and health (ICPD, 1994:27-28).

Another purpose of the article is to fulfil one of the recommendations of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) that: "the United Nations should, in full cooperation and collaboration with indigenous people and their relevant organizations, develop an enhanced understanding of indigenous people and compile data on their demographic characteristics, both current and historical, as a means of improving the understanding of the population status of indigenous people" (ICPD, 1994:28).

Source and quality of data

Very few research studies have stressed the political and administrative constraints on hilltribe development. To the author's knowledge, no separate study has been undertaken on registration and citizenship issues within the context of hilltribe development in northern Thailand. McKinnon (1983:334) urged other researchers to look carefully at the integration issue, stressing the actual situation of the hilltribes: "The matter is serious, the issues urgent, the overall situation needs to be looked at critically, and positive attention must be given to the problem of incorporating highlanders, as full and equal citizens, into the modern Thai State". Another justification may be found in the actual need to disseminate accurate information on ethnic minority groups. The 1994 ICPD observed that "special efforts are necessary to integrate statistics pertaining to indigenous populations into the national data-collection system" (ICPD, 1994:28). In this respect, compiling data on their demographic characteristics is a means to "develop an enhanced understanding of indigenous people" (ICPD, 1994:28). To carry out these tasks, compilation of secondary sources has been undertaken in relation to three basic components of the study, namely, migration, registration and citizenship. Regrettably, primary data could not be systematically collected, although several informal interviews have been undertaken.

Operating under a complex social and administrative background, one inevitably encounters various obstacles and constraints to proper data collection. Even though statistics on the Thai hilltribes were depicted several years ago as not being sufficiently comprehensive and accurate (Rerkasem and others, 1989:20) partly because of the ambiguity in hilltribes' legal status and irregularities of the registration system, the reliability of hilltribe population census and village statistics has gradually improved in recent years. This has been especially so since 1982 when the Committee to Direct the Solution to National Security Problems Relating to Hilltribe and Narcotic Crops Cultivation expressed a need for information on the hilltribe population. This study relies mainly on the "Reports on the Survey of Hilltribe Population" (NSO, 1985-1988) that were issued

since the Hilltribe Population Survey Project (HPSP) was launched in Tak Province in 1985. Four years later, HPSP had covered 20 provinces where hilltribe settlements are concentrated.

Despite steady improvements of the surveys, fluctuations in the data are still encountered. One may distinguish two main factors which account for these fluctuations, i.e. uncoordinated involvement of several agencies in the registration system,⁴ and a "fluctuating" population which is difficult to estimate in view of the fact that a significant number of hilltribe people are still unregistered or likely to be illegal migrants or migratory workers in the cities. Accordingly, the present study is divided into four major parts, each of them attempting specifically to investigate a given issue and then its positive impact on hilltribe development. Those four parts refer to different levels: national, community, household and individual. The first section pictures the integration policy at the national level and the hilltribe response. The second one explores hilltribe registration at the community level and the relevant migration issue. The third and fourth parts deal with the household and individual levels, respectively.

The study population

General overview

According to the most recent survey reported by the Tribal Research Institute (TRI) in July 1995, the hilltribe population in Thailand stands at 694,720 persons distributed in 119,216 households and 3,695 villages. Table 1 provides a breakdown by ethnic group. However, these data should be judged with circumspection because upland⁵ Thai people in general are undercounted (Kunstadter and others, 1983; Tapp, 1989-1990). Thus, an unpublished survey undertaken by the Registration Office of the Ministry of Interior at about the same time as the TRI survey reported that the same population group numbered 813,024 individuals.

Table 1: Distribution of hilltribe ethnic groups by villages and household

	Karen	Hmong	Lahu	Lisu	Yao	Akha	Lua	H'tin	Khamu	Total
Villages	2,132	243	421	135	173	258	53	148	32	3,595
Households	60,385	16,146	13,307	4,802	5,525	8,050	2,923	6,090	1,988	119,216
Total persons	32,190	12,421	73,252	27,899	40,371	48,468	15,711	32,755	10,153	694,720

Source: TRI (1995). Service and Publicity Section, Chiang Mai University.

Note: The total population excludes the Palong who recently migrated (Chiang Mai Province, 485 persons) and the Mlabries (Nan and Phrae provinces, 182 persons).



Female members of the Yao hilltribe group are famous for their beautiful embroidery and colourful costumes. (United Nations photograph by J.K. Isaac)

Geographical distribution in Thailand. Although hilltribe settlements are scattered within 20 provinces (changwat), mostly along the country's western and northern borders, 90 per cent of them live in nine provinces in the upper northern region. The highest proportion of hilltribe population is found in Chiang Mai Province (25.5 per cent of this population group). Mae Hong Son Province has the highest ratio of hilltribe people to total population, i.e. 53 per cent. Second is Tak Province with

22 per cent. Nan and Chiang Mai are next with 13 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively. Those corners of Chiang Mai, Tak and Mae Hong Son provinces are some of the remotest parts of the country where a large number of villages are accessible only on foot.

Hilltribe composition. According to the 1995 Survey reported by TRI, six major distinctive ethnic groups, each of which can be identified by distinctive costumes and languages, represent more than 90 per cent of the total hilltribe population in Thailand. The breakdown is as follows: Karen (46.3 per cent), Hmong ("Meo")⁶ (17.9 per cent), Lahu (10.5 per cent), Akha (6.9 per cent), Yao (5.8 per cent) and H'tin (4.7 per cent). The smaller remaining ethnic groups are distributed as follows: Lisu (4.0 per cent), Lua (2.3 per cent) and Khamu (1.5 per cent).

Hilltribe development overview

Some attempts have been made to develop village infrastructures that are closely related to overall economic development, e.g. roads, electricity and water supply. Although 40 per cent of the villages can be reached by four-wheel-drive vehicles, most of the roads are impassable during the rainy season.

The living conditions of hilltribe people are still substandard in both social and economic terms. In 1983, a large-scale survey indicated that the average per capita income of the hilltribes was far below the poverty line.⁷

About half of the villages have at least one primary school and attempts have been made to introduce both formal and informal education. However, many of the hilltribe people neither speak nor understand the Thai language except for a few "survival" words. Their literacy rate in the Thai language is a low 12 per cent; by comparison, the literacy rate nationally is 84 per cent. The hilltribes' inability to understand Thai is "the major barrier towards social integration into the Thai society".⁸

With regard to basic health care, the Department of Public Health has been delivering some basic health care services through mobile teams and by providing basic training to hilltribe village health workers. A recent survey has shown that about half the children from one to five years old are underweight. Deterioration of hilltribe nutrition is an emerging problem partly due to the sudden invasion of modern markets into hilltribe villages. Under market pressure, subsistence production has been replaced by cash crops and the basis of child nutrition has been completely shifted. Maternal and child care is another key issue. Currently, only a small proportion of children have received immunization compared with 63 per cent of children nationwide. The practice of family planning is about half that at the national level even though the 1994 ICPD recognizes that "indigenous people call for increased respect for indigenous ... knowledge and practice of family planning" (ICPD, 1994:27). The birth rate is high (55.5 per thousand in 1989) compared with the national rate (19 per thousand for the same period). The rate of natural increase of the hilltribe population (3.5 per cent per annum) is approximately twice the national rate (1.6 per cent). Therefore, the hilltribe population is projected to double in size in only 20 years. As observed by the 1994 ICPD, "indigenous people, after long periods of population loss, are experiencing steady and in some places rapid population growth resulting from declining mortality, although morbidity and mortality are generally still much higher than for other sections of the national population" (ICPD, 1994:27). Despite the less favourable picture for the hilltribes when compared with the national population, it should be pointed out that considerable attention has been given in recent years to bringing the benefits of Thailand's health programmes to the hilltribes. Vigorous efforts are being made to expand the health infrastructure into remote areas of the country.

Hilltribe development policies

In the formulation of policy on hilltribe welfare and development programmes during the period 1952-1982, the most important problem has been national security as it relates to the hilltribe people. The Government's welfare and development programmes for the hilltribe people started in 1959, when Thailand for the first time initiated policies specifically concerning the hilltribes (Bhruksasri, 1985:29). Prior to this time, however, Thailand's policy was laissez-faire in nature (ibid., 1985:30): the hilltribes were allowed to live freely and had autonomy in administering their own affairs. In 1959, the Government established the Central Hilltribe Committee. Since many government agencies⁹ were dealing with hilltribe issues, the task of coordinating highland development was given to the Hilltribe Welfare Division (HWD) in 1974. In 1976, a definite policy concerning the hilltribe people was formulated and they became one of the target populations of the Department of Public Welfare. The first concern of that policy was to solve the problem of national security related to the hilltribe people and the production of narcotic crops; development of remote highland areas was a subsidiary concern. At the same time, the Government approved a proposal to formulate a master plan for community and environmental development and control of narcotics. In recognizing that hilltribe people have their own identity, the current policy of integration similarly aims to "improve hilltribe welfare while respecting their integrity" (Bhruksasri, 1985:31). Accordingly, the objective was to "enable the hilltribes to become first-class citizens" (DPW, 1993:139). The national security issue in the North has lost part of its importance and economic and social problems have become more apparent. Thus, integrated development programmes are being implemented through 14 Hilltribe Welfare and Development Centres (HWDC), the tasks of which are to upgrade the living conditions of disadvantaged people and to deliver comprehensive access to basic social services. Furthermore, the objective stated in the first master plan has been implemented through a number of special projects. The overall policy goal is "to instill in them a sense of belonging" (Tapp, 1989-1990:3) and "a psychological obligation to Thai society so the hilltribes can live under law and order" (Bhruksasri, 1985:32).

Further, Thailand's Royal Family has always taken an interest in the peoples living along the borders of the country. The current King has given constant support to the hilltribes and insisted on helping them to become Thai citizens. Even though the

Government has many direct contacts with the hilltribes, it has never equalled the impact of personal visits from members of the Royal Family (Renard, personal communication).

Three main factors have thus been identified as contributing to hilltribe specificity as far as development and access to basic services are concerned: cultural distinctiveness, (relative) isolation and economic marginalization. Those obstacles worked to impede highland development for the past three decades. The more there were national institutions from which they felt excluded, the less people felt able to participate in the socio-economic development process taking place throughout the country, and the more likely were they to maintain artefact boundaries. The hilltribe development policies attempt to bring solutions to bridge this gap.

According to Bradley (1983:54) "all minorities will come increasingly within the political and economic sphere of the Thais". How do hilltribe people consider such a prediction? The integration process is well on track in achieving a majority of the goals established by the Government. The result is that hilltribe communities today differ dramatically from those in the past.¹⁰ There are Karen in large cities such as Chiang Mai who have become so completely Thai that their grandchildren perhaps will not know that their ancestors were once a minority group. Many young men and women from hilltribe groups have found employment in Chiang Rai, Chiang Mai and some even in the "mega-city" of Bangkok. Others may be seen frequently around northern Thai cities often dressed like other city dwellers.

On the other side of the coin, a widespread assertion among hilltribes is that "change" is not all good. Among the hilltribe people of Thailand, the Akha, Lahu and Lisu are particularly inclined to view all outside influences with suspicion; for example, "the road is a big snake climbing the hills to kill us" (Renard, personal communication).

None the less, while there is some resistance to change from the point of view of the hilltribes themselves, hilltribe culture is likely to influence increasingly other people in the country. People in the cities sometimes wear Hmong-style clothes, and in general, the integration policy is likely to enable hilltribe people to "make a contribution to the rich cultural variety of the Thai nation as a whole" (Charusathira, 1966:8). "Participation" is the only way that can prevent them from being depicted again as "passive victims of social and economic forces beyond their control" (Tapp, 1990:167).¹¹ The more hilltribe people are able to realize the concrete benefits of a given policy, the more likely they are to fully support it (Yoddumnern-Attig, personal communication).¹²

Hilltribe registration at the community level

The characteristic settlement pattern of hilltribe people in Thailand is the "village", which must be distinguished from small hilltribe settlements ranging from four or five households up to roughly 200 households. In general, hilltribe people in Thailand have never been politically organized above the community level. They live in small communities isolated from one another, unlike the same linguistic groups in neighbouring countries, which often display a sense of unity at the national level. How can registration at the community level improve highland development? An answer can be given only after addressing the migration issue.

The pattern of migration

This study does not attempt to deal with the migration issue as a whole but only to assess its impact on our concern. The migration issue is particularly important since it is closely related to citizenship: for the members of a village to be eligible for citizenship, the village must be settled permanently and be officially recognized by the Department of Local Administration.

Far from being something new, migration is a specific behaviour pattern that has defined types of hilltribes. Migration has long been regarded as one of the distinct socio-economic practices characterizing certain tribes. Among the permanent settlers have been the Lua and Karen, whereas the Hmong, Lisu, Lahu, Yao and Akha have been classified as migratory tribes. However, it must be pointed out that this traditional pattern is not precise enough: the Karen were migratory a century ago and the so-called migratory tribes are currently permanent settlers.

Table 2: Percentage distribution of the highland population 5 years old * and older by length of residence and province

Provinces	Less than 1 year	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years and more	Unknown	Total
Chiang Mai	2.3	2.4	1.9	2.4	1.6	85.9	3.5	100.0
Mae Hong Son	1.3	1.7	2.1	1.8	1.3	91.0	0.8	100.0
Chiang Rai	1.2	2.8	1.9	4.2	5.3	82.8	1.8	100.0
Phayao	0.6	7.8	9.0	2.4	3.5	75.0	1.7	100.0
Lamphun	0.6	0.8	0.6	1.6	0.7	95.1	0.6	100.0
Lampang	4.3	3.4	3.8	5.0	2.8	80.5	0.2	100.0
Phrae	0.6	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	96.2	0.3	100.0

Nan	1.5	2.3	1.8	6.5	6.1	81.5	0.3	100.0
Tak	0.5	2.5	3.3	2.1	2.4	89.2	-	100.0
Khamphaeng Phet	1.1	0.8	9.2	22.7	1.4	64.7	0.1	100.0
Phetchabun	0.8	0.8	1.1	3.2	3.5	90.4	0.2	100.0
Phitsanulok	0.6	2.2	2.7	5.4	14.5	74.2	0.4	100.0
Sukhothai	3.2	7.5	3.5	9.2	2.9	73.6	0.1	100.0
Uthai Thani	2.8	5.7	4.5	5.4	5.4	76.2	*	100.0
Loei	-	1.0	0.3	-	-	98.4	0.3	100.0
Suphanburi	3.5	7.7	4.7	10.6	6.4	67.0	0.1	100.0
Kanchanaburi	2.8	3.0	3.6	4.0	14.3	72.2	0.1	100.0
Ratchaburi	0.4	2.0	1.7	1.1	0.9	93.8	0.1	100.0
Phetchaburi	0.7	1.1	0.7	1.4	1.7	93.9	0.5	100.0
Phrachuap Kiri Khan	0.8	2.8	5.1	4.2	2.1	85.0	-	100.0
Total ave rage	1.5	3.0	3.1	4.7	3.9	83.3	0.6	100.0

Source: Compiled from NSO (1985-1988). Reports on the Survey of Hilltribe Population.

* Note: 11 years old for Tak Province.

The national policy for social integration of the hilltribe population is the main factor contributing to the move towards permanent settlement in the highlands or middle-slope settlements. Table 2 reveals that, throughout the uplands, there is a clear trend towards permanent settlement. By the period 1985-1987, more than 83 per cent of the hilltribe population reported that they had not moved in the previous five years (NSO, 1985-1987). Because the tradition of shifting cultivation has been declining constantly for the last 30 years, only three provinces, Mae Hong Son, Chiang Mai and Tak, have a problem with internal migration and the cycle of rotation has been significantly reduced owing to the lack of suitable land available.¹³ Different patterns of migration may be described: while the Karen people are less mobile (the lowest proportions of foreign birth are found among them and the Hmong, at 0.8 per cent and 0.4 per cent, respectively), migration among the Yao and Lisu is more frequent. Higher proportions of the Akha and Lahu were born outside the country, i.e. 15.2 per cent and 10.3 per cent, respectively. Although the smaller groups as defined above are more likely to move in order to practise shifting cultivation, the overall trend of such migration is declining because more and more of the hilltribes are engaged in permanent agriculture. Migration is also getting more difficult as national boundaries become more observable.

With regard to a hilltribe's reasons for moving, in the past, when a conflict arose between a hilltribe village and "the outside", it was usually resolved by hilltribe members packing their belongings and settling elsewhere. NSO uses four categories to classify the reasons for moving: "to look for new arable land", "to accompany the head of the household", "to follow government policy" (or relocation programmes), "to be disturbed" (i.e. escape from warfare and the like) (NSO Phayao, 1986). Table 3 reveals that 45.3 per cent of those who migrated elsewhere moved for family reasons and 30.3 per cent were searching for arable land. Only 7.2 per cent moved as a result of government policy. Thus, there is a need to foster permanent settlement, which may be regarded as the first step towards highland development (Tapp, 1990:162).

Table 3: Percentage distribution of migrants 11 years of age and older, by reasons for moving and by ethnic group

Province	To look for new arable land	Accompany head of household	Government policy	To be disturbed *	Marriage	Others	Unknown
Chiang Mai	34.5	38.7	3.4	3.8	7.4	2.2	10.0
Mae Hong Son	37.1	35.7	1.7	7.1	11.5	2.2	4.7
Chiang Rai	25.1	55.2	4.4	2.8	3.0	2.2	7.3
Phayao	9.3	65.3	13.2	0.4	4.2	3.5	4.1
Lamphun	27.2	38.9	3.1	0.6	16.7	3.2	10.3
Lampang	26.8	67.0	0.2	0.6	3.3	1.0	1.1
Phrae	15.1	43.5	1.0	-	25.3	6.0	9.1
Nan	21.1	30.5	40.9	0.8	4.3	1.5	0.9
Tak	55.3	24.4	0.8	8.0	5.3	0.5	5.7

Kamphaeng Phet	11.7	34.9	50.7	0.2	2.2	0.2	0.1
Phetchabun	17.3	61.8	6.0	2.4	7.5	3.3	1.7
Phitsanulok	26.6	53.4	8.9	3.9	2.3	2.1	2.8
Sukhothai	22.9	73.1	-	-	1.2	0.5	2.3
Uthai Thani	46.6	45.6	1.5	-	5.0	0.7	0.6
Loei	20.0	60.0	-	-	20.0	-	-
Suphan Buri	46.3	46.1	-	0.5	5.5	0.7	0.9
Kanchanaburi	25.3	49.7	7.4	10.4	3.1	3.1	1.0
Ratchaburi	51.0	34.0	1.5	2.2	7.8	0.5	3.0
Phetchaburi	19.7	18.0	-	-	45.9	3.3	13.1
Phrachuap Kiri Khan	66.3	30.4	-	-	2.2	1.1	-
Total average	30.3	45.3	7.2	2.2	9.2	1.9	3.9

Source: Compiled from NSO (1985-88). Reports on the Survey of Hilltribe Population.

Notes: Dash indicates 0 per cent. * See next page of text for explanation.

Village registration

The 1985-1988 surveys concluded that 42 per cent of the villages have official status. For them to obtain this recognition means they will eventually be included in the country's development process. Registration is the only way to make a village official.

For villages to be registered in the Village Directory of the Department of Local Administration (DOLA), it must have a village number, a village name and a village committee. Villages which have official status are called "core" villages. Smaller settlements, usually a small group of families, are called "satellite" villages. Satellite-dwellers are not allowed to report their village address but must use the identification number of the adjacent "core" village.

Table 4 gives a breakdown of villages by region. By 1993, DOLA had officially recognized 1,178 highland villages; the remaining 2,187 communities were recognized as "satellites" of the registered villages.

Region	Official villages	Unofficial communities	Households	Population
North	1,061	2,103	135,178	749,353
Northeast	1	0	96	653
Central	117	94	11,804	54,720
Total	1,178	2,187	147,078	804,726

Source: National Security Council (1993). Directory of Highland Communities and Population.

The number of both official and unofficial villages has been estimated at 3,595 in July 1995. A survey conducted in 1993 by the Committee for Solving the National Security Problem on Hilltribe and Narcotic Crops found that 35 per cent of the listed hilltribe villages are formal or "core" villages.

Impact of village registration on highland development

The question is often asked why some hilltribe villages have greater access to government services than others. The complexity of registration procedures is indubitably part of the answer. Although it is far from the only explanation in highland underdevelopment, it is safe to say that highland villages still receive fewer government services than some of the poorer lowland villages. In addition, they have far lower income. Furthermore, since communal organization plays a significant role in improving sustainable highland development, registered villages have a great deal of opportunity whereas non-registered villages remain poor. Thus, communities need to obtain official status because it is the only medium that can enable development to take place. To our knowledge, no attempts have been made so far to create a suitable formal status for

Since the implementation of the Second Master Plan for Opium Poppy Cultivating Regions of Thailand, which is coordinated by the Narcotics Control Board, most of the remote areas of northern Thailand have been classified into different classes of watersheds. Sixty per cent of the villages occupy land where no crop production is allowed; 18 per cent of the hilltribe villages are in areas where cultivation is allowed, but limited to certain practices. The classification process has not reached the remaining villages, which are in very remote corners of Thailand (Rerkasem and others, 1989:23).

A programme has been launched recently to include the highland communities within the national administrative structure of the DOLA. Over the long term, highland villages are likely to be brought within the DOLA system and therefore be regarded just as any other village in Thailand. The national policy for social integration of the hilltribe population is the main factor contributing to the move towards permanent settlement in the lowlands or middle-slope settlements, but the land-use issue is another factor. The Government's land use policy for the highlands is based upon forest protection and conservation. However, the policy regarding the communities living in those areas is still unclear. Since there is no legal basis to support permanent settlement in the highlands, the highland communities are likely to be resettled at any time.¹⁴ Relocation programmes today differ substantially from those following the "Red Meo Revolt" in the 1960s when large numbers of Hmong were forced to leave the hills to be resettled in the lowlands (Tan, 1975:194). Today, it is increasingly recognized that any attempt to relocate hilltribe farmers would create more problems in view of the fact that available arable land in the lowlands is limited. A model for land use is therefore needed for setting up guidelines for equitable distribution of farmland in northern Thailand. As recommended in some development studies, a "highland community act" should be adopted (TDRI, 1994:133).

Hilltribe registration at the household level

Household registration analysis

The first step is to analyze the different registration types and then to perform an assessment of their implications for hilltribe development.

The National Statistical Office (NSO) uses the following six criteria to classify hilltribe registration: (a) registered with non-Thai nationality, (b) registered with Thai nationality, (c) registered with another government agency, (d) Thai nationality but not registered, (e) other, i.e. non-registered, non-Thai nationality, and (f) unknown. According to the United Nations Handbook on Population and Housing Censuses, other criteria should be tabulated as separate categories: "Enumeration and processing instructions should indicate the disposition to be made of stateless persons ... and persons in the process of naturalization, as well as other ambiguous citizenship groups. The treatment of those groups should be described in the census reports" (United Nations DESD, 1992b:53). None the less, according to the data we compiled (see table 5), the breakdown by registration type is as follows: 4.2 per cent are registered but do not hold Thai nationality, and 65.2 per cent are both registered and Thai citizens. With respect to the third criterion, 13.9 per cent are listed in the population records of other government agencies, e.g. DSW which has registered roughly 300,000 individuals (Thammasal, personal communication)¹⁵ and the Border Patrol Police. Another 4.4 per cent are automatically regarded as Thai nationals because their parents held Thai citizenship even if they were not yet registered. The fifth category accounts for a little over 11 per cent of the total: "others" means that they have never been registered, and as a consequence are not Thai nationals (Penbharkhul, personal communication).¹⁶ Application of this latter classification varies considerably depending on the province concerned. In Phrachuap Kiri Khan Province, for example, 58.2 per cent are unregistered, non-citizens. Only a fraction (0.6 per cent) fit into the "unknown" category.

Each household has a household card (tho ro 13 or tho ro 14), which lists members residing in that household and their particulars. The tho ro 13 is yellow in colour and is issued to illegal residents; tho ro 14 is a white card for Thai citizens. The data contained in the household card include: address of the household, names of the members and their dates of birth, and, more importantly, information on citizenship, date of moving into the household, place moved from, and population identification number (ESCAP, 1987:281). After approval of applications by the provincial governor, the Household Registration Form, tho ro 14 or thabien baan is issued. The tho ro 14 form is an official record issued by the local DOLA officer indicating the following information: name, sex, date of birth, address, nationality (if any), names of parents and date of entry and exit from the household. The "population register" is compiled at the national level; it consists of household cards filed according to the address of each household (ESCAP, 1987:281). The responsibility for maintaining and updating the population register rests with the district registrar, a function performed by district officers and some assistant district officers (ibid.).

Impact of household registration on highland development

The impact of registration on household development is related to the nationality issue in that holding the tho ro 14 is a condition of eligibility for Thai citizenship. Since both questions are linked, proof of a hilltribe member's domicile must be recorded so that he or she can obtain citizenship before the end of the next master plan period, i.e. in the year 2001 (Penbharkhul, personal communication). Other consequences are substantial: the household registration certificate is needed for practically all major aspects of life ranging from buying land and registering livestock, to applying for jobs and enrolling in the higher grades of government schools as well as showing at police checkpoints along the road in certain parts of the country (Tapp, 1986:54).

Table 5: Percentage distribution of hilltribe population, by registration type and province

Province	Regis-tered with non-Thai nationality	Registered with Thai nationality	Registered with other government agency	Thai nationality but not registered	Other	Unknown	Total
Chiang Mai	3.7	56.1	7.0	5.2	25.7	2.3	100.0
Mae Hong Son	3.7	73.0	4.3	9.7	9.0	0.3	100.0
Chiang Rai	11.1	25.9	39.3	1.8	16.7	5.2	100.0
Phayao	1.0	71.4	23.6	2.9	0.5	0.6	100.0
Lamphun	0.1	98.2	0.7	1.0	*	*	100.0
Lampang	8.4	79.1	5.6	1.2	5.2	0.5	100.0
Phrae	0.6	91.3	4.4	3.5	*	0.2	100.0
Nan	2.7	70.8	10.4	7.2	8.9	*	100.0
Tak	2.2	36.5	6.6	18.0	36.7	*	100.0
Kamphaeng Phet	3.1	41.3	41.5	2.8	11.2	0.1	100.0
Phetchabun	0.5	88.6	3.8	1.9	4.4	0.8	100.0
Phitsanulok	2.7	4.2	82.0	0.1	11.0	*	100.0
Sukhothai	0.6	87.8	6.9	2.6	2.1	**	100.0
Uthai Thani	7.0	88.7	1.1	2.0	1.2	**	100.0
Loei	22.1	72.1	3.4	1.8	0.6	**	100.0
Suphan Buri	1.7	87.1	6.9	3.3	1.0	**	100.0
Kanchanaburi	6.0	53.8	9.8	5.8	24.4	0.2	100.0
Ratchaburi	2.8	61.7	3.4	13.1	18.8	0.2	100.0
Phetchaburi	3.1	80.8	12.4	2.7	0.1	0.9	100.0
Prachuap Kiri Khan	0.4	35.9	4.7	0.8	58.2	**	100.0
Total average	4.2	65.2	13.9	4.4	11.8	0.6	100.0
	Registered population	Non-registered population	Unknown	Total			
Total	83.3	16.2	0.6	100.0			

Source: Compiled from NSO (1985-1988). Reports on the Survey of Hilltribe Population.

Notes: * less than 0.1 per cent; ** less than 0.01 per cent

Hilltribe registration at the individual level

Citizenship procedure

Historically, members of hilltribes living in Thailand were not considered Thai citizens.¹⁷ However, since the passage of the 1965 Nationality Act, hilltribe children born in Thailand have the right to Thai nationality (Rathanakhon, 1978:45-53) provided that both their parents are Thai nationals (Hoare, 1992:182). However, to our knowledge information distinguishing citizens by birth and by naturalization is not available (United Nations DESD, 1992b:53). In 1976, a Cabinet memorandum called for steps that would make the hilltribe people self-sufficient Thai citizens. It specifically called for accelerating the registration of hilltribes with a view to enabling them to become citizens. The same goals were later enunciated by the National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB, 1982-1986:235-232). We should not fail to note that the Ministry of Interior directive does not include ethnic minority groups which during this time entered Thailand as refugees or displaced persons. The aim of the directive was to grant citizenship to those born in Thailand or who migrated to the country before 1975. That distinction is still in effect. According to the data we compiled (see table 5), 65.2 per cent of people belonging to northern hilltribes have obtained Thai citizenship. About 13 per cent are in the process of acquiring it, having already been registered with the Ministry of Interior or with another government agency. The rest comprise those without sufficient qualifications or with insufficient legal evidence to prove that they meet the eligibility criteria.

The conditions required for obtaining Thai nationality were first instituted by the Ministry of Interior's Regulation on Consideration for Granting Thai Nationality to the Hilltribes issued in 1974.¹⁸ The following directive was issued by the Ministry on 15 September 1993:¹⁹ A hilltribe individual wishing to be considered as eligible to become a Thai national must: (a) be under the supervision of a governmental office such as the Public Welfare Department, Border Patrol Police, Internal Security Department or the Army, or (b) have been verified and registered during the period 1969-1970, or (c) have been registered on a house registration certificate by the ID Project approved by the Cabinet on 20 July 1982, or (d) likewise have been registered during the period March-August 1985 by one of the projects approved by the Cabinet on 24 April 1984, or (e) have been eligible during the period 1985-1988 for the Survey of the Hilltribe People in Thailand, approved by the Cabinet on 24 April 1984, or (f) during the period 1990-1991, have been registered and issued an ID card for highlanders by the project approved on 5 June 1990 (see table 6).

Table 6: Hilltribe population by Thai nationality in household registration and total of individuals in possession of "personal identity card"

Province	Total hilltribe population	Total Thai nationals	Thai nationality on household registration		Total of individuals in possession of personal identity card
			Total population	%	
Chiang Mai	258,251	194,162	2,274	1.2	66,266
Mae Hong Son	96,533	75,294	3	0.	17,788
Chiang Rai	147,322	51,086	16,241	31.8	80,769
Phayao	14,729	13,572	1,774	13.1	1,357
Lamphun	27,442	27,120	537	2.0	319
Lampang	11,073	8,898	374	4.2	2,225
Phrae	10,540	10,108	420	4.2	562
Nan	66,173	51,057	1,928	3.8	9,432
Tak	91,296	36,570	2,564	7.0	34,443
Kamphaeng Phet	8,556	4,577	599	13.1	4,655
Phetchabun	11,769	10,657	3,358	31.5	916
Phitsanulok	5,727	1,292	992	76.8	4,429
Sukhothai	2,173	2,010	162	8.1	214
Uthai Thani	5,564	5,526	126	2.3	133
Loei	653	614	228	37.1	41
Suphan Buri	4,302	4,173	56	1.3	219
Kanchanaburi	33,168	18,530	54	0.3	19,562
Ratchaburi	12,006	8,319	68	0.8	3,683
Phetchaburi	3,629	3,442	89	2.6	201
Phrachuap Kiri Khan	2,118	1,590	106	6.7	460
Total 20 provinces	813,024	528,597	31,953	6.0	247,647

Source: Compiled from NSO (1985-88). Reports on the Survey of Hilltribe Population, op cit.

For those meeting the above-mentioned eligibility criteria who want to become citizens, they will be granted citizenship and their names included in a household registration certificate, if -- and only if -- the person has been (a) born in Thailand and reached the age of maturity, or is legally married, (b) occupying a permanent residence with his name on a household registration certificate, or has maintained his or her status regarding one item of evidence in Rule 5 for more than five years in the same district, or if having moved to a new permanent residence because of marriage but legally informed the authorities of the move and the total duration of stay at both places is not less than five years, or (c) earning a living honestly and is harmless to society and the nation, and (d) not growing any narcotic plants, or has given up such a practice. Not being a threat to national security means never having been arrested on security grounds (Tapp, 1986:54). One should note with respect to national security the policies laid down in the period 1939-1940 have always demanded a great commitment and loyalty to the Thai nation (Dhiravegin, 1991:97-8).

Although citizenship is available to the hilltribes de jure, there are often practical difficulties de facto (Tapp, 1986:53).

Potential rights are often lost through ignorance of the complicated requirements and inability to meet them because of remoteness from the government offices concerned. In view of the fact that upland people often do not know where to go to obtain government aid or whether any specific behaviour is required in this respect, there is clearly a need for dissemination of information concerning legal procedures.

Table 7 indicates that, despite the difficulties, the process of granting Thai nationality to the majority of the hilltribe population is well under way. Optimistically, 100 per cent of the hilltribe people will be granted citizenship as called for in the Second Master Plan, as long as further substantial efforts are made on a continuing basis.

Table 7: Citizenship issuance process, mid-term report of the First Master Plan, 1994

Provinces	Before master plan			Master plan mid-term			Increase in nationality	
	Total population	Thai nationality	Non-Thai nationality	Total population	Thai nationality	Non-Thai nationality	Number	%
Chiang Mai	139,965	78,613	61,352	258,251	194,162	64,089	115,549	147.0
Mae Hong Son	82,967	60,495	22,472	96,533	75,294	21,239	14,799	24.5
Chiang Rai	98,105	25,844	72,261	147,322	51,086	96,236	25,242	97.7
Phayao	10,913	7,773	3,140	14,729	13,572	1,157	5,799	74.6
Lamphun	21,259	20,867	392	27,442	27,120	322	6,253	30.0
Lampang	9,573	7,628	1,945	11,073	8,898	2,175	1,270	16.6
Phrae	8,397	7,875	522	10,540	10,108	432	2,233	28.4
Nan	55,147	38,929	16,218	66,173	51,057	15,116	12,128	31.2
Tak	68,745	24,844	43,901	91,296	36,570	55,356	11,726	47.2
Kamphaeng Phet	8,622	3,542	5,080	8,556	4,577	3,979	1,035	29.2
Phetchabun	8,446	7,481	965	11,769	10,657	1,112	3,176	42.5
Phitsanulok	5,086	209	4,877	5,727	1,292	4,435	1,083	518.2
Sukhothai	2,734	2,399	335	2,173	2,010	163	-(389)	(16.2)
Uthai Thani	2,827	2,256	571	5,564	5,526	38	3,270	144.9
Loei	501	361	140	653	614	39	253	70.1
Suphan Buri	1,396	1,101	295	4,302	4,173	129	3,072	279.0
Kanchanaburi	19,690	11,485	8,205	33,168	18,530	14,638	7,045	61.3
Ratchaburi	5,953	3,509	2,444	12,006	8,319	3,687	4,810	137.1
Phetchabun	3,088	2,469	619	3,629	3,442	187	973	39.4
Phrachuap Kiri Khan	758	272	486	2,118	1,590	528	1,318	484.6

Source: Registration Office of Ministry of Interior.

Impact of citizenship on hilltribe development

In general, registration is regarded as having substantial consequences in Thailand. For example, a marriage must be registered to be legal.²⁰ When a union breaks up, if there had been no official registration, the woman has no recourse to legal remedies: she cannot claim any property or even child support (Klausner, 1993).

For the 35 per cent of the hilltribe people who still do not hold Thai nationality, not being "citizens" means being cast adrift, surviving beyond Thai law without solid legal protection. Thus, their legal status is likely to fall under international norms pertaining to stateless persons, with protection provided according to the Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. Without citizenship (and its associated documents) the process of social integration of any hilltribe person into Thai society is greatly hampered. Granting citizenship to the hilltribes should therefore be placed high on the Government's list of priorities. The major impact of citizenship is related to the legal rights and duties subsequently created. While some form of allegiance to the central authority is expected in return for government services, hilltribe people have good reason to seek the rights that are linked with citizenship. If they become Thai citizens, government agencies could not exclude them from their jurisdiction. It is rights, duties and a commitment that join together the two communities: a hilltribe community and Thai society. Granting citizenship and registering villages should not be considered as unrelated to highland development. On the contrary, improving both registration and citizenship is the first step towards highland development.

Summary and policy implications

Integration and assimilation are not synonymous. Referring to the issue of indigenous integration in general, two inappropriate trends are encountered. Firstly, considering indigenous problems as somehow unique leads to the creation of "second-class" citizens isolated in restricted areas. Although cultural differences exist, they should not mislead policy makers into creating artificial boundaries between indigenous people and other people living in the country. Any special administrative system (such as a "reservation" policy) aiming to strengthen separation would inevitably lead to further underdevelopment. Secondly, with regard to assimilating indigenous people by all means, ICPD has recognized that "indigenous people have a distinct and important perspective on population and development relationships, frequently quite different from those of the populations with which they interrelate within national boundaries" (ICPD, 1994:28). Further, "Governments and other important institutions in society should recognize the distinct perspective of indigenous people on aspects of population and development and, in consultation with indigenous people and in collaboration with concerned non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, should address their specific needs, including needs for primary health care and reproductive health services" (ICPD, 1994:28). Thus, it is important to recognize that cultural differences do exist. Since assimilation would mean total identification with the majority and the abandonment of minority customs, such a policy should not be adopted. One may conclude that a solution lies perhaps somewhere in between the two trends. Although the "middle way" is never easy to attain, attempts to achieve a balanced policy are in the interests of both the majority and the minority.

Since it has been observed that the ethnic distinctiveness of some hilltribes is gradually being blurred, one may conclude from the above findings that more and more hilltribe people are likely to be assimilated by the majority Thai population, although many tribes still live in the highlands following lifestyles that are more traditional than modern. Even though such a perspective would suggest that hilltribe culture is likely to disappear, this has not been the case during the more than three decades that the Government's policy has been implemented. Our view is that a form of assimilation is taking place, although not as a result of government policy. This is in line with the statements of government officials. According to Mr. Wanat Bhruksasri, former TRI Director: "We never use force to get people to accept the dominant culture in this country. The policy is not assimilation, but integration". None the less, more and more hilltribe people are likely to assimilate themselves (and not only be integrated) in the Thai population. Two different patterns have been described regarding the assimilation issue: the largest minority groups who will maintain and even expand some identity traits, e.g. Karen and Hmong, and smaller groups which will lose their positive identity, e.g. the Lua living in Kanchanaburi, Suphanburi and Uthai Thani provinces, almost all of whom have by now been completely assimilated, and "soon will have become Thai" (Bradley, 1983:54). This assertion is corroborated by the 1995 TRI survey which shows that smaller groups, such as the Lahu, Lisu, Yao, H'tin and Lua, are tending to decrease as individual hilltribesmen and "become" Thai. The decrease in population size is due mainly to the departure of the young generation from the hills. A TRI official explained that this trend has been noted since 1990, although the Lua began to decrease in 1985 (Wongsprasert, personal communication).²¹

Participating in the processes of modernization does not contradict the ability to maintain personal links with one's own minority group (Georges, 1984:23). Over the long term, highland-dwellers should be able to become integrated into the social and economic mainstream while preserving the option to maintain self-determination and their own culture.

Though once again universal prescriptions cannot be provided, there are some guidelines that may facilitate this process. The most important of these is that "it is essential to provide conditions which encourage all groups to feel a shared interest in the society as a whole -- to support, in other words, the creation of a sense of civic identity" (UNRISD-World Summit for Social Development, 1995:4). Given that, in Thai society, it is not necessary to hold an exclusive ethnic identity (one can be both Thai and Chinese, Thai and Lao etc.), one can easily imagine that dual identity may be extended to hilltribes, e.g. being both Thai and Karen, or Thai and Hmong. While they will remain Karen or Meo, it will be more advantageous and efficient for the hilltribes to hold Thai identity for such things as interaction with government officials, banking, education and work (Keyes, 1979:19).

As mentioned previously, improving the processes of registration and the provision of citizenship are the first steps towards highland development. For hilltribe people to obtain such recognition means that they will eventually be included in the country's development process. Population registration is not only a step towards durable development but also a preliminary condition. From an in-depth perspective, it appears that village, household registration and citizenship are closely related to highland development. Not surprisingly, the hilltribe development equation may be written as follows: without village registration, there can be no village development; without household registration, there can be no family development; without Thai citizenship, there can be no individual development.

Footnotes

1. Information obtained in an interview with Ronald D. Renard, Highland People's Programme, UNDP Bangkok (August 1995).

2. The term "hilltribe development" refers to the process that leads traditional society to enter the process of "modernization" (Berger, 1974), a topic directly relating to our subject. However, this brings up the question of what "development" hilltribe people want for themselves and whether agencies involved are advocating the same concept or not. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the term "development" carries various and somewhat ambiguous connotations, depending on the context. However, we believe that there are core elements of such a definition which are probably acceptable

to all, e.g. improvement of life conditions, education level, and ability to find employment.

3. Thai hilltribes do not fall under the definition of an "indigenous population" as a whole but as long as some of them recognize themselves as being indigenous, it is worth pointing out that "recognition" at the international level may benefit them. There is no generally accepted definition of indigenous people, less still of ethnic minority groups. The more appropriate way to designate a group is to use the term employed by the latter to designate itself. However, since each ethnic minority group in Thailand uses a specific word to designate itself and each other, it seems practically impossible to point out a generic term. Consequently, even though some authors are reluctant to use the term "hilltribe" because such a "misleading term supports incorrect stereotypes" (TRI, 1967), we consider it as the more convenient term as far as Thailand is concerned and use it as a technical term. Furthermore, research in Thailand has confirmed that the term "hilltribe" is preferable, for it comes from the Thai expression *chao khao*, which means literally "mountain people". The term *phu khao*, though increasingly used, is not comprehensive enough. Last but not least, the term "hilltribe" has been officially defined as including only people with so-called "ordinary" or "normal" status (Bhruksasri, 1985:30), and not those who are called "displaced persons" or "refugees", i.e. it refers to people who have been registered as being born or arrived in Thailand prior to 1975. Finally, the word *Tai* refers to "ethnicity", while the word "Thai" refers to "nationality".

4. With regard to lack of coordination, the constraints facing Asia-Pacific countries in general comprise, among other factors, financial constraints, lacunae in the legal basis, low priority assigned to registration work by policy makers, lack of effective incentives, and lack of trained manpower (ESCAP, 1987:5).

5. The terms "upland people" or "highlanders" are not accurate enough to designate the hilltribes for they do not distinguish between different types of populations living in the northern Thai hills. Those terms therefore are reserved for referring to all people living in mountainous parts of northern Thailand, i.e. ethnic minority groups and *Tai* inhabitants.

6. One should not omit reporting that, according to the *Hmong* themselves, the term "Meo" (used in several surveys) carries a derogatory connotation (CCSDPT, 1985:1-28). This position supports the idea that "the definitions and criteria applied by each country investigating its population's ethnic characteristics must ... be determined by the groups that it desires to identify" (United Nations DESD, 1992b:63).

7. GDP nationally was US\$760 per capita in 1984 (United Nations, 1995).

8. A study by USAID stressed the importance of education for social integration and therefore recommended that "more scholarships should be granted to hilltribe youth for continuing higher education in the lowland" (Rerkasem, 1989:68).

9. Various reports state that the increasing number of agencies dealing with hilltribe populations is a growing problem affecting hilltribe work (RDC-Payap, Renard and others, 1988:55). This issue is likely to decrease in importance in the future: as the Thai economy develops, it is inevitable that a substantial part of external assistance will come to an end and/or be transferred to neighbouring countries.

10. This is true except for a very small number of hilltribe people who have never joined the "modern" mainstream, e.g. *Mlabries*, who still are "hunting and gathering" in remote areas of northern Thailand. According to the survey of July 1995, the *Mlabries* total 182 persons, most of whom live in Nan Province with a small number in Phrae Province.

11. It has been said that "the State and its centralized structural framework has limitations in finding solutions" regarding ethnic minority issues in general (Phillips, 1990).

12. Information obtained in an interview with Associate Professor Bencha Yoddumnern-Attig, Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University, Bangkok (August 1995).

13. "This has had the inevitable result of a sharp decline in productivity and hence income, as well as degradation of forests, soil and environment". Source: TDRI (1994), p.3.

14. Nevertheless, "the idea that people should be able to live in the forest ... has taken root and is relatively widely upheld among policy makers". Source: TDRI (1994), op. cit., p. 131.

15. Summary of an interview with Mr. Poosak Thamassal, Director of the Hilltribe Welfare Division, Department of Public Welfare, Bangkok (September 1995).

16. Summary of an interview with Mr. Sitha Penbarkhul, Chief of Planning Section, Hilltribe Welfare Division, Department of Public Welfare, Bangkok (September 1995).

17. However, some hilltribe people have been living in a symbiotic relationship with *Tai* people for a very long time (Renard, personal communication). Once northern Thai cities were established in the second half of the nineteenth century, local rulers regarded it as essential to sign treaties with *Lua* or *Karen* headmen. In return for staying in one place, being loyal citizens and paying nominal tax, hilltribe people were generally exempted from *corvee* or other exactions. Both *Lua* and *Karen* were, therefore, quite loyal citizens of the Chiang Mai kingdom (RDC-Payap, Renard and others, 1988:30). The *Karens* and *Lua*

who signed these treaties were considered subjects of the principality of Chiang Mai but under supervision of a local serf. Those who paid tribute to the local authority were categorized as subjects and never as aliens. Chao kao were already members of the local administrative system under the care of Thai Royalty. At this time, strong links were forged between the Thai kings and hilltribe seigneurs.

18. Despite being a formal requisite, it could also be observed that speaking and writing Thai is an informal condition which is often set forth by local authorities. Furthermore, this "social requisite", to be able to read and write the Thai lingua franca, is the main means of improving the image of hilltribes among other people in the country. Historically, the Thai language has been recognized as a useful means in the process of nation-building. It has become the only medium of instruction allowed in schools, government or even the private sector (Dhiravegin, 1991:93). "It is the only way that will 'win points' in the eyes of other people in Thailand". Source: Tribal Research Institute, Akha Village and Political Systems, p. 129.

19. "An effective social integration program should also aim to improve acceptance of hilltribe people among the lowlanders". Source: Rerkasem and others (1989), p. 5.

20. Thailand has linked its population registration with vital registration as is done in China, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran and Republic of Korea (ESCAP, 1987:4).

21. Summary of an interview with Mr. Wongsprasert of the Tribal Research Institute in Chiang Mai, Thailand (August, 1995).

References

Berger, Peter (1974). *Pyramids of Sacrifice* (London: Allen Lane).

Bradley, David (1983). "Identity: the persistence of minority groups", In: John McKinnon and Wanat Bhruksasri (eds.) *Highlanders of Thailand* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press).

CCSDPT (1985). *Proceedings of the CCSDPT Hmong Displaced Persons Workshop*, held at the Bangkok Indra Regent Hotel, 24 May 1985.

Charusathira, Prapas (1966). *Thailand's Hill Tribes* (Bangkok: Ministry of Interior).

_____ (1965). *Thailand's Hill Tribes*, United Asia, No. 6, Bangkok.

Department of Public Welfare (DPW) (1993). *Annual Report 1993* (Bangkok: Ministry of Interior).

Dhiravegin, Likhit (1991). "Nationalism and the State in Thailand", In: K.M. de Silva, Pensri Duke, Ellen S. Goldberg and Nathan Katz (eds.) *Ethnic Conflict in Buddhist Societies*.

ESCAP (1987). "Status of Civil Registration and Vital Statistics in Asia and the Pacific" (Bangkok: United Nations, ST/ESCAP/465).

Geddes, W.R. (1983). "Research and the Tribal Research Institute Centre", In: John McKinnon and Wanat Bhruksasri (eds.) *Highlanders of Thailand* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press).

Georges, Pierre (1984). *Geopolitique des minorites* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).

Hoare, Peter, W.C. (1992). "Movement of Lahu towards a lowland lifestyle", In: Anthony R. Walker (ed.) *The Highland Heritage, Collected Essays on Upland North Thailand*.

ICPD (International Conference on Population and Development) (1994). *Population and Development: Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 5-13 September 1994* (New York: Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis, United Nations Publication, ST/ESA/SER.A/149).

Kesmanee, Chumpinit (1987). "Hilltribe relocation policy: is there a way out of the labyrinth? a case study of Kamphaeng Phet". Paper presented at the Symposium on Culture and Environment in Thailand, August 1987, Siam Society, Chiang Mai, Thailand.

Keyes, C.F. (1979). *The Golden Peninsula: Culture and Adaptation in Mainland Southeast Asia* (New York: Macmillan).

Klausner, William J. (1993). "Reflections on Thai culture", *Collection of Writings*, Bangkok.

Kundstadter, P., E.C. Chapman and S. Sabhasri (eds.) (1978). "Farmers in the forest", *Economic Development and Marginal Agriculture in Northern Thailand* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii).

McKinnon, John (1983). "Behind and ahead" In: John McKinnon and Wanat Bhruksasri (eds.) *Highlanders of Thailand* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press).

NESDB. *Fifth Economic and Social Development Plan 1982-1986* (Bangkok: National Economic and Social Development Board).

NSO (1985). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1985; Tak Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1986). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1986; Phayao Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1986). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1986; Chiang Mai Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1986). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1986; Chiang Rai Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1987). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1987; Nan Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1987). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1987; Mae Hong Son Province* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1987). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1987; Lamphun, Phitsanulok and Loei Provinces* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1987). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1987; Lampang, Sukhothai, Phetchabun and Phrae Provinces* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

_____ (1988). *Report on the Survey of Hilltribe Population: 1988; Kanchanaburi, Kanpangpet, Ratchaburi, Uthai Tani, Pethburi, Supan Buri and Prachuap Khiri Khan Provinces* (Bangkok: National Statistical Office).

Philips, Alan (1990). "Ethnic, social and religious conflicts: the rights of minorities". An Occasional Paper from Presentations Made by the Working Group on Minorities, World Congress on Human Rights, New Delhi, India, 10-15 December 1990.

Rajah, Ananda (1990). "Ethnicity, nationalism, and the nation-state: the Karen in Burma and Thailand", In: Wijeyewardene Gehan (ed.) *Ethnic Groups across National Boundaries in Mainland Southeast Asia* (Bangkok: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies).

Rathanakhon, S. (1978). "Legal aspects of land occupation and development". In: P. Kundstadter, E.C. Chapman and S. Sabhasri (eds.) *Economic Development and Marginal Agriculture in Northern Thailand* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

Rerkasem, Kanok and others (1989). "Highland development as a narcotic prevention strategy" U.S. Agency for International Development, Chiang Mai University.

Research and Development Center, Payap University (1988). Ronald D. Renard, Prasert Bhandhachat, G. Lamar Robert, Montathip Roongruangsee, Sinth Sarabol, Narong Prachadetsuwa (eds.) *Changes in the Northern Thai Hills: An Examination of the Impact of Hill Tribe Development Work, 1957-1987* (Chiang Mai, Thailand: Chiang Mai University).

Tan Chee Beng (1975). "Central government and tribal minorities: Thailand and West Malaysia compared". In: A-R Walker (ed.) *Farmers in the Hills: Ethnographic Notes on the Upland Peoples of North Thailand* (Pulan Pinang, Malaysia: Penerbit Universiti Sains).

Tapp, Nicholas (1986). "The Hmong of Thailand, opium people of the Golden Triangle". *Anti-Slavery Society and Cultural Survival Series No. 4*, London.

_____ (1989-1990). "Sovereignty and rebellion, the White Hmong of Northern Thailand" (London: Oxford University Press).

_____ (1990). "Squatters or refugees, development and the Hmong", In: Wijeyewardene Gehan (ed.) *Ethnic Groups across National Boundaries in Mainland Southeast Asia* (Bangkok: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies).

Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI) (1994). Assessment of Sustainable Highland Agricultural Systems, Natural Resources and Environment Program (Bangkok: TDRI).

Tribal Research Institute (1967). "Tribesman and peasants in Northern Thai Hills". Proceedings of the First Symposium of the Tribal Research Center, Chiang Mai University.

United Nations (1995). World Statistics in Brief Series V,. No. 16 (New York: United Nations).

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Development (DESD), Statistical Office (1990). Handbook of Population and Housing Censuses, Part I & II, New York.

Wijeyewardene Gehan (ed.) (1990). Ethnic Groups across National Boundaries in Mainland Southeast Asia (Bangkok: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies).

Yoddumnern-Attig, Bencha, and Kathleen Ann Culhane-Pera (1991). "The impact of Hmong gender dynamics on infant mortality rates". Grant proposal (unpublished) for Rockefeller Foundation's Research Programme on Women's Stature and Fertility, San Francisco.

Asia-Pacific Population Journal, www.unescap.org/appj.asp

Print this page