

Refugees Crisis in the Human Security Agenda of South-East Asian Countries

Farida Tadjine, University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla (UKMO), Algeria

The Asian Conference on Asian Studies 2017
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Despite Southeast Asian countries, with the exception of Cambodia and Philippines, aren't a part of the 1951 Convention related to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol. The refugee crisis remains one among the most influenced issues that the Southeast Asian region faced until now. This research paper seeks to explore and discuss the response of the Southeast Asian governments on the critical refugee crisis in the light of Human Security context. Moreover, it aims to address the major factors that affected the Southeast Asian policies to deal with this issue. To meet these aims; the Human Security Approach has been adopted as a theoretical framework, while the research design has been based on qualitative research approach, and its data have been collected using different types of documents; such as, governmental and NGO's reports, journal articles, newspapers, books, official and political speech. This paper argues that the role of Southeast Asian governments in the refugee crisis was limited because it didn't sign the refugee convention and its protocol; therefore, refugees are deemed to be illegal immigrants by law. Moreover, the Southeast Asian historical experience about the negative effects of refugees on its economy, society and security, played an important role in determining its dealings with the current refugee issues. This research paper attempts to raise the scientific discussion among researchers who are interested in issues linked to Refugees, Human Security, and the Southeast Asian Region.

Keywords: Refugee Crisis, Human Security, Southeast Asian Studies, ASEAN.

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

For more than four decades, the Refugee Crisis in Southeast Asia has gained a considerable attention from various actors, disciplines, and perspectives. Likewise, since the mid-nineties, when the Human Security concept emerged, there has been a growing interest in its understanding, formulation, and implementation in different parts of the world including the Southeast Asian countries. Despite, the both concepts have not been yet adopted by ASEAN organization documents, their relevant issues have been widely discussed and attempted to handle in many ways. A close look at the recent NGO's, UN reports, and a significant literature on the refugee crisis in the region, indicates that, although, the Refugee Crisis and Human Security are both not new issues challenging the security policies in Southeast Asia, the dealing with the first is and continued to be a complex, a chronic and critical issue that highly impacts the Southeast Asian region, states, societies, and individuals. In a fact sheet published in September 2014 which covered 13 Asian countries, including 11 Southeast Asian countries, (namely: Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam.), the UNHCR regional office for South-East Asia highlighted 523,592 people as refugees and asylum seekers, by country origins: Myanmar 500,364, Sri Lanka 4,786, Afghanistan 4,282, Pakistan 3,077, Others 11,083. A total of 2.7 million people of concern, including 1.4 million stateless and over 700,000 internally displaced. (UNHCR, 2014).

This research paper mainly aims to explore and discuss the governmental response of Southeast Asian countries to the refugee crisis in the light of Human Security Approach. Moreover, it seeks to address and determine the major factors that affected this response. To this end, the question under discussion is: In the Human Security context, how do the policies of Southeast Asian country's response to the regional refugee crisis? And what are the major factors that influenced these responses? In order to answer this question, the Human Security Approach, which basically formulated by United Nations Development Program UNDP (1994) and the Commission on Human Security CHS (2003) has been adopted as a theoretical framework, while the "refugee" has been defined by the same definition that has been adopted by Amnesty International, and formulated by the 1951 Convention related to the Status of Refugees, and its 1967 protocol, which is "a person who is outside their own country and, has a well-founded fear of persecution due to his/ her race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, and is unable or unwilling to return". (UNHCR, 1951; Amnesty International, 2016, online)

The notion of Human security has been increasingly discussed since the end of cold war, by many policy makers, international relations scholars and foreign policy advisors. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the Commission on Human Security (CHS) has been highlighted what human security should involve. According to UNDP Human Development Report (1994), Human security means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruption in the patterns of daily life whether in jobs or in communities. While according to HSC Human Security Now report (2003), the notion means the protection of the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. Human security, called for people-centred, holistic actions that helped Governments and communities to

strengthen early warning about looming crises, identify the causes of insecurity, and take steps to close policy gaps, this concept provided a viable framework to bring various approaches into a coherent and concerted effort that put people at the forefront of decision-making. (UN, 2012, online) Human security is more than the absence of violence and conflict. It is not the total absence of state security; it depends on state security: the state has to provide order, the state has to provide protection, the state has to provide the legal process to protect the human beings inside its jurisdiction; not only physical protection, but intellectual and spiritual growth and the well-being of the total human being. Human security is not state-bound, it must be inter-state, because each state is no longer adequate to face the challenges to human security today. (Pitsuwan, 2007, 68) The concept of human security is not exclusive of state security; it is not exclusive of state roles; it incorporates all these in order to focus (or refocus) on the individual, rather than on the sovereignty of the state. (Pitsuwan, 2007, 68)

Research Methodology

Since this research paper is a pilot study, the research design has been based on qualitative research approach, and its data have been collected using the review of different types of documents; such as, governmental and Non-Governmental reports, journal articles, research papers, newspapers, books, official and political speech. While the analysis has been conducted using a thematic analysis. The paper has been structured based IMRaD format,

Finding and Discussion

The discussion starts with addresses the links between Human Security concept and Refugee Crisis, particularly in the context of Human Security Approach. And then gives an overview of the Human Security Agenda in Southeast Asian countries, it further provide the Refugee status and the governmental responses in the region.

The nexus between Human Security and Refugee Crisis has been viewed from two sides. The first side is when the Refugee Crisis has seen as a threat to the Human Security in the hosting countries, including its national security. And the second is when it has seen as a threat to the Human Security of the refugees themselves. This research paper will not consider the first view deeply, while, more focus will be given to the second view. Because as noted previously in the introduction this paper has adopted a Human Security Approach. The second view is well fits the major idea behind Human Security concept, which is protection and empowerment of people to operationalize the security. However, in the analysis section we will take in account that, Refugees have never been far from international and domestic security discussions, whether they are positively or negatively viewed as victims of security deficits or as potential threats to national and international security.(Edwards, 2009, 774-775) The first view, have been considered the refugees as a sources and subject of threats, and it gives a priority to the national security and focuses on the hosting state as a referent object of security. This point was illustrated by Alice Edwards, when she indicated that, Refugees in the 1990's have been viewed as threats to national borders and security, perceived as criminals and terrorists, and, collectively, viewed as threats to international peace and security. Refugees in that time no longer offer the same geopolitical benefits to state interests as they did in the politics of the

Cold War. (2009, 774-775) By contrast, in the second view, the refugees have been considered as victims and a referent object of the security, this view has called for more effective mechanisms to protect the Human security of refugees regardless to their backgrounds. This point has been provided by many scholars and activists engaged in support of refugees, they argued that the securitization of the policy debate on refugee movements in the 1990s, served to reinforce the restrictive asylum tendencies in Europe during that decade, and manifested themselves during the Kosovo refugee crisis as well. (Suhrke, 2003, 96) In other hand, the first time the High Commissioner systematically sought to relate Human Security concept to refugees was at the meeting of the “human security” coalition of states in 1999 by the High Commissioner, Sadako Ogata. In her keynote address, Sadako Ogata, emphasize two types of situations and related policy needs that must be addressed in order to improve the human security of potential or actual refugees: (Suhrke, 2003, 102)

(a) prevention of conflict and peace-building to protect and assist internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees in areas of conflict; states and organizations should form strategic partnerships with UNHCR for this purpose; (b) filling “the gap” between relief and development in the aftermath of a violent conflict so that returning refugees and IDPs could more readily be integrated and not risk repeated displacement. Both were high-priority items on the UNHCR’s agenda. (Suhrke, 2003, 102)

In a recent literature, Aramide Odutayo, Donald Kerwin has well addressed the links between Human security and Refugee Protection. To Odutayo, Human Security offers a new vocabulary with which to appeal to states for protection of refugees. (2016, 373) And to Kerwin, refugee protection can advance both human and state security. (2016, 84) Refugee protection and national security respond to the aspiration for human security, albeit from different perspectives and with different emphases. National security underscores the responsibility of states to protect the lives and safeguard the rights of their residents, while refugee protection speaks to the responsibility of states to defend the rights of persons who are at risk of persecution, either by their own states or by groups that their states cannot or will not control. (Kerwin, 2016, 84) As Robyn Lui have highlighted, protection does not only mean defending legal rights, but also means monitoring borders to ensure that they remain open when refugees cross them; demanding access for food and medicines needed for assistance; fighting discrimination; counseling on legal procedures; deciding when to advise refugees when to return home. Refugee protection is a set of legal instruments, operational activities and material contributions that can restore a sense of security in people in whom flight has deprived of everything, sometimes, even of their identity. (2002, 105)

To quote Alice Edwards again, she is concluded that, the people-centered focus of human security, irrespective of one's attachment or allegiance to the State, is conceptually powerful for refugees that are generally outside the remit of a State's national interest. This concept further embraces multilateralism, international cooperation, and interdependence, recognizing rightly, that threats to human security in one part of the world affect persons in other parts and that this needs to be taken into account in designing solutions and responses. (2009, 802-804) Today's internally displaced persons can quickly become tomorrow's refugees if the factors causing their human insecurity are not resolved. Moreover, the human security framework is

oriented toward early action and response. However, national borders are increasingly irrelevant in the face of transnational threats. Theoretically, Responsibility to protect (R2P) offers some potential for enforcement action in the face of serious threats to human insecurity. Protection and empowerment, the concept of human security aims to foster long-term solutions to refugee problems.(Edwards, 2009, 804-805).

Despite, the term Human Security Agenda didn't yet adopted officially by ASEAN and Southeast Asian countries collectively, due to the lack of consensus on its definition and the challenge of implementation since it would involve the notion of sovereignty of its member states. ASEAN has directly and indirectly addressed many agreements and programs that presented a significant policies and cooperation connected to Human Security issues in the region. (Zainal Abidin, 2012, 62)

First thing to remember is that, since 1967, ASEAN has placed the promotion of regional peace and security at the forefront of its endeavors (ASEAN, 2015, 12), it stresses the referent of security is the sovereign nation-states and in some occasions the peoples of Southeast Asia. (Feigenblatt, 2009, 12) After few years, The Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality ZOPFAN 1971 was signed as the first document that set ASEAN's vision towards security cooperation in the region. it was aims to ensure the region's freedom from any form or manner of interference by outside powers, in addition at broadening the areas of cooperation that would contribute to the strength, solidarity and closer relations among the Member States. (ASEAN, 2015, 12) Asian countries in general, have been familiar with comprehensive security, which means that security goes beyond military means, and embraces political, economic, and socio-cultural means of providing security. In the mid-1980s, the ASEAN member states adopted the notion. Later on the comprehensive view of security has been influencing member states' policy and behavior. (Cheeppensook,2007) The previous statements prove that, security issues were not a new trend of cooperation between Southeast Asian Countries; on the contrary they were in the bottom of concern in regional cooperation. However, the collective adaptation of the human security concept as a priority in security agenda is relatively new.

The following table shows the status of Human Security of each Southeast Asian country by international rank order and level of Human Development in 2015.

Country	International Rank on Human Security Index 2015	Human development Category
Singapore	5 th	Very high Human Development level
Brunei Darussalam	30 th	
Malaysia	59 th	High Human Development level
Thailand	87 th	
Indonesia	113 th	Medium Human Development level
Viet Nam	115 th	
Philippines	116 th	
Timor-Leste	133 th	
Lao PDR	138 th	
Cambodia	143 th	
Myanmar	145 th	

Sources: Data collected from (UNDP,2016, 242-244)

Table (1): Human Security in Southeast Asian Countries

It is clear from data in the table (1) that, there are considerable ranking gap in the Human Security levels from one Southeast Asian country to another, according to that gap they could be categorized to 4 groups as follows: 1: Singapore and Brunei Darussalam. 2: Malaysia and Thailand, 3: Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines. 4: Timor-Lest, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar. The table also shows that, among the eleven Southeast Asian countries there are 4 of them with a very high or high level of human development, which are respectively ordered: Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and Thailand, while the rest of countries are classified under the medium level of Human Development. The general image indicate that there are still an acceptable performances in Human Security because non state from this region in the Low Human Development category.

In the trend of Human Security Agenda in South east Asian countries, a growth efforts have done to approach it the region at civil, political and academia levels. Some interesting effort have been reflected in the declarations and works of the former secretary generals of ASEAN Surin Pitsuwan and Ong Keng Yong, in addition to Amitave acharya, the well-known researcher who is interested early in human security in southeast Asia.

Surin Pitsuwan, the former Secretary-General of ASEAN and former Thai Minister of Foreign Affairs and member of the Commission on Human Security indicated that, in South-East Asia, the traditional way of dealing with non- traditional security issues is no longer adequate. All of these issues have human security dimensions. All the crises the region have experienced in the last years have human security dimensions, this overlap between non-traditional security and human security makes it easier to promote the substance, if not the exact terminology, of human security in the region. (Acharya, 2007, 29) It is worth to be mentioned, that Thailand, with its Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, have perhaps the first human security ministry in the world (Pitsuwan, 2007, 68) And it was also the first to use the term 'human security' at ASEAN level in 1998, when Surin proposed that an ASEANPMC Caucus on human security be set up. And argued that, the human costs of the economic crisis would impact upon all the achievements that the ASEAN member

states have made together so far, and would inevitably threaten the region as a whole. Therefore, those members who are interested and ready should join hands in mapping out steps and strategies for long-term approach to the cure for and prevention of human security in the region. (Cheeppensook, 2007, online) In Surin Pitsuwan view, Thailand unfortunately, was focus on Human security with the understanding that human security equals human welfare/social welfare. Human security is more than social welfare. Because social welfare is what the state provides, the individual just waits and receives largesse from the state. But in human security there is an element of fulfillment, there is an element of human rights, there is an element of human development, there is an element of fuller freedom (2007, 68) Another view to human security in this region has come from the former Singaporean Secretary-General of ASEAN, Ong Keng Yong, when he has stressed a 'human security' approach to combating terrorism in South-East Asia. (Acharya, 2007, 29) Coupled with this view, the Philippines was practically support it by its human security act in 2007 which make it an Act to secure the State and protect its people from terrorism. (Philippines e-Ligal Forum, 2007, online) To amitav acharya, a regional perspective to human security in South-East Asia is justified because the region has a well-established institution in ASEAN, with an experience of dealing with security challenges with a regional focus. Moreover, ASEAN has developed new institutional mechanisms enable it to rethink its principles to make them more attuned to a human security agenda. (2007, 21) Acharya addressed some reasons makes the human security concept find a little resonance in the thinking and approach of South-East Asian governments.(2007, 25) one reason is that, most South-East Asian policy-makers argue that national and state security need not be incompatible with human security. Another reason is that, some of the initial Western articulation of the concept of Human Security associated it with humanitarian intervention. And this is a key reason for the wariness of governments, with their deep attachment to Westphalian sovereignty, to embrace human security. As Surin Pitsuwan, put it: If there is any region that is suspicious of external involvement or jealous of the concept of sovereignty, it is Southeast Asia. The concept of sovereignty is still very sacred here. ASEAN is yet to adopt human security. (2007, 26) In the 20th anniversary of the Human Security concept, Surin and Mely Caballero-Anthony argued that in order to advance human security, ASEAN states must be imbued with the political will to act decisively in addressing human insecurities and to work with other actors in promoting protection and empowerment of people and communities.(Pitsuwan and Caballero-Anthony, 2014, 199)

Country	Refugees status and Governmental Responses
Viet Nam	In 2015 Refugees by country origins was 313.2 thousand from Vietnam, 198.7 thousand from Myanmar and 12.8 thousand from Cambodia. The same countries have also the worst records of state compliance with international human rights and they are not bound by humanitarian or refugee conventions either.
Myanmar	
Cambodia*	
Indonesia	Refugees by country origins 9.3 thousand in 2015. Hosting more than 13,800 refugees and asylum seekers, mostly from Afghanistan and Pakistan, but also from Myanmar, Iraq, Iran, Sri Lanka and other countries.
Lao PDR	Refugees by country origins 7.4 thousands in 2015
Philippines*	Refugees by country origins 0.6 thousand 2015. In Indochina era, the government declared that reception and processing facilities for refugees had been overwhelmed by the refugee crisis long before arrivals peaked. The country remains plagued by widespread poverty and a violent political culture.

Malaysia	Refugees by country origins 0.4 thousands in 2015. Hosting more than 150000. 139780 from Myanmar, the others from Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Somalia, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Palestine and other nations. By the end of 1977, the Indochinese refugee population had increased. The number of boat people had risen from 1157 at the beginning of the year to 6974 by December. Within the first six months of 1978, 13,219 boat people sought refuge. It also had approximately 90,000 Filipinos seeking refuge from the conflict in Mindanao Island at the same time.
Thailand	The Thai government defines the Refugees as “displaced persons” and accommodates them in places referred to as “temporary shelters”. The largest groups are those displaced by fighting in Myanmar in recent decades. But there are also Hmong stranded after the wars in Indochina, and recent influxes of the Rohingya minority from Myanmar. In 2015, there were 0.2 thousand refugees by country origins. In Indochina era, the refugee population had risen from 25,000 at the beginning of 1977, to 97,600 on January 1978, and 113,300 on June 1978. The ethnic breakdown of this large refugee population in June 1978 was 96,000 from Laos, 14,000 from Democratic Kampuchea and 3200 from Vietnam.
Singapore	Refugees by country origins 0.1 thousands in 2015. In Indochina era, the government of Singapore has not allowed many refugees to land on its territory. Although rich by regional standards, the city-state is very small in area and cannot accommodate a large number of unwanted people. Singapore has, however, provided significant funding for the support of refugees elsewhere. Singapore was also unwilling to risk relative political and social stability with an influx of refugees of unknown background and temperament. It was thought that the presence of large numbers of refugees might lead to social unrest and an increase in crime. In 1977, a small group of Vietnamese sought asylum in Singapore after they had murdered the Vietnamese crew of the aircraft they had just hijacked. Such actions served to harden public opinion against other Vietnamese asylum-seeker.
Timor-Leste	Refugees by country origins 0 thousands in 2015.
Brunei Darussalam	Refugees by country origins not available in 2015. In Indochina era, it has received very few refugees, and despite the tremendous wealth of the nation, appears to have provided little for refugee relief elsewhere

* Signatory part of the 1951 convention on status of refugees.

Sources: the data collected from (B, 2016, online; Davies, 2006, 13; Lavoie & Knock, 1990, 46-49; Song, 2015, 51; UNDP, 2009, 75; UNDP, 2016, 242-244;)

Table (2): Status of Refugee Crisis in Southeast Asia and some governmental responses

In the era of Indochina War, and exactly after 1978, the refugee problem in ASEAN countries grew in both scale and intensity. In light of costs, ethnic conflicts, and security threats, ASEAN member states have been at best unwilling, and often unable to provide asylum to large numbers of refugees. (Lavoie & Knock, 1990, 45) In Lavoie and Knock research, it had been mentioned that, Indonesia has received smaller numbers of refugees than Thailand and Malaysia, their presence has disrupted national life, and in particular population resettlement programs which had been implemented to avoid Overexploitation of Javanese agricultural lands. The influx of boat people to Indonesia was seen as a serious threat to the fragile economies of affected regions. (Lavoie & Knock, 1990, 46)

With the exception of Cambodia and the Philippines, the Southeast Asian countries not a signatory part of 1951 refugee convention. This situation makes the label “refugee” not officially adopted by these countries. As the table 2 shown, among the 11 Southeast Asian countries, 5 of them which are respectively Vietnam, Myanmar, Cambodia, Indonesia and Lao PDR have the largest number of refugees by country origin in the region,

Neither Indonesia nor the Philippines are stable politically, and both countries must contend with significant violent guerilla movements. Military budgets are already high for countries where serious poverty is widespread and the governments of both countries are anxious to avoid any further threats to national security and political stability. In light of the economic, political, and social pressures that the presence of large numbers of refugees might impose upon the precarious security of these two countries, both are very reluctant to allow large numbers of refugees to settle within their borders. (Lavoie & Knock, 1990, 49)

under the circumstances emphasized in table 2, the Response of the Southeast Asian governments to the refugee crisis.

In 2015, when the recent Rohingya refugee crisis was in the top, the effect of refugee policies in Southeast Asian region has been widely criticized, by Amnesty and UNHRH, the world witnessed harrowing scenes as fishing boats crammed with refugees and migrants from Myanmar and Bangladesh were pushed back to sea by Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia. Desperate children, men and women were left without food, water and medical care for a week, before the Philippines and later Indonesia and Malaysia offered to take them in. (Amnesty international, 2015, online) Amnesty International, with Auckland Refugee Council and the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN) strongly supported a regional approach towards improving the protection of refugees and asylum seekers. They believe that this displacement crisis will not be solved unless states recognize it as a regional problem and deal with it as such. A constructive regional approach, would positively impact not only on the well-being of refugees and asylum seekers but also on the stability of the region as a whole.(Amnesty international, 2015, online) UN warns of humanitarian disaster after Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia turn back boatloads of refugees fleeing Burma, leaving 6,000 people stranded at sea (Tisdall, 2015, online)

In that time, ASEAN has published its Security Outlook, it highlighted the issue of refugees (by term of irregular movement of persons) as a major concern to ASEAN. The Outlook stressed the need for ASEAN to immediately identify the root causes and other contributory factors to the recent irregular influx of persons and work together in concert to find a solution to the crisis. this will help ASEAN in addressing the issue more effectively and in a holistic manner.(ASEAN, 2015, 81)

Response of the Southeast Asian governments to the past (Indochina) and recent (Rohingya) refugee crisis has been shaped or influenced by different and interdependent factors.

In the late 1970s, as refugee movements in South east Asian region peaked, the economic, social, and political stability of first asylum countries was threatened; several wealthy Western nations with a tradition of immigration and emergent economic interests in the area were confronted with a complex and unwelcome

dilemma (Lavoie & Knock, 1990, 43). After the Indochina refugee conference, the first negative outcome which shaped future Southeast Asian state responses on refugee crisis was that Southeast Asian states were successful in arguing at the conference that this crisis and its solutions were and therefore they would not take part in old solutions, such as the 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol. Southeast Asian states had watched how African states were forced to accept the entire refugee burden facing that continent during the 1960s and they were not going to be the next developing region to be burdened with problems beyond their capacity. This point was made regularly by all Southeast Asian states present at the 1979 conference. (Davies, 2006, 22) Southeast Asian states learned that 'hard hearts could drive hard bargains' (Davies, 2006, 23)

In addition, today's refugees living in protracted camps may become tomorrow's irregular migrants, or they may be recruited by non-state armed groups or the state military and paramilitary groups and prolong armed conflict. It acknowledges that the failure to deal with the human security issues of individuals and refugees can have an impact on national, regional, or global security. (Edwards, 2009, 804). The movement of refugees is a security threat that transcends national borders and draws attention to the impact of intrastate conflicts on national, regional and international order. In this context, the refugee problem represents a danger to the national security of receiving states and to common security. (Lui, 2002, 98). Five broad ways have been identified in which migratory movements can threaten security: when refugees and migrants are working against the regime of their home country; when they pose a risk to their host country; when immigrants are seen as a cultural threat; when they are perceived as a social or economic threat; when the host country uses immigrants as instruments to threaten the country of origin (Freitas, 2002, 38)

Many Southeast Asian states believed that complying with international refugee law would compromise their sovereignty, their security and their development. (Davies, 2006, 24)

Conclusion

The purpose of this research paper was to explore and discuss the way that the governments of Southeast Asian countries do response to the Refugee Crisis in the context of Human Security. The paper also aims to address and identify the main factors influencing these responses. As already noted previously, in the context of human security, the state is no longer the only referent object of security. Moreover, it became well known today that human security in one part of the world influences persons in other parts. Much literature has emphasized that these facts need to be taken into account in order to design solutions and responses.

Regarding to the nexus between Human Security and Refugee Crisis. It is clear from the provided literature that, while the traditional view seen the refugees Crisis as a cause of Human Insecurity, the Refugee Crisis and Human Security can be linked in the human security context through many concepts as well as, Protection and responsibility to protect, Empowerment, Freedom from fear, Freedom from wants, and freedom to live in dignity. In other words, the Refugee Crisis in the Human Security context has viewed as a part of the human insecurity.

In Southeast Asia, some states were more ready than others to accept, to incorporate, to accommodate the concept of human security, Surin recognized. With the exception of Thailand, the governments in that region do not prefer to use the term “Human Security” in its official documents. Likewise, with the exception of Cambodia and the Philippines, the terms “Refugee” not legally recognized in the region. To express the status of refugee in official documents of the Southeast Asian governments, the terms, Displaced Persons; Irregular Influx of Persons; Irregular migrants; Non- Citizens; are likely to be used, but not the term “refugee”. For most of these countries, discussions of refugee Crisis have been separated from Human Security planning and debates. Moreover, it has limited its official dealing with the issue of refugees under the rights of children and human trafficking contexts only, instead of dealing with it under the whole Human Security context for long term resolution. On the other hand, despite the overall positive performance of Southeast Asian countries in Human development, and so far in Human Security level in some of them, the most governments has not given preference to the blooming refugee Crisis that the region experiencing for more than four decades.

Nevertheless, a considerable evidence provided in this paper including the table (1), ASEAN calls, and Acharya and Surin notes, confirmed that, the absence of the terms “Refugees” and “Human Security” in the governmental documents does not necessarily mean the absence of Human Security policies or dealing with refugee issues. Some experiences as has been indicated have brought about a gradual shift to being more comfortable with the idea of sharing the responsibility to protect, to prevent calamities, and to rescue people from their fate; due to the various challenges, threats and calamities coming towards the region, not as countries any more.

As it has been shown in the finding and discussion section, and based on a tracing literature have done on Indochina and Myanmar Refugee Crisis, a juridical supported with Historical, Security, political, Societal and Economic, factors has been well influenced the worries and consequently the response of the Southeast Asian governments,

In order to contribute raising the discussion among researchers who are interested in this topic, this research paper suggests the following relevant problems to be questioned in further research: 1) We call for questioning again the extent of the incompatibility of the protective Human Security and the ASEAN way. Because some literature has stated that “protective Human Security” is incompatible with the “ASEAN way” theoretically and, to a certain extent, also in practice. The differences in temporal frame and points of reference regarding standards to be followed are important obstacles for the application of this version of Human Security in Southeast Asia. 2) How could Southeast Asian Countries collectively, create strategies enable them to settle the Refugee Crisis in a human security context without threatening the human security of the hosting countries in the region? The reason behind asking this question is that, the human security context considers the human security of all Humankind, so treating of refugee crisis without taking into account the negative effects on the human security of people in the hosting country will create a continued problem could be called “Human Insecurity Dilemma”.

Acknowledgements

The author is deeply grateful to Samiha Tadjine for her helpful comments and for the language check that contribute to improve the final version of the paper.

References

Acharya, A. (2007). Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in South-East Asia. In ASEAN & UNESCO. *ASEAN-UNESCO Concept Workshop on Human Security in South-East Asia*, 25–27 October 2006, Jakarta, Indonesia, (pp 19-66)

Amnesty International. (2015). *A regional Approach towards Refugees and Asylum Seeker in the ASIA PACIFIC*. Retrieved March 30, 2017, from <https://www.amnesty.org.nz/sites/default/files/Briefing%20-%20REGIONAL%20Approach%20%28final%29.pdf>

Amnesty international. (2016). *What's the difference between a refugee and an asylum seeker?*, Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://www.amnesty.org.au/refugee-and-an-asylum-seeker-difference/>

ASEAN. (2015). *ASEAN Security Outlook*. Malaysia, Retrieved March 30, 2017, from <http://www.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/ASEAN-SECURITY-OUTLOOK-2015.pdf>

B. (2016, June 08). More than 150,000 refugees, asylum seekers in Malaysia. Retrieved March 30, 2017, from <http://www.nst.com.my/news/2016/06/150557/more-150000-refugees-asylum-seekers-malaysia>

Cheepensook, K. (2007). The ASEAN Way on Human Security. *Mainstreaming Human Security: The Asian Contribution*, Bangkok, October 4-5, 2007, Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <http://humansecurityconf.polsci.chula.ac.th/Documents/Presentations/Kasira.pdf>

Commission on Human Security. (2003). *Human Security Now*, New York: Commission on Human Security, Retrieved March 30, 2017, from http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/chs_final_report_-_english.pdf

Davies, S. E. (2006). Saving refugees or saving borders? Southeast Asian States and the Indochinese refugee crisis. *Global Change, Peace & Security: formerly Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change*, 18(1), 3-24, DOI: 10.1080/14781150500453153

Edwards, A. (2009). Human Security and the Rights of Refugees: Transcending Territorial and Disciplinary Borders. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 30(3), 763- 807, Retrieved March 30, 2017, from <http://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1133&context=mjil>

Feigenblatt, O. V. (2009). ASEAN and Human Security: Challenges and Opportunities. Ritsumeikan Center for Asia Pacific Studies (RCAPS) Working Paper N 09-5 Retrieved March 29, 2017, from https://www.apu.ac.jp/rcaps/uploads/fckeditor/publications/workingPapers/RCAPS_WP09-5.pdf

- Freitas, R. (2002). Human Security and Refugee Protection after September 11: A Reassessment. *Refuge*, 20(4), pp 34- 44, Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <http://refuge.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/view/21272/19943>
- Kerwin, D. (2016). How Robust Refugee Protection Policies Can Strengthen Human and National Security. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 4(3), 83-140
- Lavoie, C & Knock, R. B. (1990). The ASEAN and International Response to the Southeast Asian Refugee Crisis: A Canadian Perspective. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 18(1), 43-65.
- Lui, R. (2002). World Order and UNHCR's "Comprehensive" Approach to Refugees. *Revue québécoise de droit international*, 14(1), 91-113.
- Odutayo, A. (2016). Human security and the international refugee crisis. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 12(3), 365-379, DOI: 10.1080/17449626.2016.1251484
- Philippines e- Lugal Forum. (2007). R.A. 9372 – Human Security Act of 2007 (Full Text). Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://jlp-law.com/blog/ra-9327-human-security-act-of-2007-full-text/>
- Pitsuwan, S. (2007). Human security in South-East Asia and the experience of the Commission on Human Security. In ASEAN & UNESCO. *ASEAN-UNESCO Concept Workshop on Human Security in South-East Asia*, 25–27 October 2006, Jakarta, Indonesia, (pp 67-70)
- Pitsuwan, S & Caballero-Anthony, M. (2014). Human Security in Southeast Asia: 20 Years in Review. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 2(2), 199-215.
- Song, J. (2015). Redefining Human Security for Vulnerable Migrants in East Asia. *Journal of Human Security*, 11(1), 45–56, DOI: 10.12924/johs2015.11010045.
- Suhrke, A. (2003). Human security and the protection of refugees. In Edward Newman & Joanne van Selm (Eds.), *Refugees and forced displacement: International security, human vulnerability, and the state*, (pp 93- 108). Tokyo, New York, Paris: United Nations University Press.
- Tisdall, S. (2015). *South- east Asia faces its own migrant crisis as states ply 'human ping pong*. The Guardian, Thursday 14 May, Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/14/migrant-crisis-south-east-asia-rohingya-malaysia-thailand>
- United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human Development Report*. New York, USA: UNDP, Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2009). *Thailand Human Development Report : Human Security Today and Tomorrow*. Bangkok Thailand: United Nations Development Programme.

United Nations Development Programme. (2016). *Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone*. New York, USA: UNDP, Oxford University Press.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (1951). The Refugee Convention, 1951. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <http://www.unhcr.org/4ca34be29.pdf>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2014). *South-East Asia Fact Sheet*. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/519f67fc9/south-east-asia-fact-sheet.html>

United Nations. (2012). *Human Security 'More than an Abstract Concept' — for Hungry Family, It's Food on the Table, for Refugee, It's Shelter from Conflict, General Assembly Told*. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://www.un.org/press/en/2012/ga11246.doc.htm>

Zainal Abidin, M. (2012). Mainstreaming Human Security in the ASEAN Economy Community. In Hernandez, C.G & Kraft, H.J.S. (Eds). *Mainstreaming Human Security in ASEAN Integration*, Vol III: Human Security and the Blueprints for Realizing the ASEAN Community, (pp. 32-67). Quezon City, The Philippines: Institute for Strategic and Development Studies. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from http://www.isis.org.my/attachments/1311_MZA_Chp3_HumanSecurity.pdf

Contact email: Faridatadjine@hotmail.com