
Yale Center for International and Area Studies
Working Paper Series

GENOCIDE STUDIES PROGRAM

An Oral History of Family Life
under the Khmer Rouge

Kalyanee E. Mam
Yale University

1999

Working Paper
GS 10

Yale Center for International and Area Studies
P.O. Box 208206
New Haven, CT
Ph: (203) 432-3410
Fax: (203) 432-9383
www.yale.edu/ycias/

An Oral History of Family Life under the Khmer Rouge

Kalyanee E. Mam
Yale University

Genocide Studies Program
YALE UNIVERSITY
Ben Kiernan, Director

Yale Center for International and Area Studies
Luce Hall, 34 Hillhouse Avenue
New Haven, CT 06520-8206

Introduction

Mam Soksann was watering sunflowers in his garden on the morning of 17 April 1975. A Buddhist monk approached him and informed Mam of his journey to the Thai-Cambodian border. “My intention is to go to Thailand as soon as possible, to any country in the world. I’m not sure. I will come back home someday. I love my motherland very much, but for the time being, I cannot live my life here. I must leave for a period of time. According to the predictions of Buddha, the time has come,” he explained. “The 500 Thieves are coming to town. When they come, they will rob us of all the things we possess--our families, our children, our property, and even our lives. Everything will belong to them--the bandits.”¹ The story of the 500 Thieves is a popular millennial story that predicts the coming of a group of bandits who would reverse the order of Cambodian society, turn life completely upside down, and halt all time for a period of years.

On 17 April 1975, the bandits came. The Khmer Rouge (KR)² invaded the entire country in preparation for a nationwide “liberation campaign.” Only a few days earlier, the streets had rung with peals of laughter and exploded with firecrackers in celebration of the Cambodian New Year. But instead, on April 17, blasts from guns and the cries of families foreshadowed a dreadful era. All families, urban and rural alike, were forced to abandon their homes with as few belongings as possible. They were assured by the KR soldiers that there was “no need to take anything, but just a little food, no need to take clothes or goods....Soon *Angkar*³ will bring you things.”⁴ For thousands making the treacherous journey far from familiar surroundings, there was little certainty of what *Angkar* was or represented. This force became the very organization that would rend the basic fabric of Cambodian society and would attempt to tear apart the traditional Khmer family.

When the KR came to power in 1975, their aim was to achieve a communist revolution that would place state power in the hands of worker-peasants, increase agricultural production, and radically transform the Cambodian social order.⁵ To do so, the KR required the people’s absolute loyalty. Before the KR rose to prominence, Cambodians’ identity was bound to their class, religion and family. To achieve their objectives, the KR attempted to weaken these traditional loyalties and supplant them with new loyalty to *Angkar*.

This paper will focus on the relationship between the loyalties within the family and those imposed by the state. It will do so by examining KR policies intended to undermine the family and by evaluating the success of families in resisting these policies. Data for this paper was selected from the author’s interviews of Cambodian subjects who survived the KR regime.⁶ The author’s findings challenge those of Cambodian scholars in two respects. The author has found that 1) the KR deliberately implemented new policies to undermine the traditional family structure and 2) the resistance of individuals and families against these policies was successful and has been unfairly marginalized in the academic discourse on the KR regime.

¹ Peter Soksann Mam, *My Life Story During the Khmer Rouge Regime*, unpublished personal account.

² The Khmer Rouge (KR) overthrew the Lon Nol regime on 17 April 1975 and established Democratic Kampuchea (DK). This is the official name of the Khmer Rouge regime that lasted until 1979.

³ *Angkar* is Khmer for “organization.” *Angkar* is used to refer to the Khmer Rouge regime.

⁴ Kiernan, Ben. *The Pol Pot Regime: Race, Power and Genocide In Cambodia Under the Khmer Rouge, 1975-79*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996, p. 40.

⁵ In his book, *Third World Politics*, Christopher Clapham defines a revolution as “a rapid, violent, and irreversible change in the political organization of a society. It involves the destruction of the existing political order...[and the establishment and maintenance of] some kind of new social, political and economic order.”

⁶ See Appendix on Methodology.

Traditional Perspectives

Recent studies concerning family during the KR regime grappled with the question of whether the KR implemented specific policies to destroy the traditional family structure or whether these policies were merely instrumental extensions of a previous regime. A second dimension of this debate evaluates the success of these policies and the significance of resistance to them. Traditionally scholars hold two perspectives in this debate.⁷ This section will briefly present each of these views and a third view held by the author.

Michael Vickery argues that the KR employed no deliberate policies to undermine the family. Vickery asserts that “DK [Democratic Kampuchea]⁸ policy was immeasurably stricter than the pre-revolutionary norms it mirrored, and it served to modify, not destroy, the family.”⁹ Under the KR regime these policies were rigorously enforced by the state. Vickery argues that, “DK policy was not directed [specifically] toward destruction of the family, but family relationships were subject to the same suffocating authority as all other aspects of life.”¹⁰ The policies adopted by the KR were not fundamentally new nor were they intended to disrupt the family.

The second perspective asserts that policies were designed to weaken the family structure and were successful in their implementation. This view is held by Elizabeth Becker, May Ebihara, François Ponchaud, Chantou Boua, and Judy Ledgerwood.¹¹ These scholars believe that the KR not only succeeded in undermining the traditional family structure, they also redistributed the authority of the family to the regime. Ebihara contends that “In its attempt to control various aspects of life and to transfer authority and loyalty from local foci to the central state, Democratic Kampuchea undermined the solidarity of what was perhaps the most important grass-roots social unit: the family.”¹² In contrast to Vickery, these scholars posit that KR policies were unique, deliberately implemented to break apart the traditional family structure, and successfully undermined the family.

The author finds that the KR policies were deliberate and that they were unsuccessful. As part of a systematic process created specifically to establish a new and revolutionary social order, they were meant to control the social institutions that supported the family. However, the KR regime did not last long enough for their policies to succeed. In silent, covert ways, family members challenged KR policies and demonstrated their determination to preserve their family values. Becker and others have understood the impact these policies have had on the family structure, but they have failed to take into account how individual family members during this time responded to these destructive policies and how the notion of family actually survived this horrific era. Through small

⁷ For a detailed outline of the perspectives of different authors see the Appendix on Bibliographical Essay.

⁸ Democratic Kampuchea (DK) is the official name of the Khmer Rouge regime.

⁹ Vickery, Michael. *Cambodia 1975-1982*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1984, p. 177.

¹⁰ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

¹¹ See Becker, Elizabeth. *When the War Was Over: Cambodia's Revolution and the Voices of its People*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1986; Boua, Chantou. “Women in Today's Cambodia.” *New Left Review* 131 (1982): 44-61; Ebihara, May. “Revolution and Reformation of Cambodian Village Culture.” in *The Cambodian Agony*, David A. Ablin and Marlowe Hood, eds., Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1990; Ebihara, May. “A Cambodian Village under the Khmer Rouge.” in *Genocide and Democracy in Cambodia: The Khmer Rouge, the United Nations and the International Community*, Ben Kiernan, ed., New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1993; Ledgerwood, Judy. *Changing Khmer Conceptions of Gender: Women, Stories, and the Social Order*. Diss. Cornell University, 1990. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1990; and Ponchaud, François. “Social Change in the Vortex of Revolution,” in *Cambodia, 1975-1978: Rendezvous with Death*, Karl Jackson, ed., Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.

¹² Ebihara, in Kiernan, ed., *Genocide and Democracy*, p. 28.

acts of resistance, individuals and families were able to prove the endurance of the family.¹³

Khmer Rouge Policies and Family Institutions

At the time the Khmer Rouge regime came to power, the extended family was the center of economic and cultural life. Families worked together as an economic unit responsible both for household production and consumption. Since children remained under the care and supervision of their parents, marriage was also a family decision. Furthermore, the notion of family was preserved through Buddhism and religious ceremonies that honored ancestors and family. During the pre-KR period, the family and the economic, cultural, and religious institutions that supported it, formed the very foundation of Cambodian society. The KR attack on the family and its institutions thus threatened Cambodian society as it was known.

Through a detailed analysis of testimonies of experiences during the KR regime, this essay will examine the policies explicitly adopted by the KR during 1975-1979 to destroy the family as an economic and social unit, rights to property, marriage, and religion. This paper will also examine how certain family members resisted these policies in defense of their traditional family values and evaluate the success of these policies in overcoming that grass-roots resistance.

Physical Separation of Family Members

The Khmer Rouge used three methods to separate family members and to fracture the family structure --deportation, execution, and the collectivization of work and living arrangements. Moreover, by controlling contact between family members, the KR attempted to weaken family bonds and strengthen the bonds of *Angkar* and the revolution.

Forced Evacuation

Almost all urban families were separated during the tumultuous evacuation process that took place on 17 April 1975. Of the individuals interviewed by the author, 93% confirmed that they and their families were deported from one place to another, while 33% replied they were separated from family members during evacuation.¹⁴ Family members were also separated as some died from lack of food and water, from physical exhaustion, or were executed by KR soldiers. Many families were informed that the trip would only take three days. Most of the treks lasted from two weeks up to three or four months. Sokhom¹⁵, who was forced to evacuate from Phnom Penh to Takeo province, had to walk six months before she reached her destination. Before she undertook the journey, she had been separated from her parents and from the rest of her family.¹⁶ Like Sokhom, Chundara was parted from members of her family during the evacuation. Her mother was forced to leave for Battambang province with her brothers, while she left with her sisters in the opposite direction, to Prey Veng province. At the time she was only 13 years old, her older sister was 15 and her younger sister, eight.¹⁷

¹³ James Scott refers to the power of individual resistance: "Multiplied many thousandfold, such petty acts of resistance by peasants may in the end make an utter shambles of the policies dreamed up by their would-be superiors." Scott, James. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p. 35.

¹⁴ For summary of data collected on deportation and other policies, see Appendix on Data.

¹⁵ Only first names will be used throughout this paper to protect the identity of the informants.

¹⁶ Author's interview with Sokhom, Phnom Penh, 15 June 1998.

¹⁷ Author's interview with Chundara, Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998. Chundara had already lost her father during a KR attack on Phnom Penh in 1973.

For many families, including the families of the women cited above, the evacuation process during this time of trauma and confusion spelled the loss of a support system fundamental to their survival. The only way each of the women could respond to their situation was by continuing their journey. Indeed, many endured the trek with the hope they would once again be reunited with family members at a later time.

For the less fortunate, there was no hope of family reunions. Thousands died in forced evacuations from urban areas to the countryside. According to Ben Kiernan, in Phnom Penh alone, the death rate on the trek was approximately 0.53 percent or a death toll of 10,600 in an evacuated population of two million.¹⁸ Most of the family members who died were children, the elderly, the sick, and women during childbirth.¹⁹ Men executed during the exodus were Lon Nol²⁰ officers, police officers, high-ranking officials or civilians who disobeyed orders.²¹ During the KR regime all high-ranking officials or civilians were considered enemies of the revolution. Narom, who was evacuated with her family from Phnom Penh, lost her father in this way:

When we were evacuated from Phnom Penh I was separated from my parents. We lived next to Lon Nol and we were afraid they would bomb our house, so my parents took us to live with our aunt. When Pol Pot came, we were separated and evacuated to Kompong Cham, my father's native province. I told my parents to find us there. They followed us and halfway there, the KR took my father to be killed because they knew what he did. They knew he was a capitalist. Since then I was separated from my father forever. I never saw him again. But I was reunited with my mother.²²

Although she lost her father, Narom later rejoined her mother, who had the increased responsibility of caring for five children alone and assuring their safety.

When Mony was deported to Svay Rieng from Phnom Penh, all four of her brothers were executed because they were members of the military. Her father was also taken to be killed. Her mother died only ten days after they arrived in Svay Rieng province. Even after the death of her brothers and her parents, Mony managed to reach Svay Rieng successfully with her husband and two children.²³ Since her husband was a college professor, Mony continued to fear for his life in the new village they had arrived at.

Execution

When families finally settled into the collectives, the KR continued their policy of execution. In fact, the majority of the people who were killed during the KR regime lost their lives either by execution or starvation in the *phum*.²⁴ Of the total interviews, 48% responded that one or more of their family members were executed, while 24% attributed the deaths of their family members to starvation and malnutrition. Mony's own husband was killed soon after they arrived in the *phum*. He had been plowing and became so exhausted from lack of food that he fell in the fields. He was consequently beaten with bamboo rods until unconscious, and died.²⁵

¹⁸ Kiernan, *The Pol Pot Regime*, p. 48. (This estimate does not account for other major urban areas like Battambang City)

¹⁹ Kiernan, *The Pol Pot Regime*, p. 48.

²⁰ Lon Nol was in power between 1970-75 and was deposed by the Khmer Rouge on 17 April 1975.

²¹ Kiernan, *The Pol Pot Regime*, p. 49.

²² Author's interview with Narom (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

²³ Author's interview with Mony (female, born 1940), Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998.

²⁴ These were the forced labor camps people were sent to work in.

²⁵ People were mostly tortured and killed if they were considered a threat to the regime because of their occupations during the pre-KR period. Some were killed because they were high-ranking government officials, teachers, students, capitalists, or even because they wore glasses. Most of those executed were fathers and/or husbands, men who had held "threatening" occupations in the previous regime.

The deaths of family members devastated the surviving family. Rattana was only twelve years old at the time, but she remembers vividly what happened to her father, an official in the Ministry of Commerce, and to her brother:

In Svay Rieng they took my father, then after two months they took my brother to be killed. One of my brothers came back [from the jail] to see my mother around midnight. She cooked rice for him and he told her how difficult it was for him. He had to work so hard. Around 3:00 a.m. he returned and they took him and beat him up. They accused him of stealing away to see his mother. My mother realized that my brother had been away for so long, so she cooked some potatoes for him and placed it in a can. I went with my little sister and had her take the can of potatoes to my brother. But they would not let her see him because he had been beaten up so badly. They took the can of potatoes and ate it among themselves. After two days they took him to be killed. He died before my father. My father died from sickness and lack of food. They would not give him any food. They knew he had a high position.²⁶

Although the imprisonment of Rattana's father and brother threatened the strength and solidarity of the family, Rattana's mother continued to maintain her traditional role as wife and mother, cooking potatoes and sending them away with Rattana to give to her brother in prison. By receiving her son and cooking for him, Rattana's mother risked her life, defying the rules of the Khmer Rouge. Rattana's brother jeopardized himself by stealing a visit to his mother.

Phalla also feared her husband would be killed because he was a Lon Nol soldier. Like Rattana and her mother, Phalla did everything she could to see her husband again for the last time. She and her family were evacuated from Phnom Penh to Svay Rieng and immediately on their arrival, her husband was taken away from her:

They said they wanted to take my husband to be educated. Instead, they placed him in prison. They said they would only take him for three days. Three days turned into six months. I was so frustrated I walked with my family to where he was imprisoned. My husband recognized my *sarong* hanging on the clothesline [near his prison] and he came over to see his daughter. He was so thin. We had barely spoken a word to each other since he left. In his hand he held a letter that revealed he would soon be killed.²⁷

Reasons for such executions stemmed from a desire to eliminate family ties and to transfer the bonds of the family to *Angkar*. Contrary to the desired effect of the policy, these difficult times brought many families closer together. The loss of a father and/or husband was devastating for traditional families dependent on a male figure of support. It also meant that women assumed a more important role within their families and served only to strengthen the bonds of family. This was the case for Teng. Her husband was tied to a horse and dragged to death for giving advice about farming. Two of her children died of starvation. After her husband's death, she was left to care for her remaining two children alone. Soon after, she was separated from her children and sent to Koh Kong province to work. Her daughter was not allowed to accompany her and she could not even visit her five-year old son who was put in prison for two years for eating a raw chicken he had stolen from the communal kitchen.

They would not let children live with their mother. Here [in Koh Kong] I was given rice to eat, because there was enough food here. I wanted to bring food back to my children, so I would eat only half of the cooked rice they gave me and save the rest, until I had enough in three months to fill a *krama*²⁸ for my children. Everyday I would eat the old rice that I saved and keep the warm rice for my

²⁶ Author's interview with Rattana (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 8 June 1998.

²⁷ Author's interview with Phalla (female, born 1957), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998

²⁸ A *krama* is a traditional Khmer scarf worn usually around the neck. It can also be used as a cloth, a skirt for men, a sling to wrap babies, and for many other purposes.

children. When they made dessert I only ate a part of it and saved the rest for my children. When I returned to the village I asked the leader of my group to allow me to visit my son in jail. His wrist was so small. He wore tattered shorts and a torn shirt. He had no place to sleep. He did not even have a *krama* to cover himself. I could not even recognize my own son. When I went to see him, he did not even recognize I was his mother. I suffered so much. I saw the marks on his head from all the beatings that they gave him.²⁹

Although Teng's husband had passed away and she was prevented from seeing her children, her sense of sacrifice and duty remained. Like Rattana's mother, Teng was risking her life by storing food for her children. The storage or cooking of food in any manner was punishable by death during the KR period. To offer, seek, or "steal" food, a highly prized commodity in a time of need, for one's family, became the ultimate symbol of sacrifice and love.

One must examine how individuals responded to the death of family members while considering how individuals saved themselves and their family. Some did things as simple as lying about their history and occupation while others worked hard to actively prove their loyalty to the revolution. Still others were forced to conceal their emotions towards loved ones in order to avoid death themselves.³⁰

The simplest way to avoid getting caught and killed was to lie about one's past. Y. Kalyann, a teacher before the KR period, remembers the KR were seeking to kill any members of the intelligentsia in 1977-1978. "I took off my eyeglasses and put them away. My eyesight was very poor. I lied to them," she explains. "I told them I did not know anything. I knew only a little bit but not very much."³¹ By lying about her true identity, Y. Kalyann was able to spare her own life. Narom, who was only twelve years old at the time, also chose to lie:

During this time, only if you pretended to be stupid could you survive. I told them I did not know the alphabet because I had to hide the fact that my father was a civil servant. If they knew my father was a civil servant and he had been killed, they would have to kill me. And because I was not in my native province, they did not know our past. I lied that my father was a peasant and I did not know how to read. They brought a newspaper and I pretended to look at it backwards. They let me go to school for six months and I didn't have to work and then in the daytime I did a little work.³²

For Narom, and for many of the "new" people recently "liberated" by the Khmer Rouge, their history had dangerous implications. Narom took advantage of her anonymity in a new village to create a new identity for herself and her family. By feigning ignorance Narom was able to preserve her family, attend school, and lessen her workload.

Sorn, now a soldier in Kampot, is convinced that if it was known that his father was a teacher they would have killed him. "The reason," he explains, "was that they did not want to keep educated people."³³ Sokhom also chose to keep her identity hidden: "We

²⁹ Author's interview with Teng (female, born 1951), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

³⁰ Family and individual history (*pvaut*) was very important during this Khmer Rouge period since it revealed one's class and social affiliations. One's history could aid or place one in danger of execution. Individuals with bad history were usually the "new" people or those recently liberated on 17 April 1975. These people came from the urban areas, were involved in "doubtful" occupations, and considered enemies of the revolution. Those with good history were the "old" people or those liberated since 18 March 1970. These people came from the rural provinces and were therefore involved in more "pure" occupations that were respected by the revolution.

³¹ Author's interview with Y. Kalyann (female, born 1948), Phnom Penh, 16 June 1998.

³² Author's interview with Narom. (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

³³ Author's interview with Sorn (male, born 1972), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

did everything they told us to do. I also told them I had no education. I was only a servant who knew how to sew, so they kept my life.”³⁴

Mam Soksann and his family also survived using similar tactics. When he and his family first entered the village of Snor Anlong Mean, an old grandmother warned him to be careful while living under the KR: “You should act dumb and stupid because stupidity can save your skin. They do not favor educated people. They do not want you to be smarter than they are. You should act as if you are a peasant.”³⁵ In order to conceal his identity further, the old grandmother suggested that he changed the names of all his children as well as the way his children addressed him and his wife. Instead of calling him “Papa” and his wife “Maak,” he should be addressed as “Pouk” and his wife “Mé.”³⁶

The consequences were devastating for those who chose not to or could not conceal their past. Saream was unable to obscure her identity or escape the suspicions of the regime. Although her mother was a farmer, her husband had been a school teacher. She explains the reason for his execution and the subsequent death of her other children:

In 1977, my children died one after the other and they killed my husband. Why did they kill him? You know in those days they never spared anyone who is educated. They investigated and we could not hide it from the others. My husband was also good at planting things around the garden and they did not like that. And so they killed him. After my husband was killed, my children began to die one by one. And then my mother died. I was only left with one child, the fifth one. All my other children died.³⁷

For many, their family history was so fundamental to their identity that it could not be denied. Phalkun’s father refused to disown his identity, explaining to Phalkun that in this life he wanted to die honestly. When the KR came to ask for his occupation, he said he was a teacher and even that he supervised other teachers. Soon, Phalkun’s father was accused of stealing potatoes from a garden he had been guarding. The KR tied him to a horse and dragged him along the ground until he died.³⁸

While some people lied about their history and past positions and some pretended to be less educated than they were, others struggled to prove their loyalty to the revolution. During the KR regime, Lundi’s father was put in charge of digging up *Chee Lek Muy* or #1 Fertilizer. He worked hard at this labor, believing this was the only way he could survive.

The fertilizer is found in the toilet. They dig a hole in the ground for people to defecate in. When the hole is filled up, my father had to dig up all the feces and place it in the fields for farming. There was no soap or anything; he had to dig with his own hands. They wanted to know what kind of person he was and whether the work was easy or difficult. My father realized that we were living in a communist period, therefore we must be careful about everything we do or say. He told them that when he lived in Phnom Penh he also used to do the same kind of work, therefore he had no problem with it. Everyone else did not want to clean the toilet because it was such a dirty job. But my father endured because he was afraid of being killed. A lot of people in the KR, like the leader of my *phum*, did not know how to read or write and so if you went along with what he wanted, he would believe you. So if you tell him, “Oh this work is so easy. I can do it because I used to do it in Phnom Penh during the Lon Nol period.” They listen to us and they know we love the work of the revolution, therefore there is no problem.³⁹

³⁴ Author’s interview with Sokhom (female, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 15 June 1998.

³⁵ Mam, *My Life Story*.

³⁶ Mam, *My Life Story*.

³⁷ Author’s interview with Saream (female, born 1942), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

³⁸ Author’s interview with Phalkun (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

³⁹ Author’s interview with Lundi (male, born 1960), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

It was imperative for Lundi's father and for many others to endure such conditions. Only by giving in to the tyranny of the revolution and being careful about everything he chose to do or say, was Lundi's father able to survive.⁴⁰ He realized the importance of adapting to the culture, mannerisms and policies of the regime in order to live for the sake of his family.

For many individuals the survival of their family depended on their own survival. One woman, named Chey, would not dare cry and mourn the death of her husband, fearing she would also be killed and be forced to abandon her children:

There were so many people being killed. They would tell them they were being taken to be educated. But they weren't going to be educated, they were taken to be killed. All my children survived, but my husband was killed while they were all away working. When they returned from work, I told them, "Children, they took your father away to be killed." I told them to cry but not allow themselves to be seen. When they took my husband away they did not tell me or my children. I could not cry. We had to cry in secret. When I worked, I worked very hard, fearing they would also take me away to be killed. If the mother does not work hard they will take the mother away to be killed and leave the children alone without a mother. So, I did not dare cry. There were so many widows during the KR regime.⁴¹

Chey acknowledged her responsibilities as a single mother. She refused to give up. Recognizing the consequences of mourning, she repressed her feelings and her children's emotions.

Survival depended on the ability of individuals and families to tread a fine line between obedience and outright resistance. In order to avoid execution, family members, concealed previous identities and familial sentiments, maintaining the required public appearance by feigning ignorance and illiteracy. They continued to secretly subvert KR policies and succeeded in preserving the lives of their families.

Collective Work and Living

In addition to the separation of family members through evacuation and execution, the KR separated families in their work and living arrangements.

The collectivization of work and living arrangements attacked the very structure and foundation of the traditional Cambodian family. Before the KR regime, families worked together as an economic unit. Each family owned the modes of production as well as the fruits of their labor. Families were also social units that offered emotional support. During the KR regime, these units were viciously attacked and supplanted by collectives supported by the state.⁴²

Michael Vickery believes it was never policy to separate families: it is impossible to infer that it was ever policy to separate children from their parents...Children were expected to do productive work, although it should already be clear that children, as distinct from adolescents and young adults, were not systematically separated from their families...and children old enough to work were only absent during the day.⁴³

⁴⁰ According to Vickery, "The proper mien was to tread a very fine line between ignorance and reluctant admission of a very small amount of skill, preferably acquired through practical work, and just sufficient for the task." (*Cambodia*, p. 173)

⁴¹ Author's interview with Chey (female, born 1935), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

⁴² According to Ebihara, "The solidarity of the family as a primary social unit of economic cooperation and emotional bonds was shattered by communal organization into labor teams segregated on the basis of age and gender, dispersal of family members and kinfolk into different work groups and communes, and suppression of familial sentiments." (Ebihara, in Kiernan, ed., *Genocide and Democracy*, p. 55)

⁴³ Vickery, *Cambodia*, pp. 177-178.

It was in fact policy to separate children from their parents and many children old enough to work were absent for more than a day at a time. It is true that depending on the area or village one belonged to, some families were allowed to live together after a day of working separately. However, it was rare for children and adolescents to live with their parents. Even husbands and wives were often separated. 89% of those interviewed by the author recalled being forced to work separately from their families, while 80% said they were forced to live apart from their families. Of those who would have been children at the time, close to 70% remembered living apart from their parents and their families.

During the KR regime, families were divided into three different types of work teams. These work teams were determined by age and sex. The first work team was called *senah chun*.⁴⁴ *Senah chun* consisted of adult males and females aged 50 and above. Males belonged to *senah chun boroh* and females belonged to *senah chun neary*.⁴⁵ They were given lighter work and usually remained within the village. Although some of the younger members of this group still labored in the rice fields, older members of *senah chun boroh* usually looked after the *chamcar* or gardens, collected wood, or did other kinds of light work.⁴⁶ Older members of *senah chun neary* looked after other people's children, bound palm leaves, or sewed clothing.⁴⁷ Heang, who had to work far away from the village, was forced to give up the care of her children to one of these older women:

No, children could not live with their mothers. I never saw my children. They had two old women who acted like the mother. They would give them a little bit of rice porridge and she would wash and clean other children. They had to be the mothers, while their real mothers were off working in the fields. When their mothers returned then they picked up their children to take home. It was that difficult. There was so much suffering.⁴⁸

Such an arrangement was awkward and unprecedented for the traditional Khmer family at that time. Heang expresses frustration over the fact that she was forced to have complete strangers care for her children. During the pre-KR period, although grandmothers sometimes helped to ease the burden, child-care remained a mother's responsibility.

The second work team was called *kong chalat* or the mobile work brigade. *Kong chalat* consisted of adult males and females aged 14 to 50 years old.⁴⁹ Males belonged to *kong boroh* while females belonged to *kong neary*. Members of these groups had the heaviest amount of work. They were occupied in plowing the fields; planting, transplanting and harvesting rice; or digging and carrying dirt for the irrigation projects. Momy describes some of the work she was forced to do:

I was called the *neary kandal*, the woman with great strength. They made me dig dirt to build canals, work in the gardens and plant for the *sahakoh* (cooperative). Then I had to water the plants. After all that was done they made me sew clothes for their "old" people. During the rice planting season, we did not have any time to rest. We only had half an hour to eat lunch. After that we didn't have anything to

⁴⁴ *Senah chun* was the name used by Peter Soksann Mam in his autobiography to describe persons in this age group. It is uncertain whether this term was actually used throughout the Khmer Rouge period and regime.

⁴⁵ The Khmer word *boroh* denotes male and the word *neary* denotes female.

⁴⁶ Lundi's father was already so old he pulled grass around the collective dining hall and in the morning they made him clean up the place. Later, his father was also placed in charge of collecting *Chee Lek Mui*. Sok (of Kg Chhnang), who was already 57 years old at the time, had to gather wood.

⁴⁷ At the age of 55, Low (of Kg Chhnang) was assigned the job of binding palm leaves, which were used for thatching roofs. Heang's mother, who was also over 55 years old at the time, had to look after young children and sew clothes for the "old" people.

⁴⁸ Author's interview with Heang (female, born 1926), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

⁴⁹ It was sometimes referred to as the hot-warm group because individuals in this group were considered the strongest. Members of the *kong chalat* were also referred to as *samaraphum chdah* or hard worker.

eat until 10 at night. At 1:00 in the morning we would wake again to plant rice seedlings by torch light, all the way until 12:00 then we would stop. While the women were planting rice seedlings, the men remained to plow the fields.⁵⁰

The younger and unmarried members (although married men and women were sometimes included in this group) usually traveled great distances from the village to work in the forests cutting timber or on construction projects and state farms.⁵¹ Phrum's mother was married but she was also forced to join *kong neary* and work far away from her husband and children.

The third and youngest work team was called *kong komar*. *Kong komar* consisted of children aged 13 years and under. Boys belonged to *kong komara* while girls belonged to *kong komarei*. Members of these groups had the lightest work, although Someth declares that his younger siblings did the same kind of work as he did; they only worked with the strength of children. He claims they even woke up before the older people. Young children who were really weak were made to watch after the cows and buffaloes.⁵² Children also had to dig for planting, look for firewood, and gather cow dung for fertilizer. Huh, now a policeman in Kampot, describes his work day:

When Pol Pot came, I was separated from my mother and placed in *kong komar*. I was about 10 years old. We were dispersed elsewhere, but we remained in Kampot. My mother was placed in *kong chalat*. I watched the cows and buffaloes and dug dirt. We worked from 6:00 a.m. until 11:00 a.m. and then they called us to eat in the collective. At about 1:00 p.m. we start work again until 5:00 p.m.⁵³

The division of families into separate work teams had important implications.

Although members of *senah chun* remained in the villages, most of their children in *kong chalat* and *kong komar* either worked outside of the village or did not return home. They worked, lived and ate with their own work groups.⁵⁴

Sophal was allowed to stay with her family only in the first two months. After two months each member of her family was placed in *kong chalat*:

I was in *kong neary*. We all worked but we were in different *kong*. When we slept, ate or rested we did it separately with our *kong*. When we ate, we ate with our *kong* not our family. Every three or four months they would let me go visit my father. Sometimes when my father was sick they would not allow me to go visit. They said even if he was sick they would not let me see him. I was not a doctor. They already had doctors watching him. I should just concentrate on getting my work done. They really oppressed us. There was no freedom like today.⁵⁵

Even early in the regime, families were separated for months at a time. The regime controlled people's movement to and from their families. Sophal could only visit her father every three or four months. During her father's sickness, the most crucial period in which a family member should have been present, she could not be there.

Kamann was also separated from her parents and her family only one or two months after they were evacuated. She recalls: "Everyone worked separately. I never saw my younger brothers and sisters either. Every family was separated like this. My parents died and before I was even able to see them. I did not even know they had died."⁵⁶ L.

⁵⁰ Author's interview with Mony (female, born 1940), Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998.

⁵¹ Ebihara, in Ablin and Hood, eds., *Cambodian Agony*, p. 27.

⁵² Author's interview with Someth (male, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

⁵³ Author's interview with Huh (male, born 1968), Kampot, 30 June 1998.

⁵⁴ Becker argues this did not occur until the second year of the revolution: "The party never outlawed families as such and in the first year the revolution allowed the basic family unit to survive. But by the second year new orders were issued to break up that most powerful of institutions." (When the War Was Over, p. 240) Although Becker's assertion is correct for most families, families also recalled being separated early on in the regime, both with regards to work and living arrangements.

⁵⁵ Author's interview with Sophal (female, 1955), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

⁵⁶ Author's interview with Kamann (female, born 1965), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.

Kalyann's relationship with her parents was so completely severed that she also did not know her mother had passed away until a relative came by and informed her through a letter.⁵⁷

Each interview yielded different responses about the effects of lengthy periods of separation from family members. Some felt desperate about their situations, others missed their families, while still others feared even thinking about them. They and Someth felt that work was the only way to get their mind off of thinking about their families. They admit that "even if I wanted to think, the thoughts would not flow. Living only to work, always working forever."⁵⁸ Someth argues there was no time to think about family since everyone was so busy thinking about ways to fill their stomachs:

We did anything we could to survive. Everyone was so hungry. No one thought of anything else. Even our families and husbands and wives were cut off from us. For most everyone, the husband never thought about the wife, the wife never thought about the husband. They just thought about the problem of not having enough to eat. Even when you are going to the fields and your wife is going to the fields, you're too busy thinking about catching frogs. If you don't look, your stomach will be empty.⁵⁹

Since families were already cut off from each other, They and Someth felt it was useless to contemplate what had already happened. While Someth felt most people placed their stomachs before their hearts, Low missed her children so much she could barely eat:

They took the children to work somewhere. In one year we would only see them once. Only my husband and I were left. We never saw our children. I missed them so much, I almost could not even eat. I never stole to eat. I wasn't even hungry because I missed my children so much. They never tortured us but they made us work in the fields and we just worked.⁶⁰

In contrast, Youn was too scared even to think about his wife and children: "I was able to see my wife and my children only once every four months. I never thought about it. If you think about it they will kill you. I was very scared, I did not like it."⁶¹ Youn's response emphasizes how necessary it was to repress open manifestations of familial sentiment during the KR regime. Family members separated from each other could not even safely think about their family while they were away.

While some individuals responded to their situations with feelings of helplessness, many others attempted to resist the oppressive policies enacted by the KR and to bridge the distance between family members. Even Someth, who felt that searching for food was a priority during the KR period, could not resist thinking about his family during a crucial moment:

I was rarely home with my mother. In three years, I only stayed home for about 20 days. My mother would always tell me, if I am able to run away, I should leave and I should not think about her. However, I could not divorce my feeling of her. Even if I wanted to run away, I didn't know where to go. I also thought about my younger siblings.⁶²

Family was so important to Someth that he could not endure the thought of leaving them and saving his own life. Even if he only saw his family for 20 days out of three years, the prospect of not being with them at all was unbearable. While Someth's inability to escape the KR regime proved his love for his family, it was Lundi's willingness to act against KR policy that confirmed his loyalty towards his family. While Lundi was in the forest with his work brigade the leader of his group got married. His wife was soon pregnant and he

⁵⁷ Author's interview with L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

⁵⁸ Author's interview with They (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

⁵⁹ Author's interview with Someth (male, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

⁶⁰ Author's interview with Low (female, born 1920), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.

⁶¹ Author's interview with Youn (male, born 1934), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

⁶² Author's interview with Someth (male, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

asked Lundi to search and bring food to his wife. The following excerpt reveals the tremendous risks people took to help their families:

The place where I was cutting forests was about 12 km away from the village. It was very far away. The leader of my group knew that if he brought food to his wife personally, he would be killed so he asked me to help hide some food and save it for his wife. He asked me if I wanted to go visit home, because my house and his wife's house were next to each other. I really missed my mother. I was still young and I wanted to be close to her instead of working so far away. So he gave me permission to go home....Inside, I wondered why he would give me permission to go home. According to the KR policies, I was only allowed to return home every two to three months. I thought that if they caught me I would be killed....So every time I left to bring food to his wife, I had permission to also visit my mother....At that time I started being clever for myself. When my group leader asked me to hide food for his wife, I would also hide some food for my mother. My parents were able to live more comfortably because of that. My group leader also told me to save some food for my mother, so I saved a little bit more than that for my mother. I would save about 2 kg of food for his wife and also 2 kg for my mother.⁶³

In defiance of KR policies and at the risk of death, the group leader sought to bring food to his pregnant wife. With opportunities to visit his parents often and to make their lives more comfortable with extra food, Lundi agreed to make the numerous and dangerous journeys home. Like Rattana's mother and Teng, Lundi expressed his family loyalties by bringing food to his loved ones. During the KR regime, food, a rare but essential commodity, became one of the few means for families to convey their emotions and familial sentiments.

It was because of the great risk of punishment that few defied the regime as Lundi had done. Instead, many quietly subverted the regime or accepted their fate, in order to survive and reunite later on. Chey, who soon became a widow, decided to adhere strictly to the KR policies in order to protect her family. Her daughter, however, could not resist coming home to see her mother, and by doing so, risked punishment:

My children were already gone. They went to a different *kong*. The children worked in one place, the mothers worked in another place. We were all separated from each other. We hardly saw each other....After a while my children would come and visit me. My daughter came to see me and I asked her if she had asked permission before she came. She said, "No, mother, I haven't." I told her to go back. As soon as I said that, one of the Khmer Rouge cadres came over and started yelling at her and said, "Look at her walking around so freely." My daughter told me she just wanted me to coin⁶⁴ her and she'd go back. When she returned they made her dig even more dirt. And if she couldn't finish the job they would not give her any food.⁶⁵

During the KR period, even young children needed to receive permission before they could visit their parents and family. By visiting her mother without permission from *Angkar*, Chey's daughter was challenging its authority and asserting her loyalty to her mother.

Like Chey's daughter, many children were separated from their families. Few children were as openly defiant. Nevertheless, each questioned and regretted their separation from their parents. Mann, who was about nine or ten years old, could not understand why she could not visit her family. Mann considered this the most significant problem for her at the time, far worse than the exhaustive work she had to endure and the

⁶³ Author's interview with Lundi (male, born 1960), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

⁶⁴ "coining the air" or *cos kyall* is a traditional medicinal practice used to relieve back pains, headaches, colds, dizziness, and nausea. Oil is applied to the skin, then a coin is rubbed on the skin until the skin turns bright red.

⁶⁵ Author's interview with Chey (female, born 1935), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

lack of food.⁶⁶ The purpose of the KR policy of separation was to make children independent of their parents and increasingly loyal to *Angkar*.

For some children, family dissolution affected how they viewed their parents and how they reacted to them when they did meet. Huh was separated from his mother at age seven and placed in *kong komar*. He explains the embarrassment he felt when he met his mother after a long period of time:

In your life your mother could not live with you. But when you went out to work in different places, sometimes you could see her face. In that way you were very disappointed. When they do this to you and when you see your mother again, you get embarrassed. You get embarrassed when you see your parents and brothers and sisters again and sometimes you don't want to see them since it's been so long since you've seen them. We could only see each other every three to four months and so you get embarrassed. She comes and tries to grab her child, but you move away. Throughout the whole time I stayed in *kong komar*. I never saw my mother until Vietnam invaded and freed us.⁶⁷

Huh's testimony evokes the growing disappointment and distrust he felt towards his mother, after catching repeated glimpses of her face, yet always unable to live with her or even meet with her. The desired effect of the KR policies was that after a certain period of time children would no longer miss their family.

Nonetheless, most children cherished the opportunity to meet with their parents and their families. Saram was happy when she met with her family: "I did not get to live with my parents. I had to live with my *komar*. I only saw my parents once every month or two for a little while. We were so happy when we saw each other, mother and child. Sometimes we did not even recognize each other, because we were all so thin."⁶⁸ Sann Sokha, who was only four years old at the time, did not live with her family either and hardly saw her parents. Nevertheless, she still felt love for her parents and remembers the crabs or frogs they brought her when they did meet.⁶⁹

Regardless of age and geographic/economic background, individuals from every group were separated from their families in work and living arrangements. For most of the individuals interviewed, being separated from family members was extraordinary. Many expressed a feeling of unbearable loss.

The collectivization of work and living arrangements, in conjunction with other policies such as evacuation and executions, was a systematic and deliberate policy aimed at undermining the traditional family structure. One cannot overestimate the impact these policies had on individuals and families. At the same time, the strength and will of individuals and families endured. As with the other policies implemented to separate family members, individuals and families responded resourcefully to the problems of working and living apart. Some dealt by working harder and not thinking about the issue; others openly challenged the problem and defied their situations. The bonds unifying families and the idea of family prevailed.

Attack of Personal Property and Everyday Family Institutions

The Khmer Rouge used two methods to undermine the family as an economic and social unit and institutions that preserved family interests. These policies included forcing family members to eat in a communal setting and depriving families and individuals of their rights to personal property.

⁶⁶ Author's interview with Mann (female, born 1966), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.

⁶⁷ Author's interview with Huh (male, born 1968), Kampot, 30 June 1998.

⁶⁸ Author's interview with Saram (female, born 1967), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

⁶⁹ Author's interview with Sokha (female, born 1971), Kompong Cham, 6 July 1998.

Collective Dining

Many families, in the first few months following evacuation, were allowed to eat together and even to plant potato and vegetable plants to supplement the rice that was distributed to each family. Through the months that followed, the amount of distributed rice dwindled and families were no longer permitted to plant potato and vegetable plants. They were not even allowed to catch fish or small crabs or to gather wild fruits and vegetables in the forests. For Hour and her family, it only took four months before eating was collectivized. Hour recalls the process:

In the beginning, for two months, we all ate together. At first they gave us 30 kilos of rice for eight people. That was only enough for some rice porridge every week. Afterwards they only gave us 25 then only 20 kilos a week. About four months later, we were all separated and we were just left with my mother and my older sister. All of my nieces and nephews were placed in different *kong chalat*. We planted things to eat, but after four months, even if we tried to pick anything, we would get in trouble. It was all their property now.⁷⁰

Work and dining became collectivized. Most of Hour's family was separated into different work teams. Her family was no longer allowed to supplement their allotted amount of rice with other foods they had planted or gathered. Any attempt to do so would have been punished since everything had become the property of *Angkar*. For the KR, planting and gathering food for oneself and one's family represented a selfish practice that opposed a regime that supported collectivism. Only four months after Hour and her family arrived at the village, they were forced to collectivize their habits and work in the interest of *Angkar*.

The time it took to collectivize dining usually coincided with the amount of time it took for families to be separated in work and living arrangements. For Lundi, it took about a year before he was forced to eat collectively. Lundi notes that in the beginning he and his family did not eat in a collective and the regime was still distributing rice. Only a year later, Lundi was sent away to work with his *kong chalat* and forced to eat in a collective. He attributes this to a "change in the policies of the revolution."⁷¹ Typically, after a year, most collectives did begin to collectivize practices formerly overseen by the family unit.⁷² By forcing individuals to work and eat within their work teams the regime also asserted its authority and increased individual dependence on the cooperative.

Most of the individuals interviewed complained about being forced to eat in cooperatives. Instead of working and eating with their families, individuals shared their labor as well as their food with their work teams. Their concerns about inadequate rations were subordinate even to complaints about not being able to eat with their families. L. Kalyann recounts her work and eating routine:

In the morning we lined up and we all went to work, at midday we lined up again to eat and then returned to work. Around five or six we came back to eat. We did not eat with our families. We ate in cooperatives and we each had a small dish of rice.

One bowl of soup was shared by a large group of people.⁷³

As a member of *kong neary*, L. Kalyann was forced to work far away from the village. This meant that she could neither live nor eat with her family. Sokhom describes collective dining: "Everyone ate in a different *kong*. Young women ate in *kong neary* and young men ate in *kong boroh*; younger brothers and sisters in *kong komar*, and parents and older people also ate separately."⁷⁴ According to Ebihara, "The imposition of communal dining halls was not simply a means whereby the state controlled distribution; it further

⁷⁰ Author's interview with Hour (female, born 1954), Kompong Speu, 27 June 1998.

⁷¹ Author's interview with Lundi (male, born 1960), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

⁷² According to Ebihara, Democratic Kampuchea instituted communal dining halls after 1976-1977. DK also forbade individuals from collecting and preparing their own food (in Kiernan, ed., *Genocide and Democracy*, p. 56). Becker also agrees with this assertion. (*When the War Was Over*, p. 240)

⁷³ Author's interview with L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

⁷⁴ Author's interview with Sokhom (female, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 15 June 1998.

demonstrated that the work team or cooperative had superseded the family as the basic social unit in Democratic Kampuchea.”⁷⁵

Nonetheless, the following anecdotes prove that individuals and families did not accept this policy without resistance. Someth and his family planted potatoes around the house even though he was aware he was “stealing” and betraying the revolution:

In my house we secretly planted some potato plants at night. When the plant developed tubers, we had to steal the things that already belonged to us. If we dared dig up the potatoes in their presence, they would say we were betraying the revolution and bring us to be dealt with or punished. No, if we know that our potato plant has tubers, at night we would steal our own potatoes. We plant our own potatoes in our own place and at night we would have to steal our own potatoes again. If we don't do this, we can't survive. If we don't do this we can't eat the potatoes; we have to dig up the potatoes and take them to be shared by everyone in the collective.⁷⁶

The “crime” of having food and eating it outside the collective was so grave it was punished with imprisonment or death. As mentioned earlier, Teng's five-year old son was placed in prison for two years because he was caught “stealing” a raw chicken. All property belonged to the regime. Yet, Someth and his family continued to committ the “capital crimes” and did not regret their actions. Confident in their duty to feed their own family, they resented and resisted the imposed policy of collective dining.

Bitterness towards collective dining halls was triggered by the fact that families could not eat together; and much of the indignation resulted from the meager rations people were forced to endure. At first, most people were given rice. In the latter years, only thin rice porridge was ladled out. Sometimes the porridge was mixed with vegetables such as morning glory or banana stems. Someth testifies that “One pot of rice porridge was shared with 100 people and one person only received half a ladle. All we had was rice porridge with salt. There were no vegetables, nothing.” For Chey and her family, the hunger was more than they could bear.

We walked around looking for potatoes to cook, but they would not let us cook them. They made us throw them away because they wanted us to eat in a collective. If you did [cook them] and they discovered you, they would take you to be killed. But the food was not enough; we were still hungry. If we didn't search for other food to eat, we would remain hungry. At night we would go out and try to find other things to eat.⁷⁷

These irrational policies prove that collective dining was enforced not because of a lack of food, but because the regime feared that allowing families to produce their own food would encourage family interests and distract loyalty from *Angkar*. As with other policies implemented by the regime, the purpose of collectivizing food and property was to eliminate individual dependency on the family and force individuals to project this dependency towards the organization.

In her article, “Women in Today's Cambodia,” Chantou Boua discusses the practice of hiding food to avoid sharing it with family members. She maintains that these actions “destroyed family confidence and solidarity.”⁷⁸ In contrast to this assertion, most stories refer to members of families planting, searching for, and concealing food for each other rather than only for themselves. At night Someth and his family risked their lives in order to feed each other. Chey, unable to let her children go hungry, searched for food for her children. The notion of family endured even during a difficult period that threatened the traditional sense of social connectivity.

⁷⁵ Ebihara, in Ablin and Hood, ed., *Cambodian Agony*, p. 60.

⁷⁶ Author's interview with Someth (male, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

⁷⁷ Author's interview with Chey (female, born 1935), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

⁷⁸ Boua, “Women”, p. 60.

Rights to Personal Property

The imposition of communal dining attacked family and individual rights to personal property. Families were prevented from producing their own food and denied the right to determine the use of the fruits of their labor. A common theme that weaves through the story of Heang, a nun in the province of Kompong Chhnang, was the deprivation of personal rights. Her testimony reveals the absolute tyranny of the regime and the anger and frustration she felt and continues to feel:

If we had anything, we hid it. If they saw us, they would kill us. We had no rights; only they had rights. They killed and got rid of us as if we were animals. Before, the people could eat their own rice and work their own fields and not have enough on our own. During the Pol Pot regime they herded us like cows. If they wanted to kill us they could kill us. That's why I am very disappointed. They could just drive us out of homes we worked so hard to build. When we returned to our homes, all of our fields were taken away from us. We had no more fields to work on. When we came back we had nothing. We had no pots and pans. We used leaves as our plates. That time was just insufferable just because we had no food to eat. If they gave us food, we had food, if not, we had nothing. How could we dare say anything to them? We had no rights. We did not even have the right to speak. That is why I say it was so difficult.⁷⁹

For Heang, the right to property was not limited to the home she and her family had worked so hard to build, the fields they toiled on, or the pots and pans they had owned. It included the right to express one's opinions and challenge one's leaders. It was easier when she suffered but remained free to do as she pleased. During the KR regime she was forced to slave under a regime that denied her agency.

The KR could never offer Cambodians their traditional rights. Such rights were dangerous since the KR leadership believed most would choose personal or family interests. Becker refers to an issue of *Tung Padevat* ("Revolutionary Flags"), the official journal of the Khmer Rouge, in which they made clear their goal of eliminating all forms of private property: "The specific traits of private property are the specific traits of the capitalist class. They are the essence or the vital part of capitalist class activities."⁸⁰ These specific traits included individualism, vanity, rank, boastfulness, thinking of the family interests, sectionalism, organizationalism, bureaucratism, and authoritarianism.⁸¹ By abolishing private property, the KR believed they could destroy a competing loyalty that challenged the absolute authority of the revolution.

Despite attempts made by the KR to abolish all rights and all forms of personal expressions, even high-ranking KR officers continued to feel loyalty for their families. On 25 December 1976, Thiounn Prasith, a former Khmer Rouge Ambassador to the United Nations, was asked to write his autobiography, or confession. His activities and loyalty to the regime had been questioned and Prasith needed to offer compelling evidence he was working towards upholding the objectives of the revolution. In his autobiography, Prasith suggests the abolition of "personal property within individual thought" and the development of "collective property" as a priority for himself as well as the regime. He writes:

Another thing is the movement to abolish personal property within individual thought. This movement is the most profound and the most righteous for destroying the root of revisionism within the revolutionary ranks. This movement makes [me] very conscious of understanding that I who come from the exploiting class am the object of socialist revolution. That means that I strongly need to struggle within myself in order to destroy personal property completely, and to build up collective property. The class struggle inside me is very strong, too. The

⁷⁹ Author's interview with Heang (female, born 1926), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

⁸⁰ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 196.

⁸¹ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 196.

giving up of personal property is happening constantly. It makes me happy constantly. But this struggle is very long-lasting. I need to try harder.⁸² Prasith views the abolition of “personal property within individual thought” as one of the key paths to revolutionary success. This reference can have two meanings: 1) any thoughts related to the preservation of personal property should be eradicated or 2) all personal property and rights should be destroyed. Either way this statement is interpreted, Prasith is writing about the same rights of which Heang also felt she was deprived. Prasith constantly struggled with the desire to give up personal property: “Family property still plays a role, especially the emotions toward my children. But comparing [this feeling] to the beginning of the year, it is lighter and more stable than before.”⁸³ Prasith was unable to divorce himself from his emotions, or the “personal property within individual thought” he felt toward his family and children. Even a high-ranking KR official, attempting to destroy thousands of families, could not sever ties with his own.

Even after evacuations, executions, and collectivization, the KR were unable to obliterate the family structure. Family members continued to express warmth and affection for each other and mourn the deaths of those who died. Although groups of people did not collectively assert their indignation, individuals and families did resist the policies imposed upon them. If only in small ways, the actions of every individual and family facilitated the survival of the Cambodian family.⁸⁴

Attack on Cultural and Religious Institutions

The Khmer Rouge not only expressed their authority over families by depriving individuals of their social and economic support; they also sought to attack the cultural institutions that were fundamental to the Cambodian family. They assaulted the institution of marriage and transformed it into a ceremony devoid of family involvement and sentiments. The KR abolished all forms of religion and religious practices that displayed loyalty to the family and discouraged devotion and allegiance to parents and family by attempting to instill a new revolutionary ideology that encouraged obedience and loyalty to *Angkar*. The KR sought to replace the traditional family with a new family in *Angkar*.

Forced Marriages

For the Cambodian family, marriages before the KR period existed as a union between two families as well as between two people. Marriages were arranged in the interest of the family as well as the individual and involved the consultation and the permission of parents and the extended family. Parents usually offered crucial advice as to whom their children should marry.⁸⁵

During the KR period individuals were denied the right to choose their own mate, and parents and families were also forbidden involvement in the decision-making process. Instead, the state exercised control over the selection of mates and marriage ceremonies. Although there were instances where individuals could initiate marriages, they were still required to seek permission from village chiefs.⁸⁶ Vickery argues that “similar restrictions

⁸² The Cambodian Genocide Program. “Autobiography of Thiounn Prasith, Former Khmer Rouge Ambassador to the United Nations.” 25 December 1976. Translated by Thavro Phim. Online, Internet, 19 March 1999, Available: www.yale.edu/cgp.

⁸³ The Cambodian Genocide Program, “Autobiography of Thiounn Prasith.”

⁸⁴ See footnote 13.

⁸⁵ According to Ebihara’s study of a Cambodian village in the 1960s, “It is actually the parents who make the major decision about the marriage partner, and the child acquiesces because of a sense of obedience or because she/he has no strong feelings about marrying a particular person.” (Ebihara, *Svay: A Khmer Village in Cambodia*. Diss. Columbia University, 1968. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Information Service, 1988, p. 468.)

⁸⁶ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 13; Ebihara, in Ablin and Hood, eds., *Cambodian Agony*, p. 29.

were also part of traditional society. Young people did not normally marry without parental permission--in fact, most marriages were arranged by parents."⁸⁷ Although it is true that marriages could not be initiated without the permission of parents and most marriages in the pre-KR period were arranged, Vickery does not recognize the significant differences between the marriage policies of traditional society and the policies implemented during the KR regime. He fails to identify this policy as a method used to undermine the traditional family structure.

Unlike traditional arrangements, marriages during the KR period were forced upon people unfamiliar to each other. The marriages were arranged solely in the interest of a regime absorbed in augmenting production and reproduction. When they were forced to marry, there were nine couples. At this time, she said the couples were still given opportunities to get to know each other. Later on, however, when 30-40 couples were forced to marry at a time, some couples knew each other while the unfortunate ones did not.⁸⁸ Marriages became a public and hasty affair that involved many couples instead of a private family or a village ceremony held in honor of one couple. This was the case for Hour when she was forced to marry a Khmer Rouge cadre:

I did not even know anyone. And it was not just me. There were twenty couples. Like students lined up at school, couple after couple. They gave us one black *sampot*, one black shirt, one *krama*, a pair of slippers, and a box of tiger balm. And then they made us get married.⁸⁹

Families were usually not allowed to attend these events.⁹⁰ The mass weddings were not supposed to represent the union of a couple or a family. Instead they drew attention away from the significance of the individual and the family and towards obligations to the revolution. The KR weddings also lacked the fanfare of traditional Cambodian weddings--Buddhist ceremonies, food, colorful clothing, dancing and festive music.⁹¹ Couples were lined up, row after row, with females on one side and males on the other. Instead of a celebration, weddings were depicted as a duty similar to work on the rice fields or the irrigation canals with one's work team or at the war front.

After couples were married, they were not encouraged to establish a relationship. Like everyone else, newlyweds were also separated from each other and forced to labor in work teams that were always segregated by sex. L. Kalyann was forced into a marriage with a Khmer Rouge cadre.⁹² She was only married for eight days before her husband left her and went to work far away. Within those eight days she became pregnant. He was gone most of the time and would only return once in a while and on the day the baby was born.⁹³

The regime hoped to decrease emotional attachment between couples and families while simultaneously controlling reproduction and increasing the population of the

⁸⁷ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

⁸⁸ Author's interview with They (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

⁸⁹ Author's interview with Hour (female, born 1954), Kompong Speu, 27 June 1998.

⁹⁰ Criddle, Joan and Teeda Butt Mam. *To Destroy You is No Loss: The Odyssey of a Cambodian Family*. New York: Anchor Books, 1987.

⁹¹ Weddings during the pre-KR period were very important religious and cultural affairs. The weddings lasted about one and a half days and consisted of ceremonies and rituals conducted by the *achar* or Buddhist priest, followed by an elaborate feast on the evening of the last day.

⁹² L. Kalyann's husband was also handicapped and lacked a limb. She was told that if she married him they would release her father from the torture camp and allow him to live with her. She agreed, hoping to have her father back: "So I got married to a Khmer Rouge handicapped person without a leg. But when I got married they still didn't let my father get away; only I got away. They lied. After I got married, they took everyone away." [Author's interview with L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998]

⁹³ Author's interview with L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

productive work force.⁹⁴ Marriages were usually forced upon individuals for reproductive purposes only, since most couples who were married were soon after separated from each other and rarely met afterwards. After reproduction was achieved, it was not important for couples to remain together, since their time and energy were required on the work field.⁹⁵

Although Ebihara and Becker recognize the policy of forced marriages as a method of weakening family ties and of increasing state control over sexuality and reproduction, they fail to acknowledge the responses as well as the resistance of women to these policies. Most individuals who were forced into marriage did not want to get married. "It was such a difficult time," says They, "that I did not have any desire to get married."⁹⁶ Even so, during the five months in which they were married, although they rarely saw each other, she still viewed her husband as the head of the household. Despite being in a marriage she did not accept, she chose to maintain her traditional beliefs about marriage and family.

Hour, on the other hand, expressed her fidelity to her family and tradition by refusing to marry.⁹⁷ She voiced her abhorrence and refusal to marry, and was able to resist marriage to a KR cadre:

I told them to ask me to do anything they wanted me to do and I will do it, but I will not take a husband. I said now beat me until I die but I will not answer. I told them I already had a betrothed. I will not get married. How can I get married when my parents are not even present? Because I refused, they took me and beat me again. I told him I refused and they put me in prison and had leeches placed on me.

From then on they treated me very badly and made me dig dirt.⁹⁸

Unable to give up the traditions she was accustomed to, Hour asserted herself in the face of severe punishment. She remained faithful to her betrothed as well as her parents and refused to marry without their presence. The KR met her stubbornness with cruel punishment. Despite the punishment she knew she would be faced with, Hour continued to resist. She even stated she preferred death before she would ever enter a forced marriage. Hour's story testifies to the oppressive nature of the marriage policies that were enacted at that time.

The forced marriages of the KR period differed greatly from marriages before that time. Not only was the policy oppressive towards individuals and especially women, it was aimed at destroying the nature of the Cambodian family. Despite these oppressive policies, some women still tried to maintain a traditional family structure within the marriages they were forced into while others actively refused to get married in order to preserve family traditions.

Religion

Religion, a crucial support of pre-KR family, was another cultural institution the KR attacked. Although other religions are also practiced within the country, the official national religion of Cambodia is Buddhism. For the Khmer people, religion is a way of life embedded in tradition and culture. In Cambodia, Buddhism co-exists with a folk religion that emphasizes a belief in ancestry, spirits, and the supernatural. Within the family, the Buddhist tradition reminds children to respect their elders as well as their ancestors and to offer obedience and loyalty to their parents. Buddhism also plays a

⁹⁴ Ebihara states that the policy was used to exercise control over sexuality, to sustain reproduction, and to weaken emotional commitment between couples, so that they would redirect their loyalties to the revolution. (in Ablin and Hood, eds., *Cambodian Agony*, p. 30.)

⁹⁵ According to Becker, the Khmer Rouge believed sex should be restricted only for production "because it took up too much time and detracted from the chores at hand, overnight industrialization and glorification of the motherland." (*When the War Was Over*, p. 235).

⁹⁶ Author's interview with They (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

⁹⁷ Hour is the same woman quoted above. She had already refused to marry before but they forced her into the ceremony anyway. At the ceremony she refused once again to marry.

⁹⁸ Author's interview with Hour (female, born 1954), Kompong Speu, 27 June 1998.

significant role in the major ceremonies that affect the family, such as religious holidays, weddings, and funerals.

In the Cambodian family, one of the most significant religious events is the funeral ceremony. It is an opportunity for family members to mourn and to express devotion to the deceased member of the family. For the Khmer, the most important duties a child must fulfill are to respect and honor his/her parents, to take care of them in their old age, and to mourn and perform the correct ceremonies for them when they die. If children are unable to carry out these specific obligations, tremendous feelings of guilt may result. Without the ritual ceremonies and without the Buddhist chants, it is believed the spirit will continue to wander and will never be at peace.⁹⁹

When the KR took power, one of the religious customs banned was the burial ceremony and the mourning of the dead. Many family members were lost during the KR period. The death of a family member had a significant impact on families. The inability to mourn their loss and to perform the most important and sacred ceremony left a scarring impression. Yet, even in the face of prohibition, families continued to secretly mourn the dead and even performed small funeral ceremonies.

After the death of their father, Phalkun and his siblings had to be careful how they reacted to his death since any signs of mourning were also punishable with death. Despite this threat, Phalkun and his siblings still cried and even attempted to honor their father:

We went to try to find the body but we could not find his body. If they knew we were searching for his body they would also kill us. At that time, if after they killed your father and you were mourning after your father they would also kill the child. Even if they saw the mother crying, they would kill the entire family. So we cried in secret and when they came to us, we would wipe our tears away so they would not find out... At that time, in other families, if they killed the father they also killed the children. We were lucky nothing happened to us. We were all afraid they would kill us so we dared not cry and scream. But we tried to walk somewhere far away so we could perform a small ceremony for my father...After they took my father away I just kept working, because after they take your father away they watch you.¹⁰⁰

Once a family member was found guilty or was considered an “enemy” of the revolution, it was not difficult to implicate the rest of the family.¹⁰¹ One had to be careful about how one reacted to the death of a family member, since mourning for an “enemy” was considered a crime. The man executed was now an enemy and could no longer be considered Phalkun’s father. His death could not be a loss. Nevertheless, Phalkun and his siblings cried in secret, mourned the death of their father, and even performed a small ceremony in honor of his death. By performing these ceremonies at the risk of their own lives and the lives of their family, they displayed their loyalty to religion and culture, expressing their enduring loyalty to their family.

When Teng’s parents passed away she was unable to fulfill her duties as a daughter and offer them a proper burial:

After four months my father became sick and died. When he died, I did not even know where they took him. They just bundled him up in a mat and took him away. I was very hurt. I did not have a chance to bury him properly. My mother also

⁹⁹ Even before a person dies, Buddhist monks and the *achar* or Buddhist priest comes to the home to chant and recite Buddhist prayers. After a person dies the chanting continues, ritual ceremonies are performed and the body is customarily cremated.

¹⁰⁰ Author’s interview with Phalkun (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

¹⁰¹ According to Ponchaud, “The revolutionaries were aware of the extent to which people were tied to family obligations. They therefore did not hesitate, in certain sectors, to execute the wives and children of the condemned.” (in Jackson, ed., *Cambodia 1975-1978*, p. 165.)

died after that because of serious diarrhea. I was not able to bury her properly either. My husband had to take her away.¹⁰²

Until today Teng regrets not having had the opportunity to bury her parents properly. The passage above reveals the tremendous respect and loyalty she felt for her parents. Even in the midst of a period of upheaval and tragedy, Teng continued to cling to her traditions and the religious customs she had been taught by her family.

As evident from Teng's testimony, during the Khmer Rouge period cremation was banned and bodies were simply disposed of. Ear Sophal lost her father in 1977 due to illness and lack of food. She was unable to cremate her father's body:

In the beginning when people died, they allowed people to cremate and keep the bones of their loved ones in a rightful way. But after 1976, 1977, and 1978 they would not allow you to cremate the body. They just buried the bodies and even wild dogs could dig as they pleased.¹⁰³

Such policies showed tremendous disrespect for the deceased and prevented families from expressing their loyalty. According to Sophal, this policy was not enacted until a year after the KR took power. This was also the time in which most executions took place, more families were separated in work and living arrangements, and the policy of cooperative dining was implemented in all areas. As the years passed, the KR became increasingly paranoid about their position and even more oppressive.

Nonetheless, mourning and funeral ceremonies signified that loyalty still remained with the family and not the revolution. Even after the policies were implemented, individuals continued to mourn and perform funeral ceremonies for deceased members.

Indoctrination of Revolutionary Ideology

With family ties remaining strong, the Khmer Rouge regime sought to find new ways to force obedience from the people and to suppress their fierce competitor: the family. They attempted to accomplish this through the indoctrination of children with revolutionary ideology and by creating a new family in *Angkar*. Although these policies were impressed upon all individuals, the population most significantly affected by these policies were the children since they were malleable and still impressionable. Close to 60% of the testimonials refer to indoctrination of children. Children were taught that parents had no *kun* or gratitude towards their children, that parents were the enemies of the regime and therefore enemies of the children, and finally that *Angkar* was the one with *kun* and therefore their rightful parents.¹⁰⁴

Lundi describes the ideology the KR hoped to impress upon children in the following statement: "In the *kong komar* they disciplined children to hate their parents. They said the parents had no *kun*; it is *Angkar* that gives them food and clothing to wear. It is *Angkar* that did good things for them."¹⁰⁵ The KR appropriated the vocabulary of Buddhism, particularly that of words used in a familial relationship of parent and child. In doing so, the KR substituted itself as the surrogate parent. It was thus able to usurp the authority of parents, effectively indoctrinate children with a familiar relationship of terms that were re-contextualized, and to undermine the authority of parents and religion by reconstructing a familial vocabulary as a national one.

Not only did the KR teach children that their parents lacked *kun* and that they ought to be hated; according to Mony, they also "taught children to obey *Angkar* because parents

¹⁰² Author's interview with Teng (female, born 1951), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

¹⁰³ Author's interview with Sophal (female, born 1955), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

¹⁰⁴ Within the Cambodian household, the term *mean kun* [to have gratitude], is used to judge whether children have fulfilled their duties and obligations towards their parents or elders. These terms, however, are never used by children to judge the actions of parents or elders. By using this term in this way, the KR demonstrated that parents had not fulfilled their obligations to their children. *Angkar* took care of the children. Therefore it was *Angkar* that deserves the *kun*, or gratitude.

¹⁰⁵ Author's interview with Lundi (male, born 1960), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

were not *pouk-mé*. Their *pouk-mé* was *Angkar*.¹⁰⁶ *Pouk-mé* literally translates into “dad-mom,” but is used to denote “parents” and is equivalent to the English “mom and dad.” According to François Ponchaud, the KR also adopted a moral code that mirrored a similar code used to direct respect towards parents. Instead of using the phrase “*deaung kun apouk-maday*” (recognize the goodness of your parents)¹⁰⁷, the KR substituted the phrase with “*deaung kun Angkar*” (recognize the goodness of *Angkar*).¹⁰⁸ By designating themselves as the *pouk-mé*, they hoped to win the absolute loyalty and devotion of the children.¹⁰⁹

To achieve their objectives, the KR placed all children under the age of fourteen in *kong komar*, separate from their parents and older siblings. In the mornings, the children were given an hour of “schooling” before they continued with their daily chores. The *komar* groups and the “schools” gave the KR opportunities to indoctrinate children with revolutionary ideas that would help separate children even further from their parents. In Rattana’s *komar* group there were 200 children and they were all placed under the lead of one woman who disciplined them. Rattana remembers she was very “mean” and that she would not allow them even five minutes rest.

She taught the children to be bad and not love their parents... and to find out secrets about them so they could take the parents to be punished. Some children told on their parents. They told them their mother stole some rice to cook and they would take their parents away to beat or punish. It happened in my village; I saw it all with my own eyes.¹¹⁰

Children were not only taught to hate their parents and to consider *Angkar* as their parents, they were also encouraged to spy on them.¹¹¹ The act of spying increased the divide between children and parents since it forced children to view their parents as enemies and guilty culprits. Someth recalls one child, about 12 or 13 years old, who spied on his father and hit him for digging up some potatoes. The father could not hit back and defend himself.¹¹² By allowing children to judge, hit, and spy on their parents, the KR elevated children to positions above their parents, offered them additional incentive to mistreat their parents, and co-opted their loyalty.¹¹³

Even before the liberation of the cities in 1975, L. Kalyann recalls being taught to sing revolutionary songs and being a part of a spy group: “They already created *kong chlop* or spy groups,” she says. “They made us study how to be spies. Girls studied in the daytime while guys studied at night. I didn’t like the songs but my brothers and sisters enjoyed them.”¹¹⁴ These *kong chlop* or spy groups were trained to spy on others and to

¹⁰⁶ Author’s interview with Mony (female, born 1940), Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998.

¹⁰⁷ This phrase can also be translated to: Express gratitude towards your parents.

¹⁰⁸ Ponchaud, in Jackson, ed., *Cambodia 1975-1978*, p. 165.

¹⁰⁹ Under the KR regime, according to Becker, “One of the first steps was to abolish the use of the family name. Throughout the revolution people used one name only, usually a shortened version of the given rather than the family name.” Names not only signified what family one belonged to, but certain names could also reveal one’s class and status. Therefore it was important to control how individuals were addressed in order to gain control over their status within society as well as their position within the family.

¹¹⁰ Author’s interview with Rattana (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 8 June 1998.

¹¹¹ According to Becker, “The Khmer Rouge established a spy system through their national police service and within the cooperatives. Children were made to inform on parents, comrades on comrades, neighbor on neighbor to save themselves.” (*When the War Was Over*, p. 221)

¹¹² Ponchaud states, “Parents did not have the right to admonish them, let alone beat them and could be punished for doing so. Since 1977, in the communal mess halls, children were served first, before workers.” (in Jackson, ed., *Cambodia 1975-1978*, p. 166)

¹¹³ Judy Ledgerwood also discusses the Democratic Kampuchea period in terms of reversals in the social order. (*Changing Khmer Conceptions*)

¹¹⁴ Author’s interview with L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

catch people in the act of committing crimes against the regime. The KR also hoped to instill a sense of pride in children, encouraging them to fight for the revolution.¹¹⁵

Although Phalkun was not influenced by the teachings of the revolution, he recalls there were other children who were affected. He remembers the children being told to call their parents over and to line them up in rows before they left for work. The children were then asked whether their parents did anything wrong. Children were given permission to hit their parents if their parents had committed a “crime.” He recalls one incident in particular: “A mother said something to her child and the child said to the mother, ‘I’m not your child and you’re not my mother.’ The children can really hate their parents. They point blame at them as if they were just neighbors.”¹¹⁶ The KR pitted children against their parents and offered them legitimate reasons to hate and punish their parents: parents stole from *Angkar*; they were disloyal to the regime and deserved to be punished. Like the revolutionary songs, these exercises of punishment ensured the children’s loyalty to *Angkar*.

The KR encouraged children to grow distant from their parents and to believe that their parents had abandoned them. Children became resentful of their parents and developed loyalties within other groups. Phalla claims: “Even if children were not taught directly to despise their parents, it was as if they were because they were never allowed to miss their parents.”¹¹⁷

Although some children were impressed by the teachings of the revolution, there were others who resisted the indoctrination. As he watched other children hitting their mothers, Phalkun cried with hurt and frustration and recalls thinking to himself: “At that time, everything was just mixed up. There were no proper rules and customs.”¹¹⁸ Unlike most children, Rattana was very fortunate. Although she was placed in *kong komar*, Rattana was still allowed to return home and maintained a bond with her mother:

I did not take the Khmer Rouge teachings to heart, because I realized that my parents worked hard to raise me. I could not believe the KR. I needed to be compassionate to my parents. They had lost all of their rights over their children. My parents no longer had any control, but my mother continued to teach me to be good so the KR could not blame or punish me. My mother still had feelings for me. She told me to just do whatever they asked me to do.¹¹⁹

In this passage, Rattana reveals her Buddhist upbringing and the importance of being compassionate to her parents in spite of their degraded situation. Despite her mother’s loss of public authority, Rattana continued to respect her mother’s advice privately. In fact, her mother taught her another method of resistance and survival by utilizing the traditional Buddhist precepts the KR had forced them to abandon. She advised her daughter to offer the KR the same kind of respect she would bestow on her own parents. Rattana’s mother continued to assume her position as mother and was able, after a fashion, to discipline her daughter.

It was more difficult for Sorn to resist the revolutionary indoctrination. Sorn was only four or five years old at the time and was taught to hate his parents and to view them as his enemies. He admits although he yielded a little, he did manage in the end to resist believing what the KR taught him:

At that time of course I believed them a little because that was what they taught us. I believed them along with the other children. But when I saw my parents I did not view them as my enemy but some of the other children did. It was possible at that time for children to betray their parents. But it’s normal, with parents, no matter

¹¹⁵ See appendix for samples of revolutionary songs.

¹¹⁶ Author’s interview with Phalkun (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

¹¹⁷ Author’s interview with Phalla (female, born 1957), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.

¹¹⁸ Author’s interview with Phalkun (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.

¹¹⁹ Author’s interview with Rattana (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 8 June 1998.

what they tried to teach us, anybody would love them. When you see your parents you want to run to them. I still loved them like normal.¹²⁰ It was natural for Sorn to believe what he was taught and to follow other children in their beliefs. Yet, on seeing his parents, it suddenly became “normal” for him to love his parents and to “want to run to them.” Even children aged four and five, the most impressionable group of children, were difficult to indoctrinate. The bonds between children and parents remained strong.

Although most of the revolutionary education was focused on the indoctrination of children, all members of the regime were forced to view *Angkar* as the *pouk-mé* and to discount any relationships they had with their own family members. Many of the individuals interviewed mentioned having to attend daily village meetings. These meetings were usually held in the evenings after work was completed and sometimes lasted into the late night. According to Chey, the meetings gave the leaders an opportunity to inform everyone of their duties to the revolution:

At the meetings they said that no one could love each other. If lovers dared to love each other, they would be taken to be killed.¹²¹ Everyone was scared. Even parents and children and brothers and sisters and relatives could not recognize or know each other. They could not talk to each other.¹²²

The KR wished to destroy all relationships in general. It was essential for the KR to abolish any form of relationships that competed with allegiance to the revolution. Through the strategic use of language and policy of indoctrination, *Angkar* came to characterize the new family individuals had to sacrifice their lives for. Yet in the face of this barbarous challenge, Cambodians continued to defy KR policies and assert their fidelity to the family.

Conclusion

The policies implemented by the Khmer Rouge regime sought to destroy traditional family structure and substitute *Angkar* for it. When Mam Soksann and his family wished to move to another village in order to be closer to his relatives he was told that “According to the rules of *Angkar*, people “new” and “old” are not allowed to move freely from place to place in order to live closely with their relatives, unless *Angkar* allows them to do so. All people living in the country are our relatives.”¹²³ For the KR, loyalty to one’s family was unnecessary since one’s true family was in *Angkar*, the organization.

Vickery argues that only the extended family was threatened during the Khmer Rouge period.

DK policy was immeasurably stricter than the pre-revolutionary norms it mirrored, and it served to modify, not destroy, the family through transferring parental authority over adults to the state and breaking down the extended family into nuclear units.¹²⁴

Yet even the survival of the nuclear family was not guaranteed as the KR began to physically separate family members and attack the material, cultural, and religious institutions that supported the family. By destroying the traditional family and creating a new family, the KR hoped to be rid of a competing loyalty and to transfer this loyalty to their own organization. Family members were executed or forced to work, live and eat separately so that all bonds between family members would be severed. The rights and property of family members were seized and even the rights of families to participate in

¹²⁰ Author’s interview with Sorn (male, born 1972), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

¹²¹ She is more than likely referring to pre-marital sex here.

¹²² Author’s interview with Chey (female, born 1935), Kampot, 29 June 1998.

¹²³ Mam, *My Life Story*.

¹²⁴ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

ceremonies that expressed familial sentiments were denied. Instead, family members were forced to accept revolutionary teachings that chastised the family.¹²⁵

The revolution aimed at creating a new family that would only share the fruits of their labor with the cooperative, that would only voice emotion and sentiment for the regime, and was solely interested in the welfare of the state. However, the KR could not break the century-old bonds of family traditions. Cambodians continued to cling to the prevailing notion of family, learned to adapt to policies that threatened this notion, and strove to protect and preserve the family structure even at risk of punishment and death. They did this in a number of ways: some worked within the regime, some broke out of it, some maintained a public semblance of cooperation and fidelity while working passionately to resist the imposed public policies. All clung to family as a traditional structure of interdependence and as a social unit set up as the anti-thesis of the KR regime's policy. KR policies separated families and threatened the institutions that supported families, but did not weaken the enduring sense of kinship.

Why did families resist? Why were families so intent on maintaining their loyalties to their personal family and so reluctant to contribute to the process of collectivization? Would things have been different if people did not have to suffer under such oppressive conditions? The KR stubbornly flew in the face of all that the Khmer people believed in. The idea of the collective ran contrary to the traditional Cambodian view where the idea of family was paramount.

In seeking to destroy all sentiments and relationships between individuals, the KR were unable to substitute the strong emotional bonds that existed between families. The regime desired to create a new family and considered themselves the *pouk-mé* or parents of the people, but failed to fulfill the duties of parents. The KR took on the language of family but could not prove their merit. Physically and emotionally, the KR fell far short of the responsibilities they assumed.

Instead of allowing families to control their own means of production and consumption, the KR forced individuals to work for an abstract entity with no traditional or familiar place in Khmer society. Ieng Thirith, who was Minister of Culture and Social affairs during Democratic Kampuchea¹²⁶, proudly voiced her views of the cooperatives:

It is easier for the workers. They have no need to cook. They just do the work and then they come back and eat...[The poor people] had never been served before, now they were served. Before the women had to work, come home and search for the fish, the rice, to cook it, care for the children. This was terrible. In communal living they only have to come home from work and eat.¹²⁷

Ieng Thirith and the other KR leaders failed to recognize how important and fulfilling each one of those "terrible" activities are for families. It frustrated Heang when she was forced to have others care for her own children. Her commentary on deprivation of personal rights is significant and revealing: "Before the people could eat their own rice and work their own fields and not have enough on their own. During the Khmer Rouge regime they herded us like cows."¹²⁸ It is true, as Vickery points out, that the work people were forced to do was not very different from the work they were accustomed to before. However, during the KR regime people were deprived of free will and the standard of living collectively declined.

The second reason why families resisted the KR policies was because the regime was unable to provide for the people. After the food was produced, it was uncertain where

¹²⁵ Author's interview with Niem (male, born 1963), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

¹²⁶ Ieng Thirith is also the wife of Ieng Sary, Deputy Prime Minister of Democratic Kampuchea.

¹²⁷ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 186.

¹²⁸ Author's interview with Heang (female, born 1926), Kampong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.

all the rice went.¹²⁹ The KR denied the people's rights and failed to provide for their basic needs.

The ability of families to resist Khmer Rouge policies contributed to the downfall of the regime. The KR failed in their objective to increase agricultural production and in their efforts to mobilize against outside forces. When Vietnamese forces invaded Cambodia in 1979, the KR enjoyed little popular support and were easily pushed toward the Thai border. Bereft of popular allegiance, the KR could not draw on the strength of the population they had worked like slaves in the fields. The Khmer Rouge regime did not last long enough for the policies to take hold, but the will of individuals and families to resist the policies proved they were bound to fail. The Khmer Rouge example teaches us that when the interests of a revolution run so radically counter to a people's traditions and culture, that revolution is doomed to failure.

The millennial story told by the Buddhist monk to Mam Soksann did come true. The 500 Thieves did come to town. They attempted to rob the people of Cambodia of everything they possessed--their families, their children, their property, and even their lives. Yet in the end, the thieves neglected the treasure they won in 1975. Even in the face of extreme duress, individuals preserved themselves and their families. They refused to accept the millennial story of disempowerment. Instead, they constructed their own narrative and regained agency over their possessions, their lives, and especially their families.

¹²⁹ Mony recalls: "All the rice we harvested they hauled to who knows where. They said they were transporting it to be traded. They even hauled fabrics and needles." (Mony, Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998)

Appendix

Methodology

Data for this essay was selected from interviews of Cambodian subjects who survived the KR regime and who currently reside in the country.¹³⁰ All 45 interviews were conducted in Khmer, tape-recorded and later transcribed into English. The object of the interviews was to collect a body of data from a diverse group of people on their individual experiences during the KR regime with regards to the family. Subjects of the interviews came from 9 different geographic areas. 30% of the respondents were originally from the capital city of Phnom Penh, while 70% came from the provinces. 26% of respondents belonged to the educated or government class, 17% were from the military, while 57% belonged to the peasant or merchant classes. Respondents were between 22 and 82 years old, with 84% of respondents over the age of 30. 65% of the subjects interviewed were female while 35% were male. The decision to interview more female subjects than male subjects was made keeping in mind that of the population that survived the KR regime, half to two-thirds were female.¹³¹ Within a traditional society, women were more affected by policies that violated their positions as care-givers within the family. Furthermore, I wished to gather data sensitive to issues concerning marriage and pregnancy.

I solicited information on key topics such as the evacuation of families from their homes, separation of family members upon evacuation, execution or death of family members, cooperative living, cooperative work, cooperative dining, rights to personal property, forced marriages, pregnancies, religion, and the indoctrination in revolutionary ideology. Each of these areas cover policies that attempted to physically separate family members and to attack material and cultural institutions that supported the family.

¹³⁰ The interviews were conducted during the summer of 1998. Data for one subject, Mam Soksann, was extracted from his unpublished autobiography. Therefore, the total number of subjects is 46.

Data Collected from Informants

Total number of informants: 46

Gender:

Female: 30 or 65%

Male: 16 or 35%

Ages:

21-30 07 or 15%

31-40 12 or 26%

41-50 14 or 30%

over 50 13 or 28%

Geographical Distribution: 30% from Phnom Penh and
70% from other provinces

Phnom Penh 14

Pursat 1

Takeo 2

Kg Chhnang 9

Svay Rieng 1

Kampot 6

Kg Cham 8

Koh Paan 4

Pailin 1

Class Background (pre-Khmer Rouge):

Class 1: Total 12 or 26%

government official 1

doctor 2

veterinarian 2

professor 1

¹³¹ Boua, "Women", p. 45.

teacher 5

Class 2: Total 8 or 17%

police officer 3

soldier 4

palace musician 1

Class 3: Total 26 or 57%

merchant 2

peasant 14

farmer 2

laborer 4

servant 1

seamstress 1

barber 1

cook 1

Policies¹³²:

Policy #1: Evacuation	43 answered YES or 93%
Separated upon evacuation	15 answered YES or 33%
Policy #2: Execution	22 answered YES or 48%
Death by other means	11 answered YES or 24%
Policy #3: Lived Separately	37 answered YES or 80%
Worked Separately	41 answered YES or 89%
Policy #4: Communal Dining	33 answered YES or 72%
Policy #5: Personal Property	46 answered YES or 100%
Policy #6: Forced Marriages	4 instances reported
Policy #7: Revolutionary Political Ideology	25 answered YES or 56%

¹³² The data is based on testimonies provided by the interviewees. For each of these policies, the instances may be higher. Some individuals were too young to recall whether these policies were implemented. There may also be other cases that the interviewees failed to recall.

Revolutionary Songs

The following selections of revolutionary songs are chosen for their content and focus on images of family and solidarity within the revolution. Although all songs, dance and cultural representations from the previous period were banned during the Khmer Rouge period, revolutionary songs were sung and encouraged. These songs were implemented as part of a campaign to indoctrinate a revolutionary ideology that encouraged solidarity within the collective rather than the family unit. According to David Chandler, “the main difference between these songs and pre-revolutionary songs...is that the songs are sung in unison rather than by individuals--a trend...which praise collective efforts at the expense of individual ones.”¹³³ Each of these songs were sung during the daily “meetings” and broadcasted during work to enforce loyalty and obedience to the organization. Each song reflects the mission of the revolution to undermine the bond of family.

The first poem entitled “Solidarity Group,” addresses “brothers and sisters in the solidarity group.” In the sixth stanza, this solidarity group is referred to as “a new kind of family.” This poem encourages individuals to work in unison with their group to “celebrate Kampuchea” by increasing production. The second song, “The Beauty of Kampuchea,” also refers to a united struggle that praises the sacrifice of the “Khmer children.” Instead of offering sacrifice to their parents or their family, individuals were expected to sacrifice to their new *pouk-mé* (parents), the revolution.

Two of the songs I selected speak from the perspective of children and of their love and devotion for the revolution. The first untitled selection, translated by Ben Kiernan, compares the lives of children before and after the revolution and depicts their rescue by *Angkar* from a life of misery and abandonment. Under the patronage of *Angkar*, they have “clothes to wear” and “the strength to develop collective lives.” These lines recall the statement made by Keo Lundi that *Angkar* would replace parents in feeding and clothing the children. The second selection translated by John Marston, also refers to the “affectionate care” of *Angkar*. In this song children express their duties to the revolution. Although the song refers to the study of politics, of numbers, letters, and even higher culture, it is important to keep in mind that the only kind of education the KR held in esteem was the study of agricultural production. Under the guardianship of *Angkar* children were expected to sacrifice their lives, their families, and labor for the collective whole.

¹³³ Kiernan, Ben and Chantou Boua. *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea, 1942-1981*. London: Zed Books; New York, M.E. Sharpe, 1982. p. 326.

Solidarity Group

Dear brothers and sisters in the solidarity group, happy and self-assured: let us celebrate Kampuchea, recently set free, by striking out and leaping forward to construct new rural areas.

We raised embankments, and these form a network, like spider-webs, everywhere. We dig canals, small and large, long and short, bringing water and loam to pour onto our fields.

We use fertilizer now; and now we raise embankments, high and low. We choose the seed we want. We wipe out peats. We build fences to protect our plots from beasts.

And we are very happy because we are the masters to a great degree. Problems of water no longer worry us. Even with the floods and droughts, we can grow rice.

O solidarity group, working in unison, happy and self-assured! Dry-season rice, wet-season rice, light and heavy variety of rice; our husbandry is successful everywhere.

O solidarity group, you are a new kind of family, special, beautiful and unique. Our happiness is enormous, and we struggle to expand and solidify it, even more.

The new nation of Kampuchea is glittering, glowing, sparkling kind of light. We strive to work harder and harder, to expand and complete the revolution.¹³⁴

The Beauty of Kampuchea

O beautiful, beloved Kampuchea, our destiny has joined us together, uniting our forces so as not to disagree. Even young girls get up and join in the struggle.

Pity our friends who shoulder arms. Thorns pierce their feet; they do not complain; this is an accomplishment of Khmer children struggling until blood flows out to cover the ground.

They sacrifice themselves without regret, they chase the Lon Nol bandits, with swords and knives hacking at them, killing them, until the Lon Nol bandits are destroyed.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Kiernan and Boua, p. 326.

¹³⁵ Kiernan and Boua, p. 327.

Untitled

We children love Angkar boundlessly
Because of Angkar, we have a long life ahead
A life of great glory
Before the revolution children were poor and lived lives of misery
Living like animals, suffering as orphans
The enemy abandoned all thoughts of us
We were just skin and bones, our bodies emaciated,
We lived in anxiety
We slept on the ground and woke up in anxiety
Picking through the scraps, wandering and begging for food
Now the glorious Angkar supports us all
Secure in health, full of strength to develop collective lives
With clothes to wear, not cold at night
The light of the revolution, the light of equality
Rights and freedoms are dawning brilliantly
Our Angkar is very patriotic and correct
We resolve to follow the correct path.

The brilliant red light of Angkar is eminent
We try hard to learn both arithmetic and the alphabet
With productive labour, and healthy consciousness
In order to help advance the revolution
In order to help advance the revolution.¹³⁶

Children of the New Kampuchea

Sun, throughout the nation, red, beautiful,
Shining, sparkling in the heavens,
Shower the world of the new Kampuchea,
Wondrously bright and shining, astoundingly great.

We the children have the happiness
To live the rest of our time in precious harmony,
Under the affectionate care
Of the Kampuchean revolution, immense, most clear and shining.

We persevere in studying politics,
Nourishing everyday our revolutionary stand,
Vigorously studying numbers, letters, and higher culture,
Struggling to increase understanding and knowledge,

Studying clearly the practice of labor:
Chopping, digging up, hauling, planting, growing, transplanting,
Raising dikes, digging canals and wells,
Tending the transplanted seedlings--tending prosperity.

Together sweeping up, brushing, cleaning, promoting hygiene,
Arranging matters in the village, battling vigorously,
Striving to build ourselves up in the movement,

¹³⁶ Translated by Ben Kiernan.

In order to affirm the future of the revolution.

We, the children of the revolution,
Make the supreme resolution
To strive to increase our ability to battle,
And make the stand of the revolution perfect,

To resolve to defend and build
A new Kampuchea, make it increase and leap forward,
With great happiness, prosperity, and honor.
Oh, may supreme prosperity last for ages.¹³⁷

¹³⁷ Translated by John Marston.

Bibliographical Essay

In my efforts to comprehend the debate of scholars on the topic of Cambodian families and the attempts made by the KR regime to destroy the traditional family structure, I have explored the works of six distinct authors. In my exploration I have discovered the debate embodies two perspectives traditionally held by scholars. The first perspective, held by Michael Vickery, asserts that policies adopted by the KR were not new nor were they deliberately intended to disrupt the family. The second perspective, held by scholars such as Elizabeth Becker, Chantou Boua, May Ebiyara, Judy Ledgerwood, and François Ponchaud posit that KR policies were unique, were deliberately implemented to undermine the family, and were even successful in their implementation. I have already briefly discussed this debate in the introduction of my paper. However, in this bibliographical essay, I will outline the arguments of each author in detail while indicating the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of each of their arguments. I will also reflect on how each of these works have shaped my own thinking and the strategies I have used to develop my own arguments.

First traditional perspective

In his book *Cambodia 1975-1982*, Michael Vickery devotes only five pages to the discussion of family. However, it is one of the first books to even examine the question of family. According to Vickery, not only did the KR regime mirror the previous social order, they did not implement policies specifically to destroy the traditional family structure. He states that, "Similar restrictions [on families] were also part of traditional society."¹³⁸ The only difference between the policies of the former regime and those of the KR was that the KR policies were "immeasurably stricter."¹³⁹ To illustrate his point, Vickery uses the example of forced marriages. Vickery asserts that marriages had always been forced upon individuals by their parents and extended family members. The only difference between the marriages of pre-KR and the marriages during the KR regime, lies in the transfer of authority from the parental figure to the revolutionary leaders. Furthermore, Vickery asserts that policies were never developed to undermine the nuclear family. He states that "[Nuclear units] was the DK family ideal, and the destruction of large extended families as cohesive groups probably was an element of deliberate policy."¹⁴⁰ According to Vickery, only large extended families were attacked. He even goes on to argue that the KR were in support of the nuclear family: "...it is obvious that policy was to encourage the formation and maintenance of at least nuclear family units of husband, wife, and children."¹⁴¹

Vickery's arguments are weak in two respects. First, he fails to realize the significance of other policies that deviated entirely from the previous social order, such as forced deportation, execution of family members, cooperative living that constrained family members to a life of separate work and dining, the elimination of family and personal rights to property, and the destruction of religion as a force that bound families together. Second, by failing to identify these policies, Vickery downplays their significance as instruments used to threaten not only the extended family, but the nuclear family as well.

Furthermore, Vickery's arguments are limiting. Unable to perceive the horrific intentions of the KR policies, Vickery cannot recognize the agency of individuals and families and their abilities to resist KR policies.

¹³⁸ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

¹³⁹ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

¹⁴⁰ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 175.

¹⁴¹ Vickery, *Cambodia*, p. 174.

Second traditional perspective

The second perspective asserts that policies were designed to weaken the family structure and were successful in their implementation. This view is held by Elizabeth Becker, Chantou Boua, May Ebiara, Judy Ledgerwood, and François Ponchaud. In the following analysis I will examine the ways in which each of these scholars asserted their views.

In the book, *When the War Was Over*, Elizabeth Becker, who covered Cambodia for *The Washington Post* and who was one of two journalists allowed to enter Cambodia during the KR period, gives a detailed account of family life during the KR regime. According to Becker, "Family life had to be eliminated. The state had to usurp the authority of the family if it was to survive. The family was the most potent, hence the most feared, of all relationships of the former society."¹⁴² The Khmer Rouge regime sought to undermine this structure by implementing policies intended to inevitably weaken the family, strengthen the organization, and shift loyalties from the family to the revolution. For Becker, it was not enough to emphasize the destruction of the family. It was also important to recognize the policies implemented to transmit loyalty from the family to the regime. In order to usurp the authority of the family, Becker asserts the family unit needed to be eliminated and new categories needed to be created to "redefine identities and attitudes, shifting from family to revolutionary loyalties."¹⁴³ In the end, "Nearly all directives of the Khmer Rouge led somehow toward the dissolution of the family."¹⁴⁴ New policies were implemented and were successful in their objectives.

Becker's argument contains many strengths. Not only does she realize the intention of the KR regime to destroy the family, she also acknowledges the policies utilized by the KR to undermine the family. Her conclusion, however, emphasizes the success of the policies without sufficient recognition of the attempts made by family members to subvert these policies. Becker's discussion falls short of a balanced perception of family life during the KR period.

Chantou Boua wrote her article, "Women in Today's Cambodia," for the *New Left Review* during her visit to Cambodia in the summer of 1980. She was working with an international aid agency and was able to travel extensively within the eight months she was there. This article is one of the earliest works written on the effects of the KR period on the Cambodian family. Boua argues that policies such as cooperative work, living, and dining were implemented and had disastrous effects on the family:

People talked ashamedly of hiding food from their husbands, wives or children to avoid having to share it or to prevent discovery by Pol Pot forces. Many will remain sorry for the rest of their lives for such actions which destroyed family confidence and solidarity.¹⁴⁵

Although Boua identifies the policies that collectivized certain family institutions, she fails to discuss other distinct KR policies considered in this paper. And like Becker, Boua emphasizes the destructive effects of KR policies without proper recognition of the attempts made by family members to resist these policies.

May Ebiara, an anthropologist, wrote her dissertation on a small village in Cambodia in the 1960s. In two articles, "Revolution and Reformation of Cambodian Village Culture" and "A Cambodian Village under the Khmer Rouge," Ebiara returns to this village and records her findings on the post-war effects of the KR on this village and its families. From her findings, Ebiara concludes that "The policies of Democratic Kampuchea aimed at radically reformulating Khmer society and culture into a new revolutionary order"¹⁴⁶ and in the process, "the solidarity of the family as a primary social

¹⁴² Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 223.

¹⁴³ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 237.

¹⁴⁴ Becker, *When the War Was Over*, p. 237.

¹⁴⁵ Boua, "Women", p. 60.

¹⁴⁶ Ebiara, in Kiernan, ed., *Genocide and Democracy*, p. 28.

unit of economic cooperation and emotional bonds was shattered.”¹⁴⁷ Like Becker, Ebihara agrees that policies were implemented to shift loyalties from the family to the regime and were successful in their implementation. Ebihara’s findings are significant. She focuses on many aspects of the KR policies employed and offers a detailed account on the effects of these policies on the people of her village of study. Like Becker and Boua, however, Ebihara does not account for the resistance of family members to these policies.

Judy Ledgerwood, also an anthropologist, based the findings of her dissertation on interviews of refugees at the Thai border and the United States. Ledgerwood discusses the KR period in terms of reversals in the social order. At this time, all roles based on age, gender, and class were inverted. “This inversion,” she contends, “created an atmosphere of distrust within the family.”¹⁴⁸ Like Boua’s assertion, Ledgerwood believes all sense of trust within the family was lost at this time: “The fact that life was so insecure that one could not necessarily trust one’s children or one’s wife shows the sense of complete loss of the old system of order.”¹⁴⁹ As a result, *Angkar* “was to replace the family as the primary focus of loyalty and duty.”¹⁵⁰ At first glance, Ledgerwood’s argument is appealing and appears to discuss the natural order of things when a society has been subverted by a new revolutionary order. The old system of order, however, was not completely lost. Like Becker, Boua, and Ebihara, Ledgerwood’s argument is limiting and inaccurate as it fails to explore the ways in which families confronted the challenges they were faced with.

In his article, “Social Change in the Vortex of Revolution” François Ponchaud does not view the KR era as reversals in the social order. Like Vickery, Ponchaud posits that the policies implemented by the KR were not isolated events, but drew upon existing notions of family. In contrast, Ponchaud argues that policies were utilized with the specific intent of transforming the traditional family structure:

traditional values regulating social relationships within the family and the larger society gave way to other values, giving rise to a different language and ethic. An entirely new world was what the Cambodian revolutionaries sought to fashion, in socioeconomic terms as well as culturally.”¹⁵¹

The KR did draw upon existing traditions when inventing policies to undermine the family but they reworked these values to fit their own objectives. Therefore, according to Ponchaud, KR policies were not merely extensions of a previous regime, but were unique and intentional. Ponchaud’s arguments are strong and well-supported, but like the above scholars, he is victim of the same limitations: he discusses the success of the KR policies without consideration of the families’ strength and durability at this time.

Through my research I discovered the arguments improperly marginalized individual and family agency. I wanted to emphasize this agency. The most effective method to achieve this was to interview people directly. In these interviews, I focused my questions on the policies implemented by the KR to undermine the family and how family members reacted and resisted these policies. While reviewing the testimonies I found that family members did not simply accept their situation, but fought to maintain their traditional notion of family. They kept this notion in the face of oppressive and deliberate policies.

¹⁴⁷ Ebihara, in Ablin and Hood, eds., *Cambodian Agony*, p. 55.

¹⁴⁸ Ledgerwood, *Changing Conceptions*, p. 200.

¹⁴⁹ Ledgerwood, *Changing Conceptions*, p. 202.

¹⁵⁰ Ledgerwood, *Changing Conceptions*, p. 203.

¹⁵¹ Ponchaud, in Jackson, ed., *Cambodia, 1975-1978*, p. 151.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Cambodian Genocide Program, "Autobiography of Thiounn Prasith, Former Khmer Rouge Ambassador to the United Nations", 25 December 1976, Online, Internet, 19 March 1999, Available: www.yale.edu/cgp.

Peter Soksann Mam, *My Life Story During the Khmer Rouge Regime*, unpublished personal account.

Author's Interviews with:

1. Rattana (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 8 June 1998.
2. They (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.
3. Phalla (female, born 1957), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.
4. L. Kalyann (female, born 1955), Phnom Penh, 9 June 1998.
5. Mony (female, born 1940), Phnom Penh, 10 June 1998.
6. Chundara, Phnom Penh (female, born 1963), 10 June 1998.
7. Davary, Phnom Penh (female, born 1950), 10 June 1998.
8. Sokhom (female, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 15 June 1998.
9. Savich, (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 15 June 1998.
10. Y. Kalyann (female, born 1948), Phnom Penh, 16 June 1998.
11. Lundi (male, born 1960), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.
12. Phrum (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.
13. Phalkun (male, born 1970), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.
14. Someth (male, born 1954), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.
15. Norom (female, born 1963), Phnom Penh, 17 June 1998.
16. Sophat (male, born 1955), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.
17. Sophal (female, 1955), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.
18. Niem (male, born 1963), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.
19. Heang (female, born 1926), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.
20. Teng (female, born 1951), Kompong Chhnang, 25 June 1998.
21. Kamann (female, born 1965), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.
22. Mann (female, born 1966), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.
23. Low (female, born 1920), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.
24. Sok, (male, born 1918), Kompong Chhnang, 26 June 1998.
25. Hour (female, born 1954), Kompong Speu, 27 June 1998.
26. Vatha (male, born 1952), Kompong Speu, 27 June 1998.
27. Youn (male, born 1934), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
28. Chey (female, born 1935), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
29. Saream (female, born 1942), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
30. Sorn (male, born 1972), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
31. Phally (female, born 1945), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
32. Huh (male, born 1968), Kampot, 30 June 1998.
33. Ny (female, born 1972), Kampot, 30 June 1998.
34. Saram (female, born 1967), Kampot, 29 June 1998.
35. Samnang (male, born 1929), Kampong Cham, 6 July 1998.
36. Sokha (female, born 1971), Kompong Cham, 6 July 1998.
37. Srey Thuoch (female, born 1976), Kompong Cham, 6 July 1998.
38. Vanna (female, born 1954), Kompong Cham, 6 July 1998.
39. Eng (female, born 1918), Kompong Cham, 6 July 1998.
40. Chook (male, born 1943), Kompong Cham, 7 July 1998.
41. Sokhon (female, born 1960), Kampong Cham, 7 July 1998.
42. Tylean (female, born 1958), Koh Paan, 7 July 1998.
43. Saveoun (female, born 1950), Koh Paan, 7 July 1998.
44. Cheoun (male, born 1916), Koh Paan, 7 July 1998.

45. Ty (male, born 1961), Koh Paan, 7 July 1998.

Secondary Sources

- Becker, Elizabeth. *When the War Was Over: Cambodia's Revolution and the Voices of its People*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1986.
- Boserap, Ester. *Woman's Role in Economic Development*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.
- Boua, Chantou. *Cambodia's Country Report: Women In Development*. First draft for The Second Asia and Pacific Ministerial Conference in Jakarta, June 7-14, Phnom Penh: Secretariat of State for Women's Affairs, 1994.
- "Observations of the Heng Samrin Government 1980-1982." in *Revolution and Its Aftermath In Kampuchea: Eight Essays*. David Chandler and Ben Kiernan (eds.) New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1983.
- "Women in Today's Cambodia," *New Left Review* 131 (1982): 44-61.
- Chandler, David, Ben Kiernan and Chantou Boua. *Pol Pot Plans the Future: Confidential Leadership Documents From Democratic Kampuchea 1976-1977*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, 1988.
- Criddle, JoAn D. and Teeda Butt Mam. *To Destroy You is No Loss: The Odyssey of a Cambodian Family*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1987.
- Ebihara, May. "A Cambodian Village under the Khmer Rouge." in *Genocide and Democracy in Cambodia: The Khmer Rouge, the United Nations and the International Community*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1993.
- "Return to a Khmer Village." *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 14:3: 67-70.
- "Khmer Village Women in Cambodia." in *Many Sisters: Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, C. Matthiasson, ed. New York: Free Press, 1974, p. 305-347.
- "Revolution and Reformation of Cambodian Village Culture." in *The Cambodian Agony*, David A. Ablin and Marlowe Hood, eds. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1990.
- *Svay: A Khmer Village in Cambodia*. Diss. Columbia University, 1968. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Information Service, 1988.
- Jackson, Karl, ed. *Cambodia, 1975-1978: Rendezvous with Death*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Kiernan, Ben and Chantou Boua. *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea, 1942-1981*. London: Zed Press, 1982.
- Kiernan, Ben. *The Pol Pot Regime: Race, Power and Genocide In Cambodia Under the Khmer Rouge, 1975-79*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Ledgerwood, Judy. *Changing Khmer Conceptions of Gender: Women, Stories, and the Social Order*. Diss. Cornell University, 1990. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1990.
- *Analysis of the Situation of Women in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: UNICEF, 1993.
- Ponchaud, François. Ponchaud, François. "Social Change in the Vortex of Revolution," in *Cambodia, 1975-1978: Rendezvous with Death*, Karl Jackson, ed. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- The Secretariat of State for Women's Affairs. *Cambodia's Country Report, Women : Key to National Reconstruction*. Kingdom of Cambodia: Secretariat of State for Women's Affairs, 1995.
- Sonnois, Brigitte. *Women in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: Redd-Barna, 1990.
- Vickery, Michael. *Cambodia: 1975-1982*. Boston: South End Press, 1984.

Acknowledgements

This paper would not have been possible without the love and encouragement of my family. Without the support of my mother and father, I would not be where I am today. They have shown me the beauty of Cambodia and of its culture and traditions and have revealed to me the infinite possibilities if one is courageous.

This paper would not have been successful without the support of many individuals along the way. To the Documentation Center of Cambodia and Youk Chhang I am impossibly indebted. Thank you so much for making my trip to Cambodia unforgettable. And special thanks to the Richter's Fellowship for making the trip possible. To the staff at the Cambodian Genocide Program, you have become a family away from home. And to my advisor, boss, and friend, Ben Kiernan, you have been an inspiration.

There are few people willing to put up with a student writing her senior essay. The following people have proven their resilience and have given more than their fair share of love, support, advice and criticism. At times, perhaps more of the latter than the former. To these people I give my wholehearted appreciation: Tyson Belanger, Nicky Tuchinda, Ethel Higonnet, James Kanter, Lorraine Patterson, Noelle Morrissette, Dean Lassonde, Caroline Bridgeman-Reese, Abbas Amanat, Master Wheeler, and Marcia Chambers.

Last, but definitely not least, I would like to thank all the individuals I interviewed in Cambodia for giving me the opportunity to learn about the history of Cambodia through the eyes of its people. Through our conversations I have learned many lessons. First, that the people of Cambodia have fought hard to regain their rights as individuals and as families. And second, that the process of healing requires a continuous process of story-telling. Last summer I heard many stories, both horrific and inspirational. I hope, through the years, stories continue to be told and our history never forgotten.

