PCS Global Campus Program

Essay Contest

On

All for Peace and Peace for All

Professor: Dr. Trond Gilberg,
Dr. Arjuna Parakrama,
Prof. Muhadi Sugiono,
Prof. Kenji Isezaki.

2007-2008

Acknowledgements

I must not have had a great opportunity to write this paper or it would not have been completed successfully without the heavy support and contributions from many people. So I take pleasure in mentioning them here. First, my deepest gratitude belongs to my family: my father Kim Sarem and my mother Kout Sokon, my brothers and sisters and my uncle's, Kim Chan's family. They all support me both mentality and materials. They always encourage me to study hard and at the same time grant me money for schooling.

Second, I would like to take this opportunity to express many thanks to Dr. Raymond R. Leos, J.D., M.E.A., Dean and Professor of Faculty of Communication and Media Arts and President of Legal Clinic of Paññăsăstra University of Cambodia [PUC]. He authorized me $ 54 for enrolling in the Summer Course on Peace and Conflict Study. I would love also to express a big thanks to both of my colleagues, Chay Haksym, coordinator of PUC Legal Clinic and Tep Sokunvannary, assistant of Dean Faculty of Law and Public Affairs of PUC. They have unselfishly sacrificed much of their time in the office and let me participate in the course and write the paper.

Third, I would like to express my considerable thanks to the co-professors of the Course, including and Dr. Trond Gilberg, Dr. Arjuna Parakrama, Prof. Muhadi Sugiono, and Prof. Kenji Isezaki. I have learned a lot about peace and conflict in term of theories and real case studies from them, which led me to produce this essay.

The last but not least, I would like to greatfuly express my million thanks to the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies [TUFS] which has taken a new initiation to launch the PCS Global Campus Program [GCP] funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan. In short, I would say "Without PCS Global Campus Program no essay".

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The histories of human beings have gone through both war and peace. Obviously, since war is something worse to experience, the studies of how to achieve peace and to maintain peace have been done for centuries. Then a growing peace movement has gone throughout the world. The profound ideas of those religious founders and philosophers have significantly contributed to the creation of international law and the creation of world organs functioning as both peacemakers and peacekeepers. Even though we have had great theories of peace, which have been developed for centuries, a great number of people of the world have implemented them, and there have been international organs to maintain peace, our planet has still consisted of much violence and exploitation. Cambodia would be a good example; over the past two decades after the collapse of Pol Pot's regime in 1979, Cambodia experienced civil war. So, through my research on process of the Cambodian peace achievement and the research done during Global Campus Program, this paper will address two questions: Can Cambodian peace be achieved without the efforts of all Cambodians? And can we have peace for all Cambodians?

Scholars have divided peace into negative and positive peace. Negative peace is considered as the absence of war, while positive peace, according to the Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung, is more than the absence of war or the absence of interstate violence. However, it refers to a condition of social, economic, cultural, and religious justices that minimize or eliminate violence and exploitation.

The study of the process of peace in Cambodia that is discussed here is only from 1979 or after the collapse of Pol Pot's regime. From January 7th 1979, Cambodia had civil war between People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) backed by Vietnam and Khmer Rouge, Democratic Kampuchea (DK) backed by China.

Not until 1981, did some international humanitarians initiate to bring peace for Cambodians. As a result, in July 1981, United Nations had a general meeting in New York, USA. The failure of the initiation over plans to bring peace repeated again and again since both parties of the war and international community did not have enough

4

efforts to build peace. Two more opposition parties to Government in Phnom Penh existed the same year, 1981. They were based along Cambodia-Thai border as well. One of them was Khmer People's National Liberation Front (KPNLF) led by Son Sann and the other one was FUNCINPEC led by King Norodom Sihanouk.

From 1985 onward, International conferences were conducted often in France and in Jakarta, Indonesia, which was so-called Jakarta Informal Meeting (JIM). We had JIM1, JIM2, JIM3, and JIM4. Finally, the four parties –PRK which was changed into SOC (State of Cambodia), DK, FUNCINPEC, and KPNLF reached the agreement to finish the war in Cambodia. The agreement was the so-called Paris Peace accord in October 1991. However, the Khmer Rouge did not join the election. They still fought against the coalition government until 1998, when the Win –Win Strategy of Prime Minister Hun Sen was successful. The Government used this strategy to integrate Khmer Rouge forces with the government forces by granting them amnesty

Therefore, these studies show that still not all Cambodians and not all foreign countries have made their efforts to have peace for Cambodians. That is why in the late 2007, all former high-ranking Khmer Rouge leaders were accused of crimes, which have been granted amnesty already or Cambodia must not have peace yet, and they were brought to be detained before trial by Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC). Therefore, it reflects that the peace that Cambodians have today is not for all or it is negative peace. In short, without the efforts of all Cambodians toward peace, Cambodians achieve only negative peace.

Can we make peace for all Cambodians? Sure, as I have gone through Global Campus Program I believe that we can make peace for all Cambodians, unless the peace being made is positive peace. Thus, how can we build positive peace?

According to David P. Barash and Charles P.Webel in their book "Peace and Conflict Studies", they suggested five factors toward positive peace. The five factors are: (1) Human rights, (2) Ecological well-being, (3) Economic well-being, (4) Nonviolece, and (5) Personal transformation. I completely agree with David P. Barash and Charles

P.Webel that when the five factors are successfully fulfilled Cambodians will have positive peace.

Actually, the five suggested factors have been promoted and developed from day to day and it has been a little bit better in Cambodia when it achieved negative peace in 1998. So it means that we are on the way toward positive peace.

In short, in order to end up these problems only one way to do is that all for peace. Ultimately when we have peace, the peace will be for all.

All for Peace and Peace for All

I- Introduction

The histories of human beings have gone through both war and peace. Obviously, since the war is something worse to experience, the studies of how to achieve peace and to maintain peace have been done for centuries. As a result, for example, we can see the ancient philosophers and founders of religions[1], such as Lao-zi, Confucius, Mahavira, Buddha, Pythagoras, Jesus, Nanak, and Baha'u'llah who have given humanity profound ideas about peace and nonviolence. Their messages have been passed on from generation to generation until the present time. It seems like the same old wine in new bottles. Those messages of peace and nonviolence have reached and have been carried out by modern peacemakers such as Thoreau, Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Mother Teresa, Maha Ghosananda and some others. Then a growing peace movement has gone throughout the world. More importantly, the profound ideas of those religious founders and philosophers have significantly contributed to the creation of international law and the creation of world organs functioning as both peacemakers and peacekeepers.

Even though we have had great theories of peace, which have been developed for centuries, a great number of people of the world have implemented them, and there have been international organs to maintain peace, our planet has still experienced much violence and exploitation. What is more, there have been many armed conflict zones and many people were dead or wounded in the zones. Cambodia would be a good example; over the past two decades after the collapse of Pol Pot's regime in 1979, Cambodia experienced civil war. The war itself killed thousands of people and has left thousands of widows, widowers, orphans, and the handicapped. Fortunately, from 1998 onward Cambodia has experienced the absence of war. So, through my research on process of the Cambodian peace achievement and the research done during the Global Campus Program, this paper will address two questions: Can Cambodian peace be achieved without the efforts of all Cambodians? And can we have peace for all Cambodians?

---

[1] http://www.san.beck.org/GPJ-Intro.html

II-1- Can Cambodian peace be achieved without the efforts of all Cambodians?

In order to make the paper more precise, first of all, it is better to define the key term "Peace". Of course, peace is simply defined as the absence of war. It is a situation in which no active, organized military violence is taking place[2]. However, scholars have divided peace into negative and positive peace. Again, Negative peace is considered as the absence of war, while positive peace, according to the Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung[3], is more than the absence of war or the absence of interstate violence. However, it refers to a condition of social, economic, cultural, and religious justice that minimizes or eliminates violence and exploitation.

The following is a little bit of history before the above research question is addressed. The study of the process of peace in Cambodia that is discussed here is only from 1979 or after the collapse of Pol Pot's regime. From January 7th 1979, Cambodia had civil war between the Cambodian Government in Phnom Penh, which was known as People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) backed by Vietnam and the Khmer Rouge or Democratic Kampuchea (DK) –along Cambodian-Thai border–backed by China. Both PRK and DK wanted to win the war by waging the war against each other. They might not think of other factors like negotiation so as to build peace for Cambodians. If they wanted to fight, could they bring about peace? Obviously, the war was getting worse and worse. Moreover, the international community at that time also did not pay much attention to help Cambodia solve the problem, because they might be too busy with their own businesses, the Cold War.

Not until 1981[4], did some international humanitarians initiate to bring peace for Cambodians. As a result, in July 1981, the United Nations had a general meeting in New York, USA, discussing plans to (1) stop the war and withdraw Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, (2) find mechanisms for a transitional period, (3) have a general election under the control of the UN, and (4) create a new government. However, such a meeting failed to solve Cambodian issues. The failure of the initiation over the four main plans to bring peace repeated again and again since both parties of the war and international community did not have enough efforts to build peace. More complicatedly, two more

---

[2] David P.Barash, Charles P. Webel,Peace and Conflict Studies(London: 6Bonhill Street, NewDelhi2002)6
[3]David P.Barash, 6
[4]Heng Hong, Tragedy of Cambodia (Phnom Penh, 1997) 121

opposition parties[5] to the Government in Phnom Penh existed the same year, 1981. They were based along the Cambodia-Thai border as well. One of them was the Khmer People's National Liberation Front (KPNLF) led by Son Sann and the other one was FUNCINPEC led by King Norodom Sihanouk.

From 1985 onward, not only more Cambodians wanted peace for Cambodian people, but also the more outsiders did. International conferences were conducted often in France and in Jakarta, Indonesia, which was so-called Jakarta Informal Meeting (JIM). We had JIM1, JIM2, JIM3, and JIM4. Finally, the four parties –PRK which was changed into SOC (State of Cambodia), DK, FUNCINPEC, and KPNLF reached an agreement to finish war in Cambodia. The agreement was the so-called Paris Peace Accords in October 1991. They agreed to be monitored and rebuilt by the UN. However, in May 1992[6], something unusual happened; the Khmer Rouge expanded the territory under its control, refused to be monitored by the UN and refused to disarm its forces. The United Nation Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) had spent over U.S $ 2 billion to organize a general election in 1993 and build peace in Cambodia, but the Khmer Rouge did not join the election. They still fought against the coalition government until 1998, when the Win –Win Strategy of Prime Minister Hun Sen was successful. The win-win strategy is that no one wins, no one loses. The Government used this strategy to integrate Khmer Rouge forces with the government forces by granting them amnesty[7] and that also coincided with what some Khmer Rouge leaders wanted.

Therefore, these studies show that still not all Cambodians and not all foreign countries have made their efforts to have peace for Cambodians. In fact, we can see that only four parties – SOC, DK, FUNCINPEC, and KPNLF worked with the participation from many other countries, but not all had come to the Paris Peace Accords. I mean they should do referendum before they decide over political issues. Until today not many Cambodian people know what the Paris Peace Accords were about; and what the four parties agreed with one another on. In addition, a lot of Cambodians do not know what the Win-Win Strategy applied in 1998 was. Precisely, they didn't even know that the Cambodian Government granted amnesty to the Khmer Rouge so that they could

---

[5] David Chandler, A History of Cambodia (Chiang Mai, Thailand, 1998) 233-234
[6] David Chandler, 239
[7] Craig Etcheson, Reconciliation in Cambodia: Theory and Practice (Phnom Penh, Cambodia 2004) 49

integrate with the government peacefully. I emphasize strongly like this because such a history has yet to be introduced to the national education program, and it has been a deep belief in Cambodian society that "Politic is for Politicians not for civil people to think of" In short, again I would say the peace that Cambodians have today is not the result from "all for peace". Then what happens if Cambodians have only peace which is not result from all for peace like today? It is pretty easy to answer: "If all for peace then Peace will be for all, but If not all for peace then no peace for all".

In late 2007, all former high-ranking Khmer Rouge leaders were accused of crimes, even though some have been granted amnesty already or Cambodia must not have peace yet, and they were detained before trial by Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC). So, since these former Khmer Rouge leaders have been detained for trial like this, they must not be in a state of peace yet. In addition, if we overview on Cambodian general situations right now, we can see that poverty, human right violence, land disputes, unfairness (poor legal system) and so on remain high compared to neighboring countries. Therefore, it reflects that the peace that Cambodians have today is not for all or it is a negative peace. In short, without the efforts of all Cambodians toward peace, Cambodians achieve only negative peace.

II-2- Can we make peace for all Cambodians?

Obviously, in this time Cambodia has no war or according to the definitions of peace discussed previously, it has negative peace. Again the society is very young in terms of politics, economics, and social development. In Another word, the peace that Cambodians have today has yet to bring them out of poverty, human rights violations, and injustice. According to Rural Poverty Portal's report[8], Cambodia's poor people number almost 4.8 million, and 90 percent of them are in rural areas. Most of them depend on agriculture for their livelihood, and more than that at least 12 percent of poor people are landless. Small-scale farmers practice agriculture at the subsistence level, using traditional materials and methods. Productivity is very low. Two thirds of the country's 1.6 million rural households face seasonal food shortages each year. Rice alone

---

[8] http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/english/regions/asia/khm/index.htm

accounts for as much as 30 percent of household expenditures. Rural people are constantly looking for work or other income-generating activities, which are mainly temporary and poorly paid.

Moreover, according to Yash Ghai, the UN secretary-general's special representative for Human rights in Cambodia on 17 December 2007[9], in an honest scrutiny of the reports of the Special Representatives since 1993, shows that progress in the area of the rule of the law and the administration of justice, where they occurred, were duly reported, as any fair assessment requires. At the same time, matters of concern, such as those reported during previous visits, have continued to be highlighted. These are serious concerns for the lives of many Cambodians. These issues will not go away. They deserve attention. As a Cambodian proverb reads that one cannot hide a dead elephant with a basket. In addition, Cambodia's judicial system has "profound" and "very serious" problems hampering the emergence of a stable, fair society from the shadows of the Khmer Rouge genocide, the UN's[10] human rights chief said. As a result, the peace that Cambodians have today is not for all Cambodians, especially not for the poor and the vulnerable. Then, **can we make peace for all Cambodians?** Sure, as I have gone through the Global Campus Program I believe that we can make peace for all Cambodians, unless the peace being made is positive peace. Thus, how can we build positive peace?

According to David P. Barash and Charles P.Webel[11] in their book "Peace and Conflict Studies", they suggested five factors toward positive peace. The five factors are: (1) Human rights, (2) Ecological well-being, (3) Economic well-being, (4) Nonviolece, and (5) Personal transformation. I completely agree with David P. Barash and Charles P.Webel because: first, I believe Positive Peace will become possible when it is tied directly to Human Rights because protecting human rights is good for individuals and the society as a whole. The individuals will enjoy civil rights, political rights, social rights, economic rights, and cultural rights. All of these rights are the means to human dignity and development—with human dignity and development defined in terms of freedom and

---

[9] http://cambodia.ohchr.org/report_subject.aspx?mg_id=2
[10] http://www.genocidewatch.org/CambodianjudiciaryhasprofoundproblemsMay06.htm
[11] David P.Barash, Charles P. Webel,Peace and Conflict Studies(NewDelhi2002) 427 to 547

opportunity. If human rights are completely practiced, governmental arbitrary and abusive conduct will be blocked which means there no more violation and exploitation which be done by state, then it will lead to more freedom and happiness for persons.

Second, ecological well-being is another important factor to build positive peace. We cannot achieve peace if our planet is in danger. From tragic environmental experiences, environments have killed in very different ways and sometimes it was more destructive than war. So, if we keep cutting down the trees, in the near future we will face more famine, flood, landslides or even storm, which can kill thousands of people in a minute. Furthermore, if we keep producing air pollution, the ozone layer will be depleted. As a result of that, extra ultraviolet exposure can cause sunburn, skin cancer, and blindness. Most resources will be depleted as well. Finally, not only Cambodia but also the world will be facing scarcity, which is one of the sources of war. So, we need to preserve our environment so that we can experience positive peace in the future.

Third, I agree with the point that when we have economic well being we will move to positive peace. When people feel full they may have some time to learn or find wisdom or happiness. They may see their value of lives by seeking security and make more friends, according to Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs[12].

Forth, I also accept the idea that nonviolence can be used to build positive peace because there is proof that people like Mohamads Gandhi and Martin Luther King are good examples. Mohamads Gandhi used nonviolence resistance as both a spiritual and philosophical approach to life and a powerfully practical technique of achieving political and social change in India. One more famous case was that Martin Luther King was also the chief spokesperson, architect, and spiritual leader of the nonviolent civil rights campaign in the U.S. One of his well-known acts of nonviolence was the case of the bus boycott, which started in December 1955[13], when Rosa Parks refused to take a seat in the back of a public bus. After that thousands of African Americans walked miles to work rather than ride on segregated buses; finally, public facilities were integrated.

---

[12] http://www.businessballs.com/maslow.htm
[13] David P.Barash, 523

The last point that David P. Barash and Charles P.Webe suggest for positive peace is personal transformation. Some peace builders also believe that way. For example, Mahatma Gandhi said, "Be the change you wish to see in the world". So, this means that if Cambodians want positive they must make changes toward positive peace. Furthermore, "The suffering of Cambodia has been deep; from this suffering comes great compassion; great compassion makes peaceful heart; a peaceful heart makes a peaceful person; a peaceful person makes a peaceful family; a peaceful family makes a peaceful community; a peaceful community makes a peaceful nation; a peaceful nation makes a peaceful world; may all beings live in happiness and peace"[14], said Venerable Maha Ghosananda a Cambodian Buddhist monk who called for peace and reconciliation and led to rebuild Cambodia. So, I also believe that if Cambodians change their behavior and attitude toward positive peace, they will experience positive peace.

Actually, the five suggested factors–human rights, ecological well being, economical well being, nonviolence, and personal transformation have been promoted and developed from day to day and it has been a little bit better in Cambodia when it achieved negative peace in 1998. So it means that we are on the way toward positive peace.

III-Conclusion

Cambodia is not different from many other developing states in term of political power. Only a small group of people can decide whether to wage war or build peace. Indeed, in principle Cambodian people have power or rights to make decisions on the future of their country already. However, because they lack knowledge and most of them are poor they are the victims of war and peace. They are the victims of war when there are actual wars or armed conflict. They are the victims of peace when there is absence of war, but structural violence is still there. Therefore, in order to end these problems only one way to do is all for peace. Every Cambodian person should start to build peace; ultimately they will have peace for all.

---

[14] http://www.guardian.co.uk/obituaries/story/0,,2044145,00.html

Bibliography

Craig Etcheson, <u>Reonciliation in Cambodia: Theory and Practice</u> (Phnom Penh, Cambodia 2004) 49

David Chandler, <u>A History of Cambodia</u> (Chiang Mai, Thailand, 1998) 233-234

David Chandler, <u>A History of Cambodia</u> (Chiang Mai, Thailand, 1998) 239

David P.Barash, Charles P. Webel,<u>Peace and Conflict Studies</u>(NewDelhi2002)6

David P.Barash, Charles P. Webel,<u>Peace and Conflict Studies</u>(NewDelhi2002) 427 to 547

Heng Hong, <u>Tragedy of Cambodia</u> (Phnom Penh, 1997) 121

http://www.san.beck.org/GPJ-Intro.html

http://cambodia.ohchr.org/report_subject.aspx?mg_id=2

http://www.genocidewatch.org/CambodianjudiciaryhasprofoundproblemsMay06.htm

http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/english/regions/asia/khm/index.htm

http://www.businessballs.com/maslow.htm

http://www.guardian.co.uk/obituaries/story/0,,2044145,00.html