

The Sorbonne, Khieu Samphan, and the ‘Pol Pot International’

by Michael O. Billington

“Forget the Khmer Rouge—There is no Khmer Rouge. There are no hard-liners, just one Cambodian people.” The speaker is Sam Rainsy, the founder of the opposition Khmer Nation Party, addressing a rally in Cambodia on Dec. 4, 1997. Rainsy, who returned to Cambodia from self-imposed exile on Nov. 27, went on to incite his audience to virtual insurrection against the nation’s military forces: “I urge all people to stop sending their sons to war to kill other Cambodians,” he said. The Royal Cambodian Army is at war against the remnants of the infamous Khmer Rouge, which now enjoys the support of a few thousand renegade government troops who are loyal to the deposed First Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Ranariddh. Ranariddh remains in self-imposed exile. Rainsy, who has formed an alliance with Ranariddh and the Khmer Rouge, against the government, also followed the historic Khmer Rouge script by launching a racist attack on the Vietnamese people. “And we must band together to prevent the *yuon* thieves,” he said, using a derogatory term for the Vietnamese people, “from stealing our land and timber.”

Who is Sam Rainsy, this fire-breathing “democrat,” crusading for a return to the genocidal hell of the Khmer Rouge? Rainsy’s father had served in early governments of King Sihanouk, but following a political falling-out with the monarch, which led to his father’s untimely death, Sam Rainsy’s mother moved her family into exile in France, when Sam was a teenager. French-educated, he served briefly as the Minister of Finance under co-Prime Ministers Prince Ranariddh and Hun Sen, following the 1993 elections. Dismissed from that post, Rainsy became Cambodia’s most flamboyant “opposition” politician, founding the Khmer Nation Party, with generous financial and public relations support from foreign-funded non-governmental organizations, which proliferated in Phnom Penh under the protective auspices of the UN’s mandate. In particular, Rainsy is the darling of the U.S. Congress-funded National Endowment for Democracy’s “Project Democracy” and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Rainsy and his wife were interviewed in the Aug. 20, 1997 *Bangkok Post*, where they spoke of the personal sacrifices they had made in giving up the good life in Paris to pursue this current crusade. Madame Rainsy had been managing director of a British bank, based in Paris.

With “Brother No. 1” of the Khmer Rouge, Pol Pot, dis-

creetly (and allegedly) pushed aside, this “new” Khmer Rouge that Rainsy is campaigning for, is under the leadership of Khieu Samphan, who was Pol Pot’s right-hand man throughout the bloody years of Khmer Rouge power, 1975-79, and also during the subsequent years of civil war. Khieu Samphan, like Rainsy, was an economist, educated at the Sorbonne in Paris in the 1950s, and was the Minister of Commerce in the government of then-Prince, now King Norodom Sihanouk, in the 1960s. He was among the founders of the Cambodian Communist Party in 1960, but did not leave the government and join the Khmer Rouge in the jungles until 1967.

Sam Rainsy and Khieu Samphan are both fraudulently portrayed as “moderates” by the global apparatus of UN non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the Western media. Nothing could be further from the truth. Rainsy, like his ally Prince Ranariddh, who struck a deal in July to join forces with Khieu Samphan’s Khmer Rouge, is more than willing to see his country returned to bloody chaos in order to impose the will of London and Wall Street. Khieu Samphan, for his part, is now, and always has been, the primary architect of genocide for the Khmer Rouge. Just as Hjalmar Schacht was the agent of the Bank of England who provided Adolf Hitler with the economic blueprint for looting the muscle and blood of the German people, so Khieu Samphan was the “Hjalmar Schacht” to Cambodia’s Hitler, Pol Pot. As we document below, Khieu Samphan, in his 1959 doctoral thesis at the Sorbonne, laid out in gruesome detail the destruction of Cambodia, which was actually carried out during the Khmer Rouge reign of terror in the 1970s.

A brief sketch of the background to the current crisis is necessary.

The July ‘coup’

Although the Western press repeatedly accused Cambodia’s co-Prime Minister Hun Sen of carrying out a coup last July against the other co-Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Ranariddh, the clearly documented fact is that Hun Sen successfully *prevented* a coup, which was being prepared by the Prince in open collaboration with the historic leaders of the Khmer Rouge. (See “Dow Jones Supports Return of Cambodia’s Khmer Rouge,” *EIR*, Sept. 1, 1997). Prince Ranariddh

fled the country with a score of his allies, while a small faction of the military deserted to join forces with the Khmer Rouge in the jungles along the Thai border.

The unusual co-prime minister arrangement had been set up in 1993, after UN-directed elections partially ended the civil war which had existed since 1979. Hun Sen had led the nation since soon after the 1979 defeat of the Khmer Rouge by Vietnam-led forces. Despite the horror throughout the world at the revelations of genocide under the Khmer Rouge, the United Nations continued recognizing the Khmer Rouge as the official representative of Cambodia right up to the 1993 elections. Prince Norodom Sihanouk (now King Sihanouk) and his son Prince Ranariddh remained allies of the Khmer Rouge throughout the years of the “killing fields,” continuing through to the elections.

Prince Ranariddh’s political party, the Funcinpec, and Hun Sen’s party, the Cambodian People’s Party, won a nearly equal share of the votes, with Funcinpec holding only seven seats more than the CPP. The UN then brokered the agreement between the two to serve as co-prime ministers, with Sihanouk enthroned as King in a constitutional monarchy. The Khmer Rouge, which had rejected all proposals to renounce violence and join in the elections, was outlawed by the new government.

Sam Rainsy, before his resignation as Finance Minister in the new coalition, tried to ram through the shock therapy policies demanded by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. He is proudly sponsored by the International Republican Institute (IRI), the Republican Party branch of the congressionally funded National Endowment for Democracy, which, under the banner of advocating “democracy,” promotes the worst Thatcherite free-trade ideology. Rainsy is a classic example of an Anglo-French agent advocating British monetarist policies, being passed off as an “American” agent, thanks to the “Project Democracy” networks. The purpose of this British operation is to undermine the emerging U.S.-China relationship being carefully constructed by President Clinton and President Jiang Zemin, and which has been promoted by Lyndon LaRouche and *EIR* over the past years. Continuing efforts to perpetuate destabilization of Cambodia are part of the British “ring of fire” along China’s periphery. While the British and IRI openly support Rainsy, they must be far less overt in their support for Khieu Samphan and the Khmer Rouge after the 1970s “killing fields,” in which up to 2 million of 7.5 million Cambodians were killed. The Clinton administration, to its credit, has not capitulated to the British/IRI ploy, but has been outspoken in refusing to tolerate any role for the Khmer Rouge in running Cambodia.

The British have, therefore, created an elaborate ruse, that Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge “hard-liners” are gone, and that “moderate” Khieu Samphan is leading the Khmer Rouge in a metamorphosis to “democracy.” This fraud was run through the offices of one of London’s mouthpieces in Asia, the *Far Eastern Economic Review* in Hong Kong. The *Review*’s Nate

Thayer was “invited” to record a staged trial of Pol Pot on July 25, 1997—not for his acts of genocide against the Cambodian people, but for killing fellow Khmer Rouge leader Son Sen and his family in an internal feud. Pol Pot was politely “condemned” to house arrest. The *Review*’s Thayer then paid another visit to the Khmer Rouge jungle redoubt of Anlong Veng, where he interviewed the top leaders, declaring Khieu Samphan, and even Ta Mok (nicknamed “The Butcher”) to be peace-loving democrats. For his pains, Thayer is rumored to have been paid around \$600,000 in selling his videotape of the fraudulent trial to ABC’s “Nightline.”

The situation in Cambodia today is extremely tense. The majority of Funcinpec party leaders were not so sorry to see Prince Ranariddh go. Several factions of the party had called for his ouster for over a year, because of his dealings with the Khmer Rouge, as well as other accusations. The vast majority of the Funcinpec did *not* flee, and a new party leader was elected to replace Ranariddh in the First Prime Minister’s post, Foreign Minister Ung Huot. Frantic efforts by Ranariddh, Rainsy, and their allies to prevent international recognition of Ung Huot’s selection have generally failed, although the UN has refused to recognize the current coalition. Co-Prime Ministers Hun Sen and Ung Huot have persuaded most of those Funcinpec parliamentarians who fled the country with Ranariddh after the July events, to return.

There appears to be a deal in the works with Prince Ranariddh, as well, whereby he will be tried *in absentia* for his illegal deal with the Khmer Rouge, and other charges, but will be officially pardoned by the King (with Hun Sen’s blessing), so that he can return and stand for the election.

This is the gauntlet spelled out by the UN in order for the Phnom Penh government to win international support for elections that are now scheduled for July 1998. Meanwhile, the economy is in shambles, due, in part, to a cutoff of aid from the United States after the July crisis, but also due to the financial collapse of Southeast Asia, and the region more generally, since July.

If disaster falls on Cambodia over the coming months, in some form of a reconstituted Khmer Rouge, the impact on the rest of Asia would be catastrophic. To find even a rough comparison, one must view the current situation in Central Africa, where, in a few short years, a small group of British-sponsored leaders, who can justifiably be declared to be part of a “Pol Pot International,” have conducted genocide.

EIR, therefore, as a warning, is publishing this brief outline of Khieu Samphan’s pedigree, and the *common interest*, *the common mother*, and *the common policy* represented by Khieu Samphan, Pol Pot, and the current butchers of Central Africa.

Khieu Samphan

In 1955, Khieu Samphan arrived in France to study economics at the Sorbonne. This was an era of growing cultural pessimism in Europe, made manifest in the existentialist mo-

rass of Jean-Paul Sartre, and Sartre's mentor, Nazi ideologue Martin Heidegger. Sartre's protégé, Frantz Fanon, wrote his *Wretched of the Earth*, with an introduction by Sartre, in the late 1950s, which became the handbook for "Third Worldist" revolutionaries under the direction of British intelligence. This "Nazi-Communist" ideological amalgam found its most developed expression at Dar Es Salaam University in Tanzania, set up and directed by British intelligence networks centered around Bertrand Russell, to train potential insurgents in "revolutionary violence," using the existentialist nihilism of Heidegger and Sartre, the genocidal rage of Fanon, and a Maoist variety of Marxism. (See Dennis Speed, "Nyerere's 'Kindergarten': Dar Es Salaam University and the Black Faces of the New British Colonialism," *Fidelio*, Winter 1997.)

The purpose of this project was located in the "Winds of Change" policy, enunciated by British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in the late 1950s. The British recognized that they could not sustain the Empire in its 19th-century form, and set about creating the conditions for asserting even greater control, but by different means, over ostensibly "liberated" colonial holdings in the Third World. This included British control over the economies of these nations, through the power of the international banks and the British raw materials cartels. But it also required controlled, anti-technology, anti-development insurgency movements, to be used against any nationalist leaders who attempted to assert sovereignty over their nation's economic potential.

It was Dar Es Salaam University that created today's genocidal "nationalists" in Central Africa: Uganda's Yoweri Museveni, Congo-Zaire's Laurent Kabila, and Rwanda's Paul Kagame. While butchering their own populations, these pseudo-nationalists are controlled by the British Foreign Office, and financed by the British mineral cartels. Their IMF-approved economic policies are based on scrapping the dreams of industrialization (which motivated the best of Africa's nationalist leaders throughout the 1950s and 1960s), while turning over the mineral wealth of the region to British mining interests.

Khieu Samphan's training at the Sorbonne was from the same mold as that of Dar Es Salaam University's leading lights. In addition to the existentialist environment, Khieu Samphan was immersed in the economics of "under-development theory," a construct designed to justify anti-technological and anti-urban policies, based on accumulating wealth from primitive forms of agricultural communalism. One of Khieu Samphan's associates in Paris was the Egyptian communist Samir Amin, an advocate of "under-development theory," whose works were required reading at Dar Es Salaam University.

Khieu Samphan's doctoral thesis of 1959, entitled "Cambodia's Economy and Industrial Development" (translated by Laura Summers, Data Paper #111, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1979), became the

theoretical basis of the Khmer Rouge reign of terror. The Khmer Rouge seized power in Phnom Penh only shortly after the U.S. military withdrawal from Saigon in 1975. Couched in the Marxist rhetoric of class warfare, Khieu Samphan's thesis adopted the extreme "Third Worldist" posture characteristic of Anglo-French insurgency training. While claiming to be in favor of industrialization in the long run, Khieu Samphan argued: *All investment from the West—especially from the United States—was counterproductive; infrastructure, such as roads, ports, and railroads, served only the foreign exploiters in distributing their imported manufactured goods and in looting domestic raw materials; cities, both the capital of Phnom Penh and the provincial cities, were parasitical, and the population would best be moved to "productive" employment in the countryside; and, collectivization of the peasantry was essential to accumulate wealth from the agricultural sector, without the need to improve technology.*

These were the general policies imposed after the Khmer Rouge seized power in 1975. Khieu Samphan's "autonomous national development" translated into the forced expulsion of the population from the major cities, the elimination of all private property, the elimination of education other than political indoctrination, the elimination of money and banking, and the creation of communalized labor forces for agriculture and "handicraft" industries. Hundreds of thousands died through starvation and disease. In the guise of concern for the "little people" against their oppressors, Khieu Samphan stripped the population of all human worth, by eliminating any potential for improvement, for the mastery of new technologies, or for the education of their children.

We shall quote from Khieu Samphan's 1959 thesis on several key points, all emphasis added:

1. Although Khieu Samphan acknowledges that most Cambodian peasants owned their own land, farm implements and animals, he nonetheless calls for inciting the peasantry against landowners. "Reductions [in rent] will be obtained only if peasants themselves, encouraged and aided by the government, take action. This is not, moreover, just a matter of reducing rents, but of removing vestiges of feudalism and serfdom from the countryside, vestiges which paralyze peasant initiative and enthusiasm for work. The government must in particular make every effort to support and encourage peasant associations so as to arouse peasants to take action."

2. Such "action" however, must not be allowed to include demands for more technology, more infrastructure, or even more consumption. "Methodical organization of the peasant force, into mutual aid teams and then into cooperatives, will magnify its effectiveness ten times over and make possible the clearing of new land, its irrigation, and its draining, *without upsetting current technology and without absorbing too much capital.*"

"Domestic demand is met by small industry and national handicrafts. It could even be met *without requiring too much*

investment by organizing producer and consumer cooperatives, which enhance labor productivity. . . . The national market would continue to be an agglomeration of units functioning in a more or less ‘closed economy’ *without an effort to build transport networks*. In most cases, the work can be done through ‘community projects’ *using voluntary peasant labor.*”

One result of this approach emerged in 1977, when the irrigation systems constructed since 1972 in Khmer Rouge-controlled areas by “voluntary peasant labor,” and with incompetent engineering, collapsed under heavy flood conditions. The crop was lost, and rice consumption fell by about one-half, causing widespread starvation.

3. The result, as described by Khieu Samphan, sounds like the Nazis’ “strength through joy” and “labor makes you free,” or like the deadly communalism of Mao’s “Great Leap Forward,” which was taking place at the time that Khieu Samphan wrote his thesis. Khieu Samphan writes that the government must “make peasants gradually accustomed to working cooperatively. This is fully consistent with contemporary Khmer peasant thinking. It is not unusual to see our peasants organizing themselves into teams of several families to help each other with transplanting and harvesting, all while singing well-known songs. The task is to *generalize this practice in a systematic way.*”

List and the American System

It is most ironic that Khieu Samphan quotes repeatedly from the work of the great American System economist Friedrich List, *The National System of Political Economy* (1841). List, a German citizen, became one of the foremost allies and collaborators of Mathew and Henry Carey in America, the leading proponents of the American System of Political Economy, who built Abraham Lincoln’s Republican Party. List returned to Germany in 1832, and provided the intellectual leadership for building the modern German industrial economy, based on the American System. List and his followers worked with their co-thinkers in the United States to plan the extension of American System methods throughout the world, using government-sponsored industrialization and rail-centered infrastructure development, with the aim of crushing the British Empire once and for all.

Khieu Samphan totally misrepresents List, by quoting his attacks on the *British* system as a justification for his own attacks on Western capitalist economics in general, *especially* the Americans. He presents List as an advocator of “autonomous development,” referencing his attacks on free trade and liberalism, *but without mentioning the British System or the American System.*

Khieu Samphan argues, correctly, that the industrialization of the Western nations took place under *protectionist* policies, not free trade, and he notes that the only real development within the advanced sector nations in the 20th century “arose during periods of world war.” However, he credits this,

not to the application of “American System” types of directed credit, but to the fact that war “reduced foreign competition and cut off foreign capital.” He then asserts that the restriction of free trade requires the complete elimination of international “integration,” and concludes that Cambodia should proceed *without foreign capital*, and thus, effectively, without any capital whatsoever. This is not List’s “National System,” but precisely the British/French colonial policy of enforced backwardness, adapted to the post-World War II “Winds of Change.” Rather than List’s American System, Khieu Samphan’s national socialism was a blueprint for genocide, as carried out under Pol Pot with Khieu Samphan as Commander-in-Chief during the insurgency, and head of state during the Khmer Rouge reign of terror.

The future

While the British-dominated UN and NGO apparatus is demanding that Sam Rainsy and Prince Ranariddh be allowed free rein in their treasonous effort to revive the Khmer Rouge under “moderate” Khieu Samphan, the rest of Asia is not so blind. China, Japan, and Cambodia’s Southeast Asian neighbors, while encouraging peaceful resolution of the crisis, and calling for “free elections” as scheduled under the UN mandate, have otherwise de facto recognized the legitimacy of the current Hun Sen-Ung Huot government, and criticized the pro-Khmer Rouge activities of Rainsy and Prince Ranariddh. The Chinese, especially, who were the primary *sponsors* of the Khmer Rouge in the past (dating to the Gang of Four era during the Cultural Revolution), have made clear that they have completely cut off assistance to the Khmer Rouge, while offering both economic and military support to the government in Phnom Penh. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which postponed the planned admission of Cambodia into ASEAN at their summit at the end of July 1997, due to the crisis, has announced that admission should proceed in 1998, pending the success of the elections in May.

Similarly, President Clinton—despite the howling of certain congressmen and their IRI cohorts—has instructed the State Department to work with the Hun Sen/Ung Huot government, and to refuse absolutely any role for the Khmer Rouge in running Cambodia.

Nonetheless, the planned elections create a political opportunity that can be easily manipulated by London’s destabilization experts. Under the wing of UN peacekeeping operations, Cambodia is now awash with foreign-funded NGOs—and the drugs, prostitution, and AIDS that are the camp-followers of such operations—while the economy reels under cuts in international aid and the collapse of the regional economy. Under these conditions of economic strife and hardship, the re-emergence of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia would be a threat to all of Asia. The “Africanization” of Asia must not be tolerated either by Asia, or by the West.