

Cambodia genocide: Kissinger and Brzezinski in the dock

by Michael Billington

The flood of attacks against the concept of the sovereign nation-state over the past 30 years has become a raging torrent as the 20th century comes to a close. In the Balkans, the Middle East, East Timor, and throughout the Third World generally, the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) financial oligarchy has assumed the right to dictate economic policies, impose social controls, deploy massive bombing campaigns, or even, unilaterally occupy nations or territories which refuse to obey their orders. While these actions are carried out under “humanitarian” guise, by the so-called “international community”—the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Trade Organization (WTO), NATO, or the United Nations, for example—they constitute a revival of British 19th-century colonialism in both form and content. A leading aspect of this new colonialism is a modern form of “extraterritoriality,” whereby BAC-directed institutions assume the right to conduct supranational trials of citizens of sovereign nations, even when the alleged crimes are entirely domestic in nature.

A crucial test case of this judicial breach of sovereignty is taking place in Cambodia, where the Cambodian government and Prime Minister, Samdech Hun Sen, have refused to submit to foreign jurisdiction in regard to trials of the now defunct Khmer Rouge.

Today, for the first time in the lifetime of most of the citizens of Cambodia, their country is at peace. The Khmer Rouge have finally been completely dismantled, and a freely elected government is functioning with the broad support of the population. Economic and social conditions are still wretched—among the worst of any nation on Earth—and the dangers are still immense. But, for once, there is a realistic basis for hope.

Over the past year, a new, potentially disastrous element has been introduced into this delicate situation—the mounting hue and cry from the West for an international tribunal to

try those leaders of the Khmer Rouge who yet survive, for crimes against humanity. Most of these voices are also imputing to the government of Cambodia and to Prime Minister Hun Sen, the sinister intent to subvert this appeal for “justice,” and to cover for or protect the Khmer Rouge leaders (see box).

The ironies imbedded in these hypocritical demands are monstrous in their proportions, as even a cursory review of the history of the past 50 years would make clear to any relatively open-minded investigator, and as we shall so investigate here.

The question can not be avoided: Why are certain political interests in the BAC orbit so frantic to assure that any trial or tribunal of the Khmer Rouge *not* be held within Cambodia, or under the auspices of the Cambodians themselves? Would not the people of Cambodia, who suffered the worst genocide of the last half of the 20th century, and the political party (the current government party) which fought the Khmer Rouge for 20 years and brought about their demise, be the most worthy and most capable to judge the crimes committed against them?

The predominant reason for this atrocious effort to invade Cambodia’s hard-won sovereignty, is the determination of the allies of British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his neo-imperialist accomplices to impose a Roman imperial-style global “rule of law.” However, in the case of Cambodia, Prime Minister Blair’s accomplices have a self-evident additional motive: There are many skeletons in the Cambodia closet of Mr. Blair’s crowd, including their own deployment of their agents to promote and prolong the genocide of Pol Pot et al.

During the last 50 years, Cambodia has been treated as a political football in the British-designed post-World War II world order known as the Cold War. The Khmer Rouge could never have come to power, nor survived as a belligerent force after the Vietnamese drove them from power, without the direct, open support from the BAC political and financial



Henry Kissinger (left), shown addressing the 1974 UN General Assembly, had formulated Nixon's "Madman Theory," under which, from 1969-73, the U.S. illegally bombed Cambodia. Zbigniew Brzezinski, as Carter's National Security Adviser, cynically wrote: "I encouraged the Chinese to support Pol Pot. I encouraged the Thais to help Democratic Kampuchea. . . . Pol Pot was an abomination. We could never support him, but China could."

leadership. These interests clearly want to control any trial, not (as they proclaim) to bring justice for crimes against humanity, but to prevent their own complicity and responsibility for those crimes from coming under scrutiny.

We shall herein place in the dock, before the jury of history, the two primary architects of the BAC policies which transformed this small, agricultural nation of 7 million into a physical and psychological hell: Henry A. Kissinger, the quintessential British agent of influence within the United States, who boasted to his sponsors at London's Chatham House in 1982, that he had reported *first* to London throughout his years in U.S. government service, and that he considered Winston Churchill to have been right, and Franklin Roosevelt wrong, in regard to the British effort to restore European colonialism in Asia after World War II; and, secondly, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the pretender to European feudal aristocracy, who continues, still today, in the pursuit of British geopolitical gamesmanship across Eurasia, bringing the world to the current rush toward global nuclear confrontation (see *Feature* in this issue and *EIR*, "Brzezinski Plays Britain's 'Great Game' in Central Asia," Sept. 10, 1999).

These men, and those who would speak for them, have a great deal they would prefer remain hidden or obscured within the recent history of Cambodia. While the government of Cambodia may or may not choose to hold trials of the now pacified or incarcerated Khmer Rouge leaders, as is their sovereign right, the true task of any *international* investigation should be to shed light upon the *international* causes and instigators of Cambodia's holocaust. This report is undertaken in that spirit.

Colonial legacy

The French colonization in Southeast Asia brought together the areas now comprising Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, called French Indochina. This was not a natural union,

however, since it cut across cultural fault lines—the states of Vietnam were culturally influenced by China, with a Confucian philosophy combined with a Mahayana Buddhist tradition, while Cambodia was more directly influenced by the southern Indian tradition of Theravada Buddhism. The famous Angkor civilization of the 9th-14th centuries was destroyed by invasions from Thailand backed by the Monguls, who had already laid waste to much of Eurasia. When the French arrived in 1801, sailing up the Mekong River from Saigon, they first declared a protectorate over Cambodia, but later in the century, imposed full colonial control as part of French Indochina.

In 1941, Norodom Sihanouk became King. With the Japanese occupation the following year, King Sihanouk remained on the throne under the colonial control of the Japanese and their Vichy French collaborators. Following the war, King Sihanouk negotiated a partial independence from the French, which was made more substantial in the 1954 Geneva conference which ended the French colonial war in Vietnam. The King emerged as a symbol of, not only Cambodia's traditional culture, but also its newly won independence.

The King also became actively involved in world affairs, playing a significant role in the famous 1955 Asian-African Conference in Bandung, Indonesia, together with such leaders as Sukarno, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Zhou Enlai, opposing colonialism, and planning cooperation toward the development of the former colonial nations. King Sihanouk propounded non-alignment, being neither anti-Soviet bloc nor anti-West, while resisting any breach of sovereignty from either Cold War camp. He refused to join the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), created as an anti-communist bloc in Asia by the British and U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles during the Eisenhower administration, but he nonetheless sought U.S. aid to defend against Vietnam's incursions and subversion.

The British and their allies within the United States deployed numerous covert operations in the late 1950s, aimed at subverting the spirit of the Bandung Conference and the emerging Non-Aligned Movement of formerly colonized nations. Prince Sihanouk (he stepped down as Monarch in 1955 to become the elected head of state as a Prince) became increasingly disenchanted with the intimidation coming from the Dulles State Department, which accused him (and virtually every other nationalist leader as well) of “leaning toward communism.” When the United States sponsored a coup attempt against Prince Sihanouk in 1959, he strengthened his ties to China, and when Vietnam’s U.S.-sponsored leaders, the Diem brothers, were murdered under CIA direction in 1963, the Prince renounced U.S. aid altogether. When the United States deployed troops into Cambodia in 1965 in pursuit of Vietcong sanctuaries, without asking for or receiving Cambodia’s approval, U.S.-Cambodian relations were formally severed.

The Khmer Rouge were a small force throughout the 1960s, functioning essentially as an adjunct to their fellow Vietnamese communists led by Ho Chi Minh. There were two factions of leadership in the Cambodian Communist movement—those who had been trained by the Vietnamese, who held a more Soviet-oriented, “internationalist” perspective, and those who had been educated in France, primarily at the Sorbonne, in the 1950s, led by Soloth Sar (later known as Pol Pot) and Khieu Samphan. The Sorbonne in the 1950s and 1960s was an Anglo-French laboratory for creating manipulable radicals from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, centered around the theories of “revolutionary violence” associated with Frantz Fanon and existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre, and a radical economic theory known as “underdevelopment theory” which promoted the international self-isolation of underdeveloped nations, rejecting any foreign aid or investment as a form of exploitation, while promoting total self-sufficiency through primitive communal agricultural policies. Such radicalism served the colonial powers well, by preventing alliances between and among nations opposed to colonialism, while also providing extremely violent gangs which could be unleashed against nationalist Third World leaders who refused to accept the economic demands of their former colonial masters. Peru’s bloody Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) and Cambodia’s Khmer Rouge are but two of the products of this Sorbonne workshop and its subsidiaries.

Enter Henry Kissinger

The two factions of the Khmer Rouge co-existed during the 1960s, and even maintained a certain understanding with Prince Sihanouk’s government. The government put down several Khmer Rouge efforts to foment uprisings in different parts of the country, but at the same time, Prince Sihanouk allowed the Vietnamese to operate in Cambodian territory and to receive arms shipments through Cambodian ports. China and Russia, which were both supporting the North Vietnamese in the rapidly escalating war in Vietnam, continued

nonetheless to recognize and support the non-communist government of Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia.

Then, in March 1969, soon after Dr. Henry A. Kissinger took office as National Security Adviser under President Richard Nixon, U.S. B-52s began sustained carpet bombing of vast areas of Cambodian territory near the Vietnam border. Thousands of flights, each with 30 tons of bombs, introduced Cambodia to the practice made common in Vietnam of wiping out entire villages suspected of harboring communist forces. The bombing of this sovereign, neutral nation was carried out in flagrant disregard of both American and international law, and in complete secrecy from the American people, including even most of the Congress. The official records of the bombing raids were systematically falsified in order to maintain the lie that the United States was respecting Cambodian sovereignty. Prince Sihanouk, trying to retain some semblance of neutrality, remained silent about the bombings.

The U.S. air raids were singularly unsuccessful in destroying Vietcong or North Vietnamese base camps, which were operating out of well-protected tunnels and were highly mobile. The local villagers, however, were not so well protected. Survivors began moving toward the interior as refugees, while the Vietnamese troops also moved deeper into Cambodia’s heartland, drawing the bombers behind them. Thus began a three-year process of U.S. bombing of Cambodia’s rural areas, judged by some estimates to be the most extensive bombing per square kilometer and per capita of any nation in history.

Nixon and Kissinger referred to this as part of the “Madman Theory,” which held that, although the Nixon administration was publicly committed to winding down the Vietnam War and finding a negotiated “honorable peace,” it was necessary to demonstrate to the adversary in North Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union (and to any other Third World country which may have been considering resistance to neo-colonial dictates) that the U.S. President was mad enough to unleash bloody hell at almost any time and place in order to force acceptance of his “negotiating conditions,” and a not-so-subtle threat that the United States might opt for a nuclear response if the Soviets or the Chinese became directly involved.

The madness escalated in March 1970. The United States had long nurtured direct ties with Cambodia’s military through Army Chief Gen. Lon Nol, who was then also serving as Prime Minister under Prince Sihanouk. Kissinger was working with Gen. Lon Nol to expand the Cambodian Army with U.S. assistance, when the General suddenly seized power, deposing Prince Sihanouk while the Prince was visiting Moscow and Beijing. Kissinger’s insistence that Gen. Lon Nol had acted without U.S. backing or instigation is belied by the direct U.S. aid preceding the coup and the immediate extensive support within hours of Lon Nol’s seizure of power.

Even with a subservient regime in power in Phnom Penh, Kissinger chose to treat Cambodia as a personal fiefdom. Within weeks of the Lon Nol coup, the United States launched a direct land invasion into eastern Cambodia with U.S. and

South Vietnamese troops, ostensibly to destroy Vietcong and North Vietnamese base camps, without bothering to notify the Cambodian government. Gen. Lon Nol could only meekly protest that the invasion violated Cambodia's territorial integrity, while complaining that the invasion placed the entire country in danger, rather than just the border regions.

For the United States to invade a sovereign, neutral nation without a Congressional declaration of war was illegal under the Constitution. Even the fig leaf of a "Tonkin Gulf Resolution" was dispensed with, in favor of an imperial declaration of personal prerogative and power. Kissinger and Nixon called on then-Assistant Attorney General William Rehnquist to provide a legal justification for the criminal invasion. Rehnquist promptly responded by dispensing with the U.S. Constitutional mandate, that only the U.S. Congress could declare war, and pronounced instead that the U.S. President was justified in deploying U.S. troops to wage war wherever and whenever he so desired—a precedent which has had disastrous consequences for civilization over the past 30 years. Rehnquist, who later became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, would make a career of perverting the spirit and the letter of the U.S. Constitution.

Although the invasion force was withdrawn from Cambodia after three months (largely to appease U.S. popular opinion), the bombing campaign escalated. At first, U.S. bombing targets were chosen in collaboration with Gen. Lon Nol's government, but over the next few years, the U.S. military increasingly ran the targetting itself, disregarding any political or social consequences of the ensuing catastrophic destruction of vast rural areas. Peasant refugees fled to the cities in droves, so that by 1973, Phnom Penh, a city of about 500,000, swelled to more than 2 million.

Although millions fled to the cities to escape the bombing, many also chose to join the resistance under Khmer Rouge direction. Sihanouk is often blamed for the rapid expansion of the Khmer Rouge after the 1970 coup, because he chose to align himself with his former Khmer Rouge enemies, broadcasting a call from Beijing to the Cambodian people, to rise up against the U.S.-backed Lon Nol government by joining the alliance formed between himself and the Khmer Rouge. There is no question that many Cambodians were persuaded to join the Khmer Rouge by this call from the still-revered symbol of Cambodia's culture and unity, but, were it not for the massive U.S. bombing operations, it is virtually certain that the conflict would have ended in some form of negotiated peace—an approach which the mercurial Prince Sihanouk had made his trademark, as he would demonstrate again after the war. But with the peasantry forced to choose between leaving their homes to escape the bombing, or joining the Khmer Rouge (with the Prince's blessing) and defending their villages, the Khmer Rouge rapidly grew into a formidable force.

The bombardment reached its pinnacle after the January 1973 Paris Peace Agreement negotiated between Henry Kissinger and the North Vietnamese. The United States agreed

to halt all bombing in Vietnam and withdraw all U.S. troops over a predetermined interval. However, Cambodia was left out of the Paris agreement. Within two weeks, the entire U.S. bombing force was re-targetted to Cambodia. Over the next six months, over 250,000 tons of bombs were dropped on Cambodia, doubling the tonnage from the previous three years. Only when the U.S. Congress ordered an end to the bombing, did the administration stop the carnage.

A second result of the Paris Peace Agreement was that the Anglo-French-trained faction of the Khmer Rouge purged those associated with the Vietnamese and Vietnam's Soviet backers, pointing to the "sell-out" of Cambodia's communists by the Vietnamese at the Paris peace talks. The now infamous, xenophobic, communalist doctrines of the Sorbonne faction of the Khmer Rouge were then implemented with ferocity.

Even before the onslaught of the Khmer Rouge terror, somewhere between 500,000 and 1 million Cambodians were killed, mostly by U.S. bombs, while millions more were driven from their homes as refugees. Having thus created a living hell, the United States withdrew in the face of the Frankenstein monster it had helped create.

Geopolitics

Kissinger's self-professed allegiance to the British Foreign Office is expressed ideologically by his adherence to British balance-of-power geopolitics. Kissinger was simultaneously negotiating détente with Moscow and establishing U.S. relations with China, after over 20 years of estrangement, while also waging massive, if "limited," warfare against Soviet and Chinese-allied nations in Southeast Asia. This apparent contradiction is in fact a coherent policy, designed in the 1950s under the auspices of Bertrand Russell, Henry Kissinger, and others, known as the Pugwash Doctrine. The Pugwash Doctrine envisioned a world governed by the financial oligarchy centered in London, structured as a bi-polar world, with the United States and the Soviet Union holding each other at bay through the Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) doctrine of massive nuclear retaliation. All other nations were to accept and obey this bi-polar world structure under the threat of nuclear annihilation—a terror made realistic by the earlier application of the "Madman Theory" by Harry Truman and his British sponsors, who unleashed the nuclear holocaust against Japan even while Japan was seeking to surrender.

The Vietnam War fit within the Pugwash Doctrine as a limited, surrogate confrontation between the superpowers, thus serving to prevent any global collaboration on development between East and West, while maintaining a strategy of tension just below the level of World War III. However, during the 1960s, Kissinger and his London allies recognized that the emerging rift between Moscow and Beijing provided an opportunity for further geopolitical manipulation, a process which became known as the China Card. The key to the China Card, as later expressed by Zbigniew Brzezinski, was "the importance of the U.S. maintaining a better relationship

with both China and the U.S.S.R. than either of them has with each other.”

Not only was the communist bloc divided, but the non-aligned nations of the Third World were thus subjected to further centrifugal pressures. To a geopolitician like Henry Kissinger, Vietnam, and especially Cambodia, took on a wholly new character, as tools to be wielded in balance-of-power politics.

Kissinger took office in 1969, knowing that the Vietnam War was lost. What the good doctor meant by seeking an “honorable peace” was to divide the nations comprising the former colony of French Indochina along the lines of the Sino-Soviet split. Kissinger knew well the historic animosities that existed between Vietnam and Cambodia, as well as between Vietnam and China, divisions which determined his approach to the Paris Peace conference, and motivated the devastating bombing campaign over Cambodia which immediately followed the Paris Treaty.

In his memoirs,¹ Kissinger complains bitterly that his bombing of Cambodia—which he describes merely as an “effort to buttress the successors to Sihanouk”—had been widely blamed for the subsequent horrors under the Khmer Rouge. “This bizarre expression of self-hatred,” writes Kissinger, “makes as much sense as blaming Hitler’s Holocaust on the British’s bombing of Hamburg.” But Kissinger lies twice: He knows that the British conspired to put Hitler in power in the first place, as a geopolitical maneuver aimed at dividing Europe and getting Germany and the Soviet Union to bleed each other to death, while Hitler implemented the fascist economic policies designed by Bank of England-asset Hjalmar Schacht, the Nazi Economics Minister. So, also, Kissinger designed a U.S. pullout from the Vietnam War which intentionally left Indochina divided between a Soviet-sponsored Vietnam and a Chinese-sponsored Cambodia, not only to divide Indochina itself, but to serve as a means to manipulate and aggravate tensions between China and Russia on a global scale. For the next 20 years, Cambodia would suffer as the sacrificial lamb to British Cold War geopolitics.

Kissinger also takes great exception in his memoirs to William Shawcross, who in his extremely well-documented *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon, and the Destruction of Cambodia*, written in 1978, accused Kissinger of taking measures to prevent any compromise which could have brought Prince Sihanouk back to power as the head of a neutral coalition government. Efforts to effect such an outcome were pursued extensively by the French and the Chinese, who had good reasons to anticipate a disaster if the Khmer Rouge were to take over on their own through a military victory. Kissinger acknowledges that Zhou Enlai told him in February 1973, immediately following the Paris Peace Agreement ending the Vietnam War, that China was not anxious to see the Khmer Rouge rule on their own, but that Prince Sihanouk should be supported in building a coalition government.

1. Henry Kissinger, *Years of Renewal* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999).

Kissinger not only ignored Zhou Enlai, but unleashed the full fury of the combined U.S. air capacity in Asia over Cambodia. He then had the chutzpah to blame the U.S. Congress for sabotaging the potential for a negotiated peace by passing legislation ending the bombing!

Then, in late 1974 and early 1975, the French Ambassador in Beijing came close to achieving another agreement whereby China would support Sihanouk as head of a negotiated coalition government. At that time, China’s Zhou Enlai warned Sihanouk and Khieu Samphan, the Sorbonne-trained architect of the Khmer Rouge economic program, that radical agrarian communalism had the potential for disaster, pointing to the massive, deadly failure of China’s Great Leap Forward in the late 1950s. China itself was still suffering the internal turmoil of the Cultural Revolution, with the leadership of the nation shifting between the extreme radicals known later as the Gang of Four, and the far more rational forces associated with Zhou Enlai. Zhou strongly backed Prince Sihanouk, but he was extremely cautious about the Khmer Rouge, who drew their support from the Chinese advocates of “revolutionary violence” such as the Gang of Four. (Later, in 1976, when Zhou Enlai died and China was temporarily in the total grip of the Gang of Four, Sihanouk was unceremoniously dumped from his titular role as head of state in the Khmer Rouge government, and spent the rest of the years of Khmer Rouge rule as a passive symbol, under virtual house arrest.)

In December 1974, the French presented the Chinese/Sihanouk proposal for a negotiated peace to President Ford (Nixon had resigned) and Henry Kissinger at a summit meeting in Martinique. Kissinger threw cold water on the idea by imposing stringent conditions regarding the necessary role of Gen. Lon Nol’s government in any coalition. In a pompous explanation in his memoirs, Kissinger writes: “We had our doubts that . . . China would engage itself again, or that, if it did, it would do so through French intermediaries.” The last chance to circumvent the impending Khmer Rouge military victory was wasted. Kissinger, after all, needed a surrogate Sino-Soviet conflict, not a neutral, peaceful solution.

Zbigniew Brzezinski

There is no need here to detail the horrors of the Khmer Rouge reign of terror from 1975 to 1979: the depopulation of the urban centers, forced communal labor, and the elimination of money, personal property, schooling, family ties, communications, etc. There are many published accounts drawing on the voluminous self-documentation by the Khmer Rouge, up to and including detailed descriptions of the torture and murder of tens of thousands of supposed enemies of the state in the Killing Fields. (See, for instance, Elizabeth Becker, *When the War Was Over: Cambodia and the Khmer Rouge Revolution* [New York: Public Affairs, 1998]). It need only be noted for our purposes that Pol Pot launched military operations against Vietnam in 1977, while, at the same time, the Khmer Rouge leadership turned against its own cadre in paranoid internal purges. Large numbers of Khmer Rouge troops

Learn from the past to save the future

Cambodian Prime Minister Samdech Hun Sen announced on Dec. 15 that his Council of Ministers will vote Dec. 24 on the long-awaited draft law authorizing a *national* war crimes tribunal for aging leaders of the now-defunct Khmer Rouge. The law will then be sent to the National Assembly for passage. Holding a copy of the draft, he told Deutsche Presse Agentur (DPA), "You see how we are working as an independent and sovereign country, which will not tolerate, at all, acts of genocide. . . . Once the draft is adopted by the Council of Ministers, we will not retreat." During his September trip to the UN General Assembly, Prime Minister Samdech Hun Sen delivered an *aide m emoire* rejecting Secretary General Kofi Annan's proposal for a "mixed tribunal," to be convened outside of Cambodia and run by foreign judges and prosecutors appointed by Annan, as a gross violation of Cambodia's sovereignty.

Cambodia did not, however, close the door on UN assistance, and has sought advice from legal experts in Russia, India, France, and the United States. Subsequently, the United States proposed the "super majority" proposal. The existing three-tier Cambodian court structure will be respected, allowing for trial, appeal, and Supreme Court appeal. At each level, the unusual, and risky, proposal calls for a majority of Cambodian judges and a minority of foreign judges; a majority of the entire panel must uphold any ruling. The trial stage will have five judges, three Cambodians, two foreigners; four judges must confirm the ruling. The appeals court will have seven judges, four Cambodians, three foreigners; the Supreme Court will have nine judges, five Cambodians, four foreigners. Foreign prosecutors might also work alongside Cambodian peers.

Only two former Khmer Rouge leaders are in custody, former Khmer Rouge Defense Minister Ta Mok, a.k.a.

"The Butcher," and Kang Khhek Ieu, a.k.a. "Duch," chief executioner at Tuol Sleng prison. In his DPA interview, Samdech Hun Sen said these two should not be made scapegoats, but others should be tried. The case of Khmer Rouge Foreign Minister Ieng Sary is unique, as he received a royal amnesty in 1996, backed by both prime ministers and a two-thirds majority of the National Assembly, but he has no immunity from a charge of crimes against humanity, Hun Sen added. He continues to warn, though, that the process must be conducted carefully to avoid spooking former Khmer Rouge into fleeing to the jungle and renewing war.

The purpose of any tribunal, he said again on Dec. 15, "is to be responsible to the needs of the Cambodian people." This issue is addressed in *EIR's* new videotape "Storm Over Asia," where *EIR* Founder Lyndon LaRouche discusses the revolution in diplomacy and human rights accomplished in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, ending nearly 150 years of religious wars in Europe. Cambodia's challenge is an internal war, waged by Cambodians, against Cambodians, in Cambodia. *How* to win the peace is not so different.

LaRouche reports that the parties to the Treaty of Westphalia "had the wisdom to agree . . . that we were not going to try to find the blame for each party for guilt in connection with these wars, and the atrocities which were perpetrated as part of these wars; no seeking of retribution. The principle of no retribution, was key to securing the peace. People realized that to try to fight out the issues of recrimination and respective guilt . . . would mean the war would just go on. . . . When people say, . . . 'we've got to go in there and straighten these people out,' all you're doing is . . . spreading war; you're spreading war that can not be stopped, because now, the people who are going in, doing the punishing, are the new criminals. . . . So the solution to war, as has always been understood by the great strategists of modern European civilization, and also China, is to bring peace. . . ." — *Gail Billington*

and their officers defected to Vietnam. Hun Sen, at that time a lower-level officer in the Eastern zone, refused to carry out instructions to massacre Vietnamese villagers, and defected with his troops into Vietnam.

The Carter administration took office in January 1977, with Zbigniew Brzezinski taking over as National Security Adviser. Brzezinski, like Kissinger, was a founding member of the Trilateral Commission, established in 1972 to promote the power of the financial oligarchy over the rights of sovereign nation-states. Carter was entirely a creation of the Trilateral Commission entourage within his Cabinet. Brzezinski, in addition to his adherence to British geopolitics generally, also harbored delusions of his Polish aristocratic heritage, and

professed a deep-seated hatred of Russia (not *communism*, but *Russia*, as is most evident today in his continuing role in the destabilization of Russia). Brzezinski's immediate preoccupation upon taking office was the extension of Kissinger's China Card as a geopolitical weapon to divide Eurasia and divide the developing sector nations of the Non-Aligned Movement.

With the demise of the Gang of Four in 1976, ending the Cultural Revolution once and for all, China was returning to sanity. Besides continuing the negotiations with the United States, there were also efforts to improve their strained relations with Vietnam, and deep concerns about the extremes of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. Brzezinski was hell-bent to

prevent any rapprochement between China and Vietnam, and to keep China tied to the Khmer Rouge. He declared Vietnam the *aggressor* in the Khmer Rouge border raids against Vietnam, calling it a Soviet proxy, supposedly challenging China and its ally, Cambodia.

News of Khmer Rouge genocide was already circulating in the West. Democrat Steven Solarz and Republican Bob Dole sponsored Congressional hearings into the genocide as early as May 1977. Even within the Carter administration there was opposition to Brzezinski's promotion of the Khmer Rouge against the Vietnamese. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in particular, was attempting to bring about the reestablishment of relations between the United States and Vietnam, to finally put an end to the legacy of the Vietnam War.

Brzezinski moved quickly to impose himself as the chief negotiator with Beijing in the process of establishing diplomatic relations, accusing Vance of being too soft on the Soviets and the Vietnamese. In his memoirs,² Brzezinski refers to his disagreements with Vance, who was negotiating disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. He states: "I had by then become quite preoccupied with Moscow's misuse of détente to improve the Soviet geopolitical and strategic position. . . . I believed that a strategic response was necessary."

That strategic response was the revival of London's "Great Game" of the 19th century—the fostering of separatist, ethnic, and religious rebellions along the borders of Russia and China across the entire Eurasian landmass, the so-called "Arc of Crisis." This destabilization of both Russia and China was to be combined with the China Card, aimed at intensifying the Sino-Soviet conflict. To that end, Brzezinski travelled to Beijing in May 1978, accompanied by his deputy and fellow Trilateral Commission member Samuel Huntington—who would later make famous his imperial "Clash of Civilizations" theory, which argues that the various cultural and racial subdivisions of the human race are inherently incapable of peaceful collaboration, but are destined to confrontation and warfare on a global scale.

Brzezinski told the Chinese that the U.S. relationship with China must be based on the "common threat which causes us to draw together—the emergence of the Soviet Union as a global power." To promote himself, Brzezinski told the Chinese: "I would be willing to make a little bet with you as to who is less popular in the Soviet Union—you or me." He made an ostentatious show of declarations against both the Soviet Union and Vietnam as common enemies of China and the United States.

Brzezinski then moved to sabotage Secretary Vance's efforts to establish relations with Vietnam, which had reached a point of agreement in principle by September 1978. Brzezinski convinced Carter to postpone the process so as not to prejudice relations with China. That "postponement" was to last for more than 20 years, until 1998!

2. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Adviser, 1977-81* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983).

In December 1978, the Vietnamese responded to the recurring Khmer Rouge unilateral military attacks across the border, and to the ample evidence that Cambodia was a nation engulfed in madness, by sweeping rapidly across the border and into Phnom Penh, together with the Cambodian troops who had earlier defected. Brzezinski, rather than cheering the liberation of Cambodia from the grip of the most hideous genocide and human rights disaster since World War II, condemned Vietnam as an evil aggressor against the sovereignty of Democratic Kampuchea (the Khmer Rouge name for Cambodia). Continuing efforts by Vance and others to establish relations with Vietnam were quickly squelched by Brzezinski. Other attempts to condemn the atrocities of the Khmer Rouge and to seek an international tribunal into the genocide were suddenly suspended, including even the UN's investigation into the Killing Fields. In fact, the United States led a campaign within the UN to recognize the Khmer Rouge as the official representatives of Cambodia, rather than the new government in Phnom Penh, even as detailed accounts of Khmer Rouge genocide were provoking shock and disgust around the world.

In a psychologically deranged admission of his own crimes, Brzezinski wrote that: "I encouraged the Chinese to support Pol Pot. I encouraged the Thais to help Democratic Kampuchea. . . . Pol Pot was an abomination. We could never support him, but China could."

Even this was a lie. In fact, Brzezinski arranged for extensive U.S. aid for the Khmer Rouge in the form of aid to its refugee camps along the Thai border.

The argument that human rights had to take a back seat to the issue of sovereignty is particularly hypocritical when viewed in comparison to Brzezinski's recent role, in league with his protégé Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, in carrying out the British-directed NATO bombardment of Serbia. Their argument, that human rights violations justify the breach of sovereignty, including the destruction of civilian infrastructure and the deaths of thousands, totally contradicts their earlier argument in regard to Cambodia. The common factor which makes this contradiction coherent, is that both cases represent the underlying British geopolitical policy of dividing the Eurasian nations against one another.

Within weeks of the defeat of the Khmer Rouge and the establishment of a new government in Phnom Penh, China's head of state Deng Xiaoping travelled to the United States for an historic visit, consolidating the official establishment of U.S.-China relations which had taken place on Jan. 1, 1979. In preparation for the visit, Brzezinski persuaded President Carter to remove from his speech a passage which stated that the new American-Chinese relationship was not directed against anyone else. Indeed, he intended to encourage China to go to war with Vietnam over the Cambodia issue.

In his memoirs, Brzezinski comes close to admitting that he promoted a Chinese invasion of Vietnam, although claiming that the administration merely refrained from objecting to Deng's announcement of a limited invasion to "punish"

Vietnam for the Cambodia incursion and other grievances. "Throughout this crisis," Brzezinski wrote, "I felt that the Chinese action in some respects might prove beneficial to us. For one thing, it set some limits for Soviet power by demonstrating that an ally of the Soviet Union could be molested with relative impunity."

The role of the United Nations

Throughout the 1980s the United Nations officially recognized the deposed Khmer Rouge as the official representatives of Cambodia, either alone or as part of a coalition with Prince Sihanouk, *even though Prince Sihanouk tried several times to prevent it*. The Prince even sought U.S. asylum, a request conveyed in a note to the U.S. Ambassador to the UN. Asylum would have permanently freed the Prince from his strained alliance with the Khmer Rouge, and provided a basis for the United States to support Prince Sihanouk without supporting the Khmer Rouge. But that, of course, would have been counter to the geopolitical aim of maintaining a virulent anti-Vietnam and anti-Soviet force as head of the opposition to the new Cambodian government. Asylum was denied, under the excuse, conveyed by Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, that the Prince would "lose his standing as an independent leader if he chose exile in the United States." In other words, stick with the Khmer Rouge.

Prince Sihanouk then proposed that Cambodia's UN seat be left *vacant* until a new national government could be formed. This proposal was rejected by a vote, led by the United States, in favor of seating the Khmer Rouge immediately. (The Non-Aligned Movement conference in 1979 refused to recognize the Khmer Rouge, following Prince Sihanouk's proposal.) Prince Sihanouk, pressured by the United States to renew his alliance with the Khmer Rouge, finally relented in 1981, forming a coalition to oppose the Vietnamese occupation.

The government in Phnom Penh, meanwhile, was forced to carry out a sustained war against the still-active Khmer Rouge forces, which continued attacks on government positions and terrorist actions in the rural areas, especially against ethnic Vietnamese communities.

Only the cooling of the Sino-Soviet conflict in the late 1980s provided some hope for peace. The first item on the agenda of the historic meeting of the Chinese and Soviet foreign ministers in September 1987 was the Cambodian situation. Soon afterwards, Prince Sihanouk met with Hun Sen in Paris, and by 1989 the Vietnamese had completed a peaceful withdrawal of their forces from Cambodia.

The complex process of negotiations which led to the October 1991 Paris Agreement and the July 1993 election under UN auspices need not be discussed here. But one crucial point must be emphasized in order to place the current debate over a tribunal into perspective—Prime Minister Hun Sen, while anxious to come to terms with Prince Sihanouk, and also with also Khmer Rouge officials who were willing to give up armed struggle, believed strongly and insisted repeat-

edly that any agreement must include a strong condemnation of the genocide which had occurred under Khmer Rouge rule, and an international tribunal to try those most responsible. This demand was repeatedly rejected by the Western negotiators representing the UN, claiming that such charges and threats of trials would prevent the Khmer Rouge from joining peacefully in the election process. Note that the Khmer Rouge were, at that time, actively engaged in extensive guerrilla war and acts of terrorism against the government and people of Cambodia. And yet today, after the government has successfully defeated and pacified the entire Khmer Rouge, with absolutely no help from the West, the UN is now insisting that the Khmer Rouge leaders, even those who surrendered and transferred allegiance to the government, must be put on trial, under *foreign jurisdiction*—a policy which would very likely provoke the ex-Khmer Rouge forces to flee once again to the jungles and renew their military campaigns. Prime Minister Hun Sen has quite rightly questioned why the UN, which forced the government to accept the Khmer Rouge as partners in the electoral process (although the Khmer Rouge ultimately dropped out of that agreement), are now so self-righteously intent on exacting revenge on those same forces they earlier promoted.

Revenge is neither a Christian nor a Buddhist virtue, and is not to be confused with justice. The Cambodian people themselves have expressed their desire for peace, not revenge, through their votes and through their ability to coexist in harmony with the Khmer Rouge cadre who have renounced violence and submitted to the sovereignty of the national government. Nor are there many still-remaining secrets concerning the crimes under Khmer Rouge rule—the directors of the death camps carefully documented their torture and murder, and those documents, along with other Khmer Rouge records, are on display in museums in Phnom Penh.

However, it is clear that there are many in the West, whose responsibility for the Cambodian genocide is less well documented, who would prefer that a search for truth and justice be replaced by a show trial, under their control, of the known Khmer Rouge leaders. Calling themselves "the international community," they are the same BAC spokesmen who loudly blame the nations of Southeast Asia for the financial collapse of the last two years, without mention of the international currency speculators or the IMF, who first caused and then perpetrated the crisis. Just as Malaysia has called the bluff of the speculators and the IMF, so Cambodia is to be commended for its firm rejection of the UN demands regarding the tribunal. It is to be hoped that other nations being threatened by the same process will take inspiration from Cambodia's defense of their rights and their sovereignty, and of justice for their nation.

Michael Billington is now serving his eighth year of a 77-year sentence in Virginia state prison. Ostensibly convicted on charges of "securities fraud," he in fact was railroaded into prison because of his association with Lyndon LaRouche.