

Bringing the Khmer Rouge to Justice

Ben Kiernan

In 1974, I began a quarter century of research on the Khmer Rouge movement. As an undergraduate I wrote an empirical study of their insurgency against the Sihanouk regime in the late 1960s¹ and soon published several shorter articles. At first I was relatively sympathetic to their purported reforms and nationalism, but when I commenced Ph.D. research in 1978, I acknowledged my error and began a two-decade project of documenting the crimes of the Khmer Rouge regime.² By 1980 I had interviewed hundreds of Cambodian survivors and had begun to publish their accounts.³ In Australia during the 1980s, I translated most of my interviews, as well as key Khmer Rouge documents, and wrote detailed accounts of specific aspects of the genocide.⁴ I also published historical analyses of the Khmer Rouge rise to power.⁵

At Yale University in 1994, I established the Cambodian Genocide Program, to continue this work with a grant from the U.S. Department of State. In January 1995, we opened the Documentation Center of Cambodia in Phnom Penh. Four years later, the United Nations Group of Experts completed its report to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan on the legal ramifications of the Cambodian Genocide. In March 1999, this report was published by the Secretary-General. It stated:

Over the last 20 years, various attempts have been made to gather evidence of Khmer Rouge atrocities to build a historical record of these acts. For nearly 20 years, scholars have been accumulating such evidence by talking with survivors and participants in the terror and reviewing documents, photographs, and gravesites. The most impressive and organized effort in this regard is the Documentation Center of Cambodia, located in Phnom Penh. Originally set up by Yale University through a grant from the Government of the United States of America, the Center now functions as an independent research institute with funding from several governments and foundations. It has conducted a documentation project to collect, catalogue and store documents of Democratic Kampuchea, as well as a mapping project to locate sites of execution centres and mass graves.⁶

The report went on to recommend the creation of an international tribunal to judge the crimes of the Khmer Rouge leadership. Cambodia is now studying the establishment of a “mixed” national and international tribunal. This

success was achieved under fire, not only from the Khmer Rouge, but also a sustained barrage from the West's most powerful newspaper.

The Cambodian Genocide Program, 1994–1999

"The only research operation in the world that focuses on Khmer Rouge atrocities, apart from Yale's genocide program." This is how the Editor-at-Large of the *the Asian Wall Street Journal* described the Documentation Center of Cambodia in 1997.⁷ Despite this, the *Wall Street Journal* led a campaign against Yale's Cambodian Genocide Program (CGP) throughout the two-year period in which the CGP created the Documentation Center.⁸

April 17, 1995, marked the twentieth anniversary of the seizure of power by the genocidal Khmer Rouge regime. The *Wall Street Journal* chose the occasion for a long editorial-page article appealing to the U.S. State Department and Congress to revoke the Department's inaugurating grant to the CGP, labeling its Director (me) a "communist" with Khmer Rouge sympathies. The appeal failed after the *Journal* published responses, but the paper followed with further *ad hominem* barrages, again directed at the CGP's source of funds. Fortunately, this provoked an encouraging display of support, including letters from twenty-nine leading international Cambodia specialists and various other scholars in my defense.⁹ The Khmer Rouge, meanwhile, "indicted" me as an "arch-war criminal" and an "accessory executioner of the U.S. imperialists."¹⁰ Despite attacks from two sides, we pursued our mandate to establish a comprehensive, publicly accessible archive and documentation database on the Khmer Rouge genocide, and to train Cambodian scholars and archivists to manage and enhance it.

The next year, the *Asian Wall Street Journal* fired another volley at the CGP, this time chastising us for not giving priority to the search for U.S. servicemen missing in action from the 1970-75 Cambodian war—before the Khmer Rouge takeover.¹¹ To discourage further funding for the CGP, the article described me as "the grant world's equivalent of box office poison." The *Wall Street Journal* republished this piece and proclaimed to readers in an accompanying editorial that the CGP was closing down the next month.¹² None of this was true—though the *Journal* now declined to print responses or corrections.¹³ In that three-month period, the CGP in fact raised \$1.5 million, quadrupling its original grant. The CGP and the Documentation Center of Cambodia were now assured of funding for the next five years, a prospect beyond our wildest hopes in 1995. The Documentation Center, with the massive archive of Khmer Rouge internal documents we assembled in 1995-96, has now become Cambodia's first independent research institute on the history of Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge regime, known as "Democratic Kampuchea" (DK), which presided over the deaths of 1.7 million people.

Why did the *Wall Street Journal* launch such a campaign in 1995? Why the attempt to scuttle the world's only research operation on the Cambodian geno-

cide? Why did the *Journal* choose the same target as the Khmer Rouge did? Why did it fail? What is the nexus between denial of genocide and attempts to foreclose its investigation? In this case, as we shall see, there is a complex relationship between assertion and suppression.¹⁴

I will discuss two forms of denial of the Cambodian genocide and one of suppression. First, the outright attempt to deny that anything serious occurred. In 1984, Bunroeun Thach, then of the University of Syracuse's political science department, took this position. He praised "Democratic Kampuchea political leaders" for having successfully "buried the past," attacked what he called Hanoi's campaign "to discredit the Communist Party of Kampuchea," and argued for including the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia's future.¹⁵ Thach won few scholarly converts, but another Cambodian with similar views was Sorpong Peou, who opposed legal accountability for the Khmer Rouge genocide. As late as March 1997, Peou proclaimed: "Punishing Pol Pot will not solve the problem." He added: "Prosecution in a condition of anarchy is wishful thinking and may hinder national reconciliation." The journalist who interviewed him reported that Peou "says he is willing to forgive for the sake of breaking the cycle of deception and pre-emptive violence." The reporter also wrote: "Sorpong supports reconciliation with the Khmer Rouge rather than punishment for past crimes [and] supports the pragmatic strategy of incorporating Khmer Rouge defectors into the government structure in the hope that the movement will die a natural death."¹⁶

Peou's apologetics for the Khmer Rouge was more influential than Bunroeun Thach's. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* published his review of my 1996 book *The Pol Pot Regime*. In his review, Peou called the Khmer Rouge leaders "so-called 'genocidists.'" He linked what he called "the pre-emptive nature of the violence" to "Pol Pot's egalitarianism," his "prudence," "insecurity," and "vulnerability," and "the fickleness of popular support."¹⁷ Extraordinarily, Peou claimed, "From 1970 to 1975, the Cham Muslims were not persecuted at all." When he did acknowledge massacres of Chams, he denied they were premeditated, despite overwhelming evidence. He then claimed that "the Pol Pot group made several—unsuccessful—attempts to limit the killing."¹⁸ It is extraordinary to read such assertions in the journal of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Few authors have shown such boldness in defending the Khmer Rouge genocidists.

A colleague of Peou's, Stephen R. Heder, in 1991, described most of the top-level Khmer Rouge leaders as "dissidents" who were "suspect in the eyes of Pol Pot." These alleged "dissidents" even included Son Sen, Deputy Prime Minister and CPK Security chief, Chhit Choeun alias Ta Mok, the Khmer Rouge military commander, Ke Pauk, the deputy military commander, and Deuch, the chief of the notorious Tuol Sleng prison. Heder wrote that "such surviving dissidents as Son Sen and Kae Pok and perhaps even Ta Mok and Deuch have been wrongly depicted as 'Pol Pot loyalists.'"

Heder went on to assert that “there were only two prominent Kampuchean communists who were not suspect in the eyes of Pol Pot and Nuon Chea. They were Ieng Sary...and Khiev Samphan....Both Ieng Sary and Khiev Samphan were apparently considered completely loyal and lacking the domestic political strength with which to challenge Pol Pot and Nuon Chea in any way.”¹⁹

However, when Ieng Sary and Khieu Samphan came within reach of legal action, Heder backpedaled. In 1996, Ieng Sary defected to the Cambodian government. Heder now described Ieng Sary as having shown signs of “dissent and deviation” from Pol Pot’s policies. In Ieng Sary’s zone in the 1980s, “it was possible for peasants to accumulate small amounts of wealth,” Heder said, adding that “China would have seen Ieng Sary as more reasonable” than Pol Pot. Moreover, Heder reportedly went on, “those differences may have existed” under the Pol Pot regime from 1975 to 1979, “with Ieng Sary advocating a more tolerant attitude toward intellectuals and being accused in the Communist inner circle of wanting to coddle the bourgeois elite.” Heder added, “There’s no evidence to suggest that Ieng Sary was ever No. 2, or that he had the kind of power base to allow him to enforce his will.”²⁰ (Sary was in fact No. 3 to Pol Pot. Hypocritically, Heder branded the Cambodian Genocide Program as soft on Sary!)²¹ A Khmer Rouge aide to Ieng Sary even quoted Heder’s statements on Radio France-Internationale that, “according to the documents I have referred to, Mr. Ieng Sary is the only one, among Khmer Rouge leaders, about whom I have so far been unable to gather tangible evidence showing that he initiated or applied purges against intellectuals.”²²

Khieu Samphan was certainly not in that category. In another 1991 paper, Heder had concluded: “Khieu Samphan’s political star rose literally on heaps of corpses. He continued to rise in importance as he helped Pol Pot purge other communists....” Samphan, according to Heder, was “one of the key accomplices in the political execution machine that Pol Pot created” and “one of Pol Pot’s chief servitors, second perhaps only to Nuon Chea.”²³

But again, in 1999, after Khieu Samphan surrendered with Nuon Chea, Heder suddenly began to state that the case against Samphan was inadequate: “There are cases to be answered by Khieu Samphan and Ieng Sary, but on the available documentary evidence you have to be less confident they would ever be convicted.... There is other evidence against Khieu Samphan that implicates him in the purge process but little or no documentary evidence that would stand up in court. But that’s not to say we won’t suddenly dig up such a document tomorrow.”

Indeed, Heder has now dug up evidence to convict those he had described in 1991 as anti-Pol Pot “dissidents.” Mok and Ke Pauk, as well as Nuon Chea, could be indicted on the basis of transcripts of messages between these central leaders and zone commanders relating to arrests and killings. But in an interview with a reporter, “Heder said the weakness of the cases against Khieu

Samphan and Ieng Sary related to 'indirect command responsibility,' a contentious issue under international law."²⁴

This is false. War crimes cases do require proof of "command responsibility," but in cases of crimes against humanity and genocide, what is needed is proof of a conspiracy. International lawyer Dr. Gregory Stanton writes:

Heder is wrong about Khieu Samphan and Ieng Sary's culpability for crimes against humanity and genocide. All one needs to show for those crimes is participation in a conspiracy. To prove their attendance at meetings of the Central Committee where decisions were made to eradicate Chams or to uproot everybody in the Eastern Zone would be enough. Ieng Sary's diary evidently shows that he was well aware of the plans to exterminate the enemies of the party. Khieu Samphan can probably be shown to have been equally aware of the party's policies.²⁵

He was. We have complete copies of the minutes of fifteen meetings of the most powerful body in Democratic Kampuchea—the Standing Committee of the Central Committee of the ruling Communist Party of Kampuchea. These crucial Standing Committee meetings were held between October 9, 1975 and May 30, 1976. Khieu Samphan is recorded in the minutes (under his revolutionary name Hem) as having attended twelve of these fifteen meetings. The minutes of two of the meetings do not record who was present, but it is likely that Samphan was there as well, totaling fourteen out of the fifteen meetings for which we have evidence. At the meeting of October 9, 1975, the Standing Committee put Samphan "in charge of the Front and the Royal Government; [and of] the accountancy and pricing aspects of commerce." Samphan was also made President of the State Presidium (i.e., Head of State of Democratic Kampuchea) by a decision of the Central Committee on March 30, 1976.²⁶ In 1977-78, he also headed the powerful Office of the CPK Central Committee ("Office 870"). In April 1977, soon after he assumed this post, Samphan declared publicly, "We must wipe out the enemy [and] suppress all stripes of enemy at all times."²⁷ The diary of an aide to Ieng Sary reveals the following view: "In our country, one percent to five percent are traitors, boring in....[T]he enemies are on our body, among the military, the workers, in the cooperatives and even in our ranks....These enemies must be progressively wiped out."²⁸

More common than Heder's mental gymnastics is a consistent view that what occurred under the Khmer Rouge, though murderous, was not genocide. Two historians of Cambodia, Michael Vickery of the University Sains Malaysia and Monash University's David P. Chandler, both take this position. They oppose the Khmer Rouge, but they have categorized the regime's crimes as other than genocidal.²⁹

Vickery, who considers the Khmer Rouge guilty of "intolerable violence" and "mass murder," argues that in Cambodia, unlike China and Vietnam, "nationalism, populism and peasantism really won out over communism."³⁰ "The violence of DK was first of all because it was such a complete peasant revolution, with the victorious peasant revolutionaries doing what peasant rebels

have always wanted to do to their urban enemies."³¹ Vickery believes an orthodox Marxist regime would have been preferable. Chandler, by contrast, holds Marxism responsible for the violence, downplaying other factors like racist or genocidal policies. He argues, "Under the regime of Democratic Kampuchea (DK), a million Cambodians, or one in eight, died from warfare, starvation, overwork, misdiagnosed diseases, and executions. Most of these deaths, however, were never intended by DK. Instead, one Cambodian in eight fell victim to the government's utopian program of total and rapid social transformation, which its leaders had expected would succeed at far less cost."³²

This technical denial of genocide, though in my view incorrect, is quite legitimate.³³ Vickery and Chandler do not fit into the category of Holocaust revisionists like Serge Thion, who deny the very concept and the plausibility of genocide. Thion indefensibly prefers the term "deportation" for the fate of Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe, and casts doubt on the evidence for the gas chambers.³⁴ (In the Cambodian case, Thion argues that the Khmer Rouge's crimes should be tried in a Cambodian court, rather than an international one.)³⁵ By contrast, arguments that the Cambodian people suffered not genocide but "a peasantist revolution of the purest sort" (Vickery) or "the purest and most thoroughgoing Marxist-Leninist revolution" (Chandler),³⁶ have a defensible intellectual basis.

The analyses of Vickery and Chandler are also more honest than a third position which consists, in the style of the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page, in noting that genocide occurred, while attempting to block investigation of it. I shall now examine various attempts to suppress the CGP's historical accounting of the Cambodian genocide, in the hope of uncovering a lesson for future chroniclers of crimes against humanity. In conclusion, I shall weigh the arguments of those who reject use of the term "genocide" in the Cambodian case, against the actions of those who have tried either to turn public inquiry to other issues, or simply to suppress the facts of the case.

The first attempt to derail the CGP came from a man describing himself as "a poor Chilean, a citizen of the Third World."³⁷ Julio A. Jeldres had left Chile before the 1973 coup, and subsequently moved to Australia and then Cambodia. In the 1970s, Jeldres not only was a supporter of the Pinochet military dictatorship in Chile, but was also a member of a Khmer Rouge international front organization.³⁸ Within weeks of our launching the Cambodian Genocide Program, in 1995 Jeldres published an article entitled "Genocide Investigation Off on the Wrong Foot."³⁹

In reply, I noted Jeldres' support for the Pinochet regime.⁴⁰ Jeldres quickly denied "doing work for the regime" of General Pinochet, claiming he was "a member of the Chilean Folk Dance Group, a non-political, cultural association."⁴¹ But a statement Jeldres published in 1975, which he signed as "President of the Chilean Club," made no mention of folk dance. In it, Jeldres expressed his sympathies with Pinochet's Chile, which he called a victim of

"the Australian government's attitude to my country." He praised Pinochet's 1973 coup for ensuring merely that "marxism was ousted." Instead of protesting the destruction of Chilean democracy, Jeldres denounced the international outcry over it. Like Pinochet, he equated democracy with communism, and complained that the Chilean dictatorship was "the 'target' of a communist international campaign against us."⁴²

So it was not surprising to find Jeldres later attempting to block action against another murderous regime, this time in Cambodia—especially because for at least five years, he had been an "Honorary Member" of the Khmer Rouge front organization known as FUNK. In 1976, he had privately boasted of this continued "honorary" status.⁴³ In 1978, at the height of the genocide, Jeldres sided with the Khmer Rouge against their Vietnamese opponents, and even claimed that the Pol Pot regime told him all he needed to know. As he then put it, "I am kept fully informed by the Cambodian Embassy in Peking."⁴⁴ In 1995, campaigning against the CGP's investigation of the Khmer Rouge period, Jeldres continued to claim that in 1978, Pol Pot's embassy "was the only source of information on what was going on in Cambodia."⁴⁵ He was alone in excluding consideration of information from refugees and victims of the genocide.

In the 1980s, Jeldres was associated with another Khmer Rouge front, the exiled Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea.⁴⁶ In the early 1990s, he joined the magazine *Khmer Conscience*, which published the writings of Bunroeun Thach (see earlier reference).⁴⁷ In Cambodia's English-language press in 1995 and 1996, Jeldres continued to denounce the CGP's investigation of the Khmer Rouge regime.⁴⁸

Attempts by such people to suppress the only research program to document Khmer Rouge crimes comprise a new variation on the politics of genocide "denial." Longtime allies and even members of Khmer Rouge organizations have portrayed themselves as opponents of the genocide, thus seeking credibility for their demand that its investigation be cut short. This political chicanery should not, however, be confused with differing definitions of genocide, or with other scholarly debate about the nature of the tragedy.

The *Wall Street Journal* attack on the CGP was begun by Stephen J. Morris, who had met Julio Jeldres in Bangkok a decade earlier.⁴⁹ Throughout the 1980s, Morris, like Jeldres and Bunroeun Thach, devoted himself to political activism in support of Cambodian factions who were allied to the communist Khmer Rouge, but whom Morris praised as "anti-communist." In 1989, Morris complained that the democratic government of Thailand was selling out the Khmer Rouge. "It has now gone so far that Thai commanders have provided Phnom Penh's artillery commanders with precise intelligence on the location of Khmer Rouge units."⁵⁰ In the winter of 1990, Morris addressed a meeting of Cambodians in Brighton, Massachusetts. According to witnesses, Morris "took the floor and in an impassioned speech warned Cambodians in the room that they should not do anything that would appear to support the Vietnamese

backed government of Cambodia, including bringing attention to Khmer Rouge atrocities. He did not support a trial of the Khmer Rouge and attributed his inside information about the Cambodian situation to having dined with Khmer Rouge leaders.⁵¹ Morris wrote, "The real Khmer Rouge military aim...is to force Phnom Penh to accept a comprehensive political settlement such as the UN peace plan."⁵² His attack on the CGP's investigation of the Khmer Rouge was predictable. So was Morris' praise for Stephen Heder, whose "pro-Khmer Rouge views" Morris had once noted.⁵³

More surprising was the *Wall Street Journal's* readiness to give space to a writer who had embarrassed it once before. In 1990 Morris attacked Lesley Cockburn, an American Broadcasting Company producer, for her feature on Cambodia.⁵⁴ Objecting to the feature's accurate portrayal of the United States' diplomatic support for the Khmer Rouge in the 1980s, Morris also pilloried what he called "Ms. Cockburn's 1987 PBS Documentary, 'Murder on the Rio San Juan.'" Cockburn had had nothing to do with that program, and the *Journal's* Editor conceded that Morris had made "an error."⁵⁵

The *Journal's* assault on the CGP attracted the attention of the *Reader's Digest*, which investigated reprinting it. A *Digest* research editor called me on May 22, 1995, to ask, among other things, if I had ever used Marxist terms. He then called the head of my department at Yale and asked if I was a communist. More confidently, he questioned another senior member of the department, "Did you know Kiernan was a communist?" But when my reply to Morris' second attack appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* on May 30, the *Digest* decided not to republish his article.

The *Journal* gave Morris a third opportunity to repeat his allegations. The last word came when twenty-nine international Cambodia scholars wrote that "Kiernan has been an outspoken and untiring opponent of the Khmer Rouge for 17 years," while "Morris supported a coalition government-in-exile which was dominated by the Khmer Rouge." These scholars, who included Vickery and Chandler, despite their differences with the CGP on the issue of genocide, added: "We have full confidence in Professor Kiernan's integrity, professional scholarship, and ability to carry out the important work of the Cambodian Genocide Program."⁵⁶

Thus, a phase of the campaign ended. Having lost the debate in the academic world and the media, Morris moved to the realm of raw power. Ron Marks, a CIA officer seconded as Special Assistant to then Senator Bob Dole, drafted a letter repeating Morris' charges against me. Six senior Republican Senators—Dole, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Senate Foreign Relations Committee head Jesse Helms, and three others—sent the letter to the U.S. Secretary of State on August 7, 1995. Two of the signatories, Trent Lott and Jesse Helms, were associated with the Council of Conservative Citizens, which claims, among other things, that interracial marriage "amounts to white genocide," that Jews have "turned spite into welfare billions for themselves," and

that African Americans and Latinos suffer from "high crime and low intelligence." In 1992, Senator Trent Lott had given the keynote speech to a national board meeting of the Council. "The people in this room stand for the right principles and the right philosophy," he said (six years later Lott falsely claimed that he had "no firsthand knowledge" of the Council's views).⁵⁷

As the letter went off to Albright, a Morris backer from the conservative Heritage Foundation approached Alphonse LaPorta, head of the State Department's Office of Cambodian Genocide Investigations, and said, "If you don't get rid of Kiernan, we'll go after you."⁵⁸ LaPorta concluded that if I did not step down, the Senate would revoke the grant to the CGP, ending our investigation of the Khmer Rouge regime. I held my ground, with strong support from Yale University. On October 2, new support arrived. An editorial in the conservative *Washington Times* praised the CGP's achievements and described the Morris and Dole campaign against me as "lunacy."⁵⁹ The issue blew over with the CGP's Congressional backing enhanced.⁶⁰

On September 17, 1996, Nancy deWolf Smith of the *Asian Wall Street Journal* called me from Hong Kong. She said something "is becoming an issue." This was that the previous month the Pentagon had not gained immediate access to the archives of the Khmer Rouge secret police, which CGP staff from the Documentation Center had discovered in Phnom Penh in March 1996. Smith had the impression, which we could not confirm, that these 1975-79 documents contained information on the fate of Americans missing in Cambodia from the 1970-75 war. I explained that the Pentagon had not consulted me before sending its contract researchers directly to Cambodia the previous month. They had arrived at the Documentation Center saying, "It's all settled." They wanted to start work then and there, before the files had been catalogued.

On September 12, I invited them to return in January, after we had completed our documentation of the Khmer Rouge genocide for the State Department. The Documentation Center, with CGP funding, would then be free to serve the Pentagon's different needs. On October 23, James W. Wold of the Pentagon's MIA office accepted my offer. I responded on October 25, reconfirming to General Wold that his researcher David Chandler was welcome to work in the Documentation Center's archives in January-February 1997.⁶¹ Wold's office called that afternoon to thank me. The State Department followed suit, as did Chandler.⁶²

Three days later, on October 29, in the *Asian Wall Street Journal*, Smith falsely accused me of withholding cooperation from Pentagon researchers.⁶³ I replied by fax on November 4, but Smith's newspaper held back my reply, passing it on to the *Wall Street Journal* in New York. On December 5, Mr. George Melloan, the *Journal's* Deputy Editor (International), requested a copy of "the letter you received from General Wold."⁶⁴ I faxed it to Melloan immediately. This letter confirms my September 12 offer to the Pentagon. However, on December 19, the *Journal* republished Smith's October piece, alongside an edito-

rial stating: "Mr. Kiernan refused the Pentagon researchers access to the documents. He continues to do so to this day, and will continue to do so until his project closes."⁶⁵ Two weeks earlier, Melloan had received irrefutable evidence that we had scheduled the Pentagon's visit for the following month. This dishonest editorial appeared simultaneously in the *Asian Wall Street Journal*.⁶⁶ Both newspapers also finally printed my short letter of November 4, but refused to publish corrections to their new editorial. Mr. Terrill E. Lautz, Vice-President of the Henry Luce Foundation, wrote that I had received a \$250,000 grant from his foundation—in October 1996, just as Smith was describing me as "the grant world's equivalent of box office poison." The *Journal* declined to print this letter, Yale's own reply, or even a letter from the Pentagon. The paper left readers, potential funders, and the Khmer Rouge with the false impression that the CGP was to "close" in January 1997.⁶⁷

On the contrary, in January 1997 the CGP launched a new World Wide Web site, including four large databases documenting the crimes of the Khmer Rouge regime.⁶⁸ Chandler worked in the Documentation Center's archives in February 1997 as arranged, and returned in May. Though neither he nor his Pentagon employers have yet announced whether he has found any information on American MIAs, Chandler again thanked us for our cooperation. We have seen no such acknowledgement from the *Wall Street Journal*. But the Editor-at-Large of the *Asian Wall Street Journal* reports our continued existence as "the only research operation in the world that focuses on Khmer Rouge atrocities." In a turnaround paralleling that in the U.S. Senate, the *Readers' Digest* praised the CGP and the Documentation Center: "Even today, project workers are uncovering masses of files that point to Pol Pot's 'bureaucracy of death.' Moreover, Yale won a commitment from the Cambodian government to endorse initiatives that would bring the evidence—and Khmer Rouge leaders—to a criminal trial."⁶⁹

Meanwhile, the Khmer Rouge split, with one faction led by Ieng Sary launching its own "Research and Documentation Center" to defend itself.⁷⁰ In June 1997, the two Cambodian Prime Ministers appealed to the United Nations to establish a tribunal to judge the crimes of the Khmer Rouge period. In early 1998, the UN assembled a group of distinguished legal experts to report on this issue. They visited the Documentation Center of Cambodia in November 1998 and examined the evidence in detail. Their report, delivered to the UN Secretary-General in February 1999, recommended the establishment of an Ad Hoc International Criminal Tribunal to pass judgement on the Khmer Rouge leaders, and a truth commission to be held in Cambodia to allow the surviving victims to air their grievances more fully.

Pol Pot died in his sleep in April 1998, less than a year after murdering his former Security chief, Son Sen, whom he suspected of attempting to follow Ieng Sary's defection to the government. But the 1998 mutiny and defection of

former Khmer Rouge deputy commander Ke Pauk and the surrender of Khieu Samphan and Nuon Chea mean that three of the last Khmer Rouge leaders at large are now capable of being apprehended. The lone, one-legged military commander Chhit Choeun, alias Mok, did not last long in the jungle. He was captured in March 1999 and sent before a Cambodian military court. Meanwhile, four of the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council made strong statements in support of the establishment of an international tribunal.

In this period, new attempts were made to stymie the work of the Cambodian Genocide Program. In May 1998, Congressman Tom Campbell (R-California) wrote another letter to the U.S. Secretary of State, supported by Vietnam veteran and former Reagan appointee John Parsons Wheeler III. This time the allegation was mismanagement of the CGP's State Department grant. After a six-month inquiry, the Office of Investigations of the U.S. Inspector-General found "no evidence of wrongdoing" and closed its investigation.⁷¹ Meanwhile Campbell's colleague, Congressman Dana Rohrabacher (R-California) and Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina proposed a resolution (H.Res. 533) that would try Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen as a "war criminal"—rather than pursue what Rohrabacher called the "obsession with a handful of geriatric Khmer Rouge leaders."⁷²

When two of the geriatric genocidists, Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan, surrendered to the Cambodian government and the U.S. Government called for them to be sent before an international tribunal, Stephen Morris made a final attempt to prevent a genocide trial. He wrote a short piece for *Commentary* criticizing the "useless Genocide Warning Center" which the U.S. Government had established the previous month. Morris now pronounced that "genocide is extremely rare" and that "the only unambiguous example of genocide to have occurred since the Nazi Holocaust" was the 1994 Rwandan case. In Morris's view, Cambodians did not suffer a genocide, because "the persecution of ethnic minorities was only a relatively minor aspect of policy" in the Khmer Rouge period.⁷³ Morris's colleague, Adam Garfinkle, writing in the *Los Angeles Times*, took up the case against an international tribunal for Cambodia. Firstly, he agreed that "the atrocities of Cambodia represented a nearly pure political and ideological madness, not an ethnic or religious one. For this reason, the application of the term genocide to what happened in Cambodia between 1974 and 1979 is improper." Secondly, Garfinkle added, "What business is the fate of two aged and defeated killers—Khieu Samphan and Nuon Chea—to the U.S. Government? Did any American perish at the hands of these deranged thugs?" And thirdly, he concluded, a tribunal "is liable to dredge up no little amount of embarrassment about the American role in recent Cambodian history.... [W]e were indeed there at the creation of Cambodia's troubles. For purely prudential reasons, then, a U.S. initiative aimed at exhuming our own policy ancestor, so to speak, seems very ill-advised."⁷⁴

This close look at the failed efforts to impede the task of the CGP enables us to see firsthand how denial and suppression of information about genocide work. Both the creation of historical memory and its erasure depend upon contemporary politics as much as history itself. Bunroeun Thach, Julio Jeldres, Stephen Morris, Congressional Republicans, and the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page all considered their own political agenda more important than documenting the crimes of the Khmer Rouge and bringing the criminals to trial for genocide. This agenda reflected the anti-Soviet alliance between the United States and China during the later stages of the Cold War, an alliance which often brought together conservative anti-communists and Maoist radicals. We see such a combination in this case. Priorities for members of this coalition usually included disguising their own past support for the Khmer Rouge, burying the history of the Vietnam War, and yet refighting it by both covering for the Khmer Rouge and fanning the flames of the MIA issue.⁷⁵ Justice for the victims of the Khmer Rouge was not among their priorities. Those who sought it were often attacked from two sides.

Neither Congressional Republicans nor the *Wall Street Journal* denied that the Cambodian genocide occurred. Rather, they took extraordinary measures to prevent or divert investigation of that genocide. A determined campaign by some of the United States' most powerful politicians and one of the world's most powerful newspapers failed. But it posed a larger obstacle to a historical accounting for the genocide than did scholars preferring to use their own concepts, or explanations beyond the wording of the Genocide Convention. Most scholars reflexively welcome further research and documentation. By contrast, political pressure is the greatest threat to honest inquiry. And the best defense is a deeper exchange of ideas, further scholarship, and more determination.

Pol Pot is dead, and the Khmer Rouge army has collapsed in division and defeat. All surviving Khmer Rouge leaders have surrendered, defected, or been captured. The first trials, of Pol Pot's military commander, Chhit Choeun (alias Mok), and of the Khmer Rouge Security Chief, Kang Khék Iev (alias Deuch), may begin soon in Phnom Penh. Charges of genocide have also been prepared against Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan. In spite of all of the politics involved in the documentation of events in Cambodia, it appears that getting history right has proceeded hand in hand with the quest for justice.

Notes

1. Ben Kiernan, *The Smlaut Rebellion and Its Aftermath, 1967-70: The Origins of Cambodia's Liberation Movement*, Parts I and II (Monash University, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, 1975).
2. Ben Kiernan, "Why's Kampuchea Gone to Pot?," *Nation Review*, November 17, 1978.
3. "Kampuchea: A Refugee's Account," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 9:3 (1979): 369-74. See also Ben Kiernan, "People Heng in against Pol Pot," *Nation Review*, April 5, 1979; "Kampuchea: Thai Neutrality a Farce," *Nation Review*, May 24, 1979; "Die Erfahrungen der Frau Hong Var in Kampuchea der Jahre 1975-1979," *Kursbuch* 57 (October 1979): 122-129

- (with Chanthou Boua); "Motsattningarna inom den kommunistiska rorelsen i Kampuchea," *Kommentar* 8 (1979): 4-25; "Pol Pots uppgång och fall," *Kommentar* 11 (1979): 16-34; "Flyktingintervjuer om mat, arbete, halsa samre 1977-78?" *Vietnam Nu* 4 (1979): 10-11 (with Chanthou Boua); "Het Verhal Van Hok Sarun: Het level van een arme boer onder Pol Pot," *Vietnam Bulletin* 8 (November 15, 1979): 22-24 (with Chanthou Boua); "Background to a Tragedy," *New Straits Times*, December 20, 1979; "Why the Slaughter?" *Nation Review*, January 1980: 40; "Bureaucracy of Death: Documents from Inside Pol Pot's Torture Machine," *New Statesman*, May 2, 1980: 669-676 (with C. Boua and A. Barnett); "Students Killed in Kampuchea," *Sydney Tribune*, May 14, 1980.
4. Ben Kiernan, "Genocide in de Oostelijke Zone," *Vietnam Bulletin* 16 (June 25, 1980): 20-22; "Wild Chickens, Farm Chickens, and Cormorants: Kampuchea's Eastern Zone under Pol Pot," in David Chandler and Ben Kiernan (eds.), *Revolution and its Aftermath in Kampuchea* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Southeast Asia Council, 1983), 136-211; "Kampuchea and Stalinism," in *Marxism in Asia*, ed. C. Mackerras et al. (London: Croom Helm, 1985), 232-250; *Cambodia: The Eastern Zone Massacres* (Columbia University Center for the Study of Human Rights, 1986); "Kampuchea's Ethnic Chinese Under Pol Pot," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 16:1 (1986): 18-29; "Orphans of Genocide: The Cham Muslims of Kampuchea under Pol Pot," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 20:4 (1988): 2-33; Chanthou Boua, David Chandler, and Ben Kiernan, eds., *Pol Pot Plans the Future: Confidential Leadership Documents from Democratic Kampuchea, 1976-77* (New Haven, CT: Yale Southeast Asia Council, 1988); "The Genocide in Cambodia, 1975-1979," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 22:2 (1990): 35-40.
 5. Ben Kiernan, "Conflict in the Kampuchean Communist Movement," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 10:1-2 (1980): 7-74; *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea, 1942-1981* (London: Zed, 1982) (with Chanthou Boua); *How Pol Pot Came To Power: A History of Communism in Kampuchea, 1930-1975* (London: Verso, 1985).
 6. United Nations, AS, General Assembly, Security Council, A/53/850, S/1999/231, March 16, 1999, Annex, *Report of the Group of Experts for Cambodia established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 52/135*, 16.
 7. Barry Wain, "Pol Pot's Paper Trail," *Asian Wall Street Journal*, May 9-10, 1997.
 8. I refer specifically to the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page, with its tradition of hamfisted ideological campaigning. See "The Big Lie Theory of the Country's Biggest Newspaper," in *Extra!*, the journal of Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR), 8:5 (September/October 1995): 13-24.
 9. Stephen J. Morris, "The Wrong Man to Investigate Cambodia," *Wall Street Journal*, April 17, 1995; "Scholars Speak Out on Cambodian Holocaust," *Wall Street Journal*, July 13, 1995. Other attacks and responses appeared on April 28, May 15 and 30, June 15, and July 13, 1995. For a description and correction of my views on the Khmer Rouge before 1978, see Kiernan, "Vietnam and the Governments and People of Kampuchea," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 11:4 (1979): 19-25; 12:2 (1980): 72.
 10. Khmer Rouge radio broadcast, August 14, 1995. U.S. CIA, *Foreign Broadcast Information Service*, EAS-95-157, August 15, 1995: 67. The Khmer Rouge also described me as "a protégé of the United States."
 11. "America's Cambodian Coda," *Asian Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 1996.
 12. "Will Yale Deliver?" *Wall Street Journal*, December 19, 1996. For a different view of the CGP, see "Cambodia's Blinding Genocide: A Website Exhumes the Faces of the Dead," *New York Times* Editorial Notebook, April 21, 1997.
 13. Unpublished letters to the *Wall Street Journal* in response to its December 19, 1996, article and editorial on the CGP can be found at its World Wide Web site (www.yale.edu/cgp), under "More Findings": "CGP Assistance to the Search for US MIA's."
 14. On academic suppression, see for instance Brian Martin et al., eds., *Intellectual Suppression: Australian Case Histories, Analysis, and Responses* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1986).
 15. Letter to the editor, *Far Eastern Economic Review* (FEER), July 5, 1984. Bunroeun Thach later moved to the University of Hawaii; see his "Two Eggs in the Same Baskets," *Khmer Conscience* (Winter 1991), my reply, "Bunroeun Thach's Basket Case," and the subsequent exchange (Spring-Summer 1991): 19-23. Thach later became Acting Director of the Preah

- Sihanouk Raj Academy in Phnom Penh, but his incompetence and racism created internal strife and controversy. In 1995 King Sihanouk withdrew his endorsement for the Academy. Thach was dismissed and left Cambodia, and the Academy re-formed as the Center for Advanced Study.
16. Steve Sharp, "Sites of Genocide," *Good Weekend*, March 29, 1997: 33-34, 37.
 17. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* (Winter 1997): 413-425; the quotations appear on pp. 414, 416, 420, 423, respectively.
 18. For contrary evidence which Sorpong Peou deliberately ignored in his review, see *The Pol Pot Regime*, 67-68, 258-267, and 93, respectively; and my response, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* (Summer 1998).
 19. Stephen R. Heder, "Khmer Rouge Opposition to Pol Pot," in *Reflections on Cambodian Political History*, Australian National University, Strategic and Defence Studies Center, Working Paper no. 239, 1991: 5.
 20. Keith Richburg, "Timing of Khmer Rouge Defections Suggests Possible Role by China," *Washington Post*, August 24, 1996: A18.
 21. *Phnom Penh Post*, October 18 and November 1, 1996.
 22. Former Khmer Rouge official Suong Sikoeun, *Phnom Penh Post*, November 15-28, 1996, quoting Stephen Heder on Radio France-Internationale, August 22 and October 10, 1996.
 23. Stephen R. Heder, *Pol Pot and Khieu Samphan*, Monash University, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Working Paper no. 70: 22-23.
 24. "Evidence Against K. Rouge Leaders Varies—Researcher," *News America Digital Publishing*, Phnom Penh, January 5, 1999, wire report distributed on Camnews, January 5, 1999.
 25. Gregory Stanton, personal communication.
 26. *Pol Pot Plans the Future*, 7.
 27. Khieu Samphan, speech broadcast on Phnom Penh Radio, April 15, 1977, extract in *New Statesman*, May 2, 1980: 675.
 28. See *Ieng Sary's Regime: A Diary of the Khmer Rouge Foreign Ministry, 1976-79*, full translation by Phat Kosal and Ben Kiernan available on the Cambodian Genocide Program website (www.yale.edu/cgp).
 29. See Michael Vickery, *Cambodia 1975-1982* (Boston: South End Press, 1984); David P. Chandler, *The Tragedy of Cambodian History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 3; David Chandler, *Brother Number One* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992), 4-5, and *Journal of Asian Studies* 55:4 (November 1996): 1063-1064.
 30. Michael Vickery, "Violence in Democratic Kampuchea," paper distributed at a conference on State-Organized Terror, Michigan State University, November 1988: 14; and Vickery, *Cambodia 1975-1982*, 289-90. He correctly adds: "DK theory had multiple origins, one of which was 'Thanhism' and another of which was Marxism. It is not easy to say which became of greater importance in the synthesis" (p. 256).
 31. Vickery, "Violence in Democratic Kampuchea," 17.
 32. Chandler, *The Tragedy of Cambodian History*, 1. He correctly adds: "This does nothing to alleviate the horror or their responsibility for it."
 33. For my critique of Vickery's and Chandler's views, see Ben Kiernan, *The Pol Pot Regime: Race, Power, and Genocide in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, 1975-1979*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), and my review in the *Journal of Asian Studies* 52:4 (November 1993): 1076-78.
 34. See Serge Thion, *Vérité historique ou vérité politique: affaire Faurisson* (Paris: La Vieille Taupe, 1980).
 35. For instance, Serge Thion, "Genocide as a Political Commodity," in *Genocide and Democracy in Cambodia: The Khmer Rouge, the United Nations, and the International Community*, ed. Ben Kiernan (New Haven, CT: Yale Council on Southeast Asia Studies, 1993), esp. 187: "We should first clean our own house...Who are we to give moral lessons to others?" Thion's premise is that all Westerners are responsible for U.S. or French government war crimes, an immobilizing notion of Caucasian collective guilt. A harsher view is that he also had no expectations of his appeal for a Cambodian domestic tribunal. (For my critique of Thion's view of the Cambodian genocide itself, see p. 17.)
 36. Vickery, *Cambodia 1975-1982*, 287; Chandler, *Brother Number One*, 3.

37. Julio A. Jeldres, "A Response to Michael Vickery," distributed by Hann So, Camnews Internet discussion list, June 17, 1996.
38. See *Private Eye* (London), May 7 and July 16, 1993; *Phnom Penh Post*, November 30, 1996; and below.
39. Julio A. Jeldres, "Genocide Investigation off on the Wrong Foot," *Cambodia Daily*, January 27, 1995.
40. Ben Kiernan, "Jeldres Wrong to Point Finger at Alleged 'Pol Pot Apologists,'" *Cambodia Daily*, February 1, 1995. I added that in less than a year (in 1977-78) Jeldres had received three invitations to visit the Chilean consulate in Sydney, Australia. I was aware of this because Jeldres had written to me at the time (on March 14, 1978), revealing also that "the programmes were rather heavy and I did not have a minute to spare." These three invitations followed Jeldres' earlier visit to the Chilean consulate in May 1977.
41. "Jeldres vs. Kiernan," *Cambodia Daily*, February 10, 1995, and Rosanna Barbero, "Jeldres Falls into His Own Trap," *Cambodia Daily*, February 14, 1995.
42. Australia, Jeldres went on, "has now joined the communist countries and the so-called non-aligned ones in their attacks against Chile. We are getting sanctions because we did not want a communist government. The change of government in Chile is our problem and not Australia's." Julio A. Jeldres, "Insult to Chile," *Melbourne Age*, January 21, 1975. For the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page's defense of Pinochet, see *Extra!* 8:5 (September/October 1995): 15, 19; and of mass murder in El Salvador, 14-18.
43. In a letter to the author dated July 1, 1976, Jeldres revealed that, "In 1971, I was made Honorary Member of FUNK"; copy in my possession. FUNK was the Front Uni National du Kampuchéa, a coalition of Sihanoukists and Khmer Rouge dominated by the latter.
44. Jeldres, letter to the author dated March 14, 1978; copy in my possession.
45. *Cambodia Daily*, February 10, 1995.
46. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May 31, 1984. See my reply to Jeldres of June 21, 1984.
47. William Shawcross denied Jeldres' association with *Khmer Conscience* (see *Private Eye*, July 2 and 16, 1993), but its editor Hann So continued to distribute Jeldres' writings. See Jeldres, "A Response to Michael Vickery," distributed by Hann So, Camnews discussion list, June 17, 1996, copy in my possession.
48. See, for instance, Jeldres' articles in *Cambodia Daily*, February 28, 1995, and *Phnom Penh Post*, July 28, 1995 and September 20, 1996; also Jeldres' statements on Radio Australia, September 13, 1995.
49. In 1996 Jeldres revealed: "I met Stephen Morris twice in Bangkok in 1985/86....I have since spoken to him three times on the phone" (Jeldres, "Response to Michael Vickery," distributed by Hann So, Camnews discussion list, June 17, 1996).
50. "Thailand's Separate Peace in Indochina," *Asian Wall Street Journal*, September 4, 1989.
51. Mary Scully, R.N.C.S., and Theanvy Kuoch, unpublished letter to the *Wall Street Journal*, May 19, 1995.
52. Morris argued further that the Khmer Rouge were not the problem: "The danger lies in the Vietnamese Communists' determination to subvert such an agreement." Stephen J. Morris, "Skeletons in the Closet," *New Republic*, June 4, 1990. Morris labeled critics of the UN plan, and of its inclusion of the Khmer Rouge, as proponents of "an immoral, lost cause" beholden to Hanoi. The UN plan, he asserted, "is morally right, and offers real hope of success." It gave the Khmer Rouge, Morris wrongly predicted, an "incentive to lay down its arms," which "will end the war." Morris, "US Choice in Cambodia," *Boston Globe*, August 7, 1990.
53. Morris had once described Cornell University's Southeast Asia Program (America's most distinguished such institution) as "a comfortable milieu for those fond of totalitarian dictatorship." Morris attacked Heder, a former Cornell student, for his "pro-Khmer Rouge views" and for "propounding the moral virtue" of communism (Stephen J. Morris, "Ho Chi Minh, Pol Pot, and Cornell," *National Interest* (Summer 1989): 60). But in 1995, Morris shamelessly recommended Heder as one of a team he suggested should have been awarded the State Department grant that I received to document the crimes of the Khmer Rouge (*Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 17, 1995). In one of his own attacks on my work, Heder cited an unpublished draft by Morris (*Southeast Asia Research* 5:2 (July 1997): 128, n. 57).

- Though François Ponchaud also described Heder as “un Américain pro-Khmers Rouges” (*Le Point*, April 25, 1998), Henri Locard has cited Heder’s work to attack mine. Locard asserted *inter alia* that the Khmer Rouge were “sincere idealistic leaders” and had not massacred Cambodia’s Vietnamese minority, but had expelled and “spared” them (*Le Monde*, April 28, 1998). See my response (*Le Monde*, May 14, 1998), and my article, “Le communisme racial des Khmer rouges,” *Esprit* 252 (May 1999): 93-127.
54. Morris, “ABC Flacks for Hanoi,” *Wall Street Journal*, April 26, 1990.
 55. *Wall Street Journal*, June 6, 1990. Morris has a history of McCarthyist witch-hunting. Once affiliated with Harvard’s Russian Research Center, Morris fell out with its Associate Director, Professor Marshall Goldman, whom Morris calls an “ally” of “the pro-Hanoi left” (*Washington Times*, September 29, 1993). Neil Sheehan, author of the Pulitzer Prize-winning work, *A Bright Shining Lie: John Paul Vann and the Americans in Vietnam*, is dismissed by Morris as someone who “holds a benign view of the Vietnamese Communist Party” (*Washington Times*, September 29, 1993). John McAuliff and Eileen Blumenthal, organizers of a 1990 Cambodian dancers’ tour of the United States, were attacked by Morris for possible “criminal” activity (*Boston Globe*, October 14, 1990) and for holding 39 dancers as “prisoners.” Morris’s charges were investigated and proved to be totally unfounded by both the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. McAuliff’s and Blumenthal’s alleged victims, in both Cambodia and the U.S., remain their colleagues and friends (letter to the *Wall Street Journal*, April 28, 1995).
 56. “Scholars Speak Out on Cambodia Holocaust,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 13, 1995. See also *Washington Post*, July 8, 1995.
 57. See John Kifner, “Lott, and Shadow of a Pro-White Group,” *New York Times*, January 14, 1999: A9; Frank Rich, “Scandals Sans Bimbos Need Not Apply,” *New York Times*, December 26, 1998: A27; People For the American Way, *PFAW News* (Winter 1999): 5.
 58. Alphonse La Porta, personal communication, August 22, 1995.
 59. “The Academic Killing Fields,” *Washington Times*, October 2, 1995.
 60. See for instance, Eyal Press, “Unforgiven,” *Lingua Franca* (April/May 1997): 72. A letter to the Secretary of State from Rep. Martin Hoke of Ohio, backing Morris’ charges and circulated to the 435 members of Congress, drew only one signatory, that of Robert K. Dornan of California (June 19, 1995).
 61. Copies of Wold’s and my letters can be found at the CGP’s World Wide Web site (www.yale.edu/cgp), under More Findings: “CGP Assistance to the Search for US MIAs.”
 62. Chandler e-mailed me on November 19, 1996: “Thanks for your supportive response to the MIA people, with whom I’ll be working in Phnom Penh in Jan.-Feb.”
 63. Nancy DeWolf Smith, “America’s Cambodian Coda,” *Asian Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 1996.
 64. For evidence of Melloan’s McCarthyist false charges against journalist Raymond Bonner on El Salvador, see *Extra!* 8:5 (September-October 1995): 15.
 65. “Will Yale Deliver?” *Wall Street Journal*, December 19, 1996.
 66. “Will Yale Deliver?” *Asian Wall Street Journal*, December 20, 1996.
 67. For the facts, see the unpublished letters posted on the CGP’s website (www.yale.edu/cgp).
 68. The Cambodian Genocide Data Base and other materials on the Khmer Rouge can be found at www.yale.edu/cgp.
 69. Peter Michelmores, “Legacy of the Killing Fields,” *Reader’s Digest* (May 1997): 66. See also Chanthou Boua and Ben Kiernan, “Bureaucracy of Death: Documents from Inside Pol Pot’s Torture Machine,” *New Statesman*, May 2, 1980.
 70. See *Cambodia Daily*, September 10-11, 1996.
 71. Letter to the author from the Inspector-General, Jacquelyn L. Williams-Bridgers, dated November 5, 1998.
 72. Statement by Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Ca) on the House floor, October 10, 1998, quoted in *Indochina Interchange* 9:1 (Winter 1999): 14.
 73. Stephen J. Morris, “Clinton’s Genocide Confusion,” *Commentary*, January 12, 1999.
 74. Adam Garfinkle, “Be Careful Which Graves We Exhume,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 24, 1999.

75. H. Bruce Franklin, *M.I.A. or Mythmaking in America* (New York, Lawrence Hill, 1992). Stephen Morris' claimed 1993 "find" of an alleged Russian document on U.S. POWs in Vietnam was quickly shown to be full of errors (Nayan Chanda, "Research and Destroy," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May 6, 1993), and was reported to be a CIA fake (Susan Katz Keating, *Prisoners of Hope*, 1994).