

Speech of the Party Representative
during
the Celebration of the 17th Anniversary
of the Great Victory
of the Communist Party of Kampuchea
in which
the Party makes an open and official declaration
on the domestic and international arenas.
(30-9-60—30-9-77)

ឯកសារបកប្រែ
TRANSLATION/TRADUCTION
ថ្ងៃ ខែ ឆ្នាំ (Date):.....14-Jul-2011, 08:34
CMS/CFO:.....Ly Bunloug.....

-First, let me extend my respect to beloved comrade representatives of the collective workers,

-to beloved comrade representatives of the collective peasant,

-to beloved comrade representatives of all arm forces units, the infantry, the navy and the air force,

-and to beloved and respected comrades of all ministries and offices/centers.

Today, we are gathering here to celebrate the 17th birthday of our Communist Party of Kampuchea. So, in this occasion, I would like to take the opportunity to extend my respect, from here, to all our collective worker classes who, like in the past, are now storming the attacks at all the work camps and sites. They are doing this in order to join in and contribute to the works of country defense and country rebuilding, and to solve our people's livelihood problems with a high spirit of responsibility, and to fulfill the great revolutionary tasks assigned by the Party.

From this great gathering, I would like to express my deepest respect to all collective worker classes, who are the members of our cooperatives countrywide, who are presently, like in the past, attacking actively in order to achieve the rice production plan assigned by the Party for 1977. They are doing this with a high spirit of responsibility in order to join in and contribute to the works of country defense and country rebuilding, and to solve our people's livelihood problems as quickly as possible.

I would like to express my warmest and deepest respect to all our Revolutionary Arm Forces who are presently, like in the past, attacking to overcome all kinds of obstacles at the remote battlefields in order to protect the sovereignty and territory integrity of our Democratic Kampuchea. They are working with a high spirit of revolutionary responsibility in order to make an important contribution to the works of country rebuilding, and to improve the livelihood of our people as quickly as possible.

I would like to express further my deepest respect to all comrades and friends at all ministries and revolutionary centers who presently, like in the past, have overcome all kinds of obstacles in order to fulfill the supreme revolutionary tasks assigned by the Party. They have made every effort to complete these tasks in order to join in and contribute to the works of country defense and country rebuilding, and to improve the livelihood of our people as quickly as possible.

I must express my deepest respect to all comrades because in the past, at present time and in the future, these our evolutionary Arm Forces, these our worker classes, these our peasant classes, and these comrade members of all our ministries and revolutionary centers are the forces who protect our precious land and rebuild our new Kampuchea toward a prosperity, and work to improve the livelihood of our people as quickly as possible in accordance with the slogan of 'the Wonderful Great Leap Forward'.

In this occasion, while we are celebrating this 17th anniversary of our Communist Party of Kampuchea, I would like to officially tell you here about one special point. This year, in this 17th anniversary of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, our Party has decided to **openly and officially declare [the existence of] the Communist Party of Kampuchea on the domestic and the international arenas.**

Our people of all classes have clearly known that it is true that the Communist Party of Kampuchea which has led our Kampuchea revolution. Our people know even better that because we have had the Communist Party of Kampuchea leading us, we have seized victories continuously until the great victory of 17 April 1975. Our people of all classes, especially the worker-peasant classes and other revolutionaries, have known, seen, understood, and absorbed the face of the Communist Party of Kampuchea since many years ago even though this Party had not declared its existence openly. During the past 17 years, without an open declaration, our people of all classes, especially the poor, were waiting anxiously for the opportunity to see the face of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, so that they can cheer and hail its leadership who has sacrificed everything in order to lead the entire Kampuchean people to revolve and liberate our country and people. So, from now on, we all believe firmly that our people countrywide will cheerfully applaud and call the Party the bright and correct Communist Party of Kampuchea, which was previously known as only <<Kampuchea Revolutionary Angkar>>. This open declaration of the Party will be loudly heard everywhere in all directions, in the remote areas, in the forest and mountain, in the plain field, and in town.

As for our friends in the world, they know clearly that no people in the world were ever able to revolve and seize victory without the leadership of the party of the worker class. How could the people of Kampuchea seize victories continuously and even defeat the American Imperialist, who is the imperialist leader of the world, without knowing that the Communist Party of Kampuchea was leading them? This was why the people of Kampuchea were waiting anxiously for the time the Communist Party of Kampuchea to come out and declare its existence domestically and internationally so that they can cheer her great victory and leadership, who has led the Kampuchean people all the way until they capture the 17 April 1975 victory.

So, the open and official declaration of the Party on the domestic and international arenas during this time will create a great happiness for our entire population and our near or faraway friends on 5 continents in the world. However, our Communist Party of Kampuchea influence will cause more concerns to the imperialist and the reactionary group.

So, this 17th anniversary celebration of our Party today is a special event in the history of our nation, our people, our revolution, and our Communist Party of Kampuchea. In this occasion, we must express our respect and admiration to the soul of our ancestor who are the heroes and heroines of our people, of our Kampuchea Revolutionary Arm Forces, and of our Party, who had gone through all kinds of obstacles and sacrificed their life continuously while working to liberate Kampuchea in order to make the country to become 100% independent, and to liberate the Kampuchean people—especially the worker-peasant and laborer who are the absolute majority of about 90% of the country population—completely from the centuries-old of inferiority, oppression, and slavery; and to restore their integrity and honor, making them loudly known to the world while, at the same time, our friends on the 5 continents are hailing the victory of our Kampuchea revolution.

So, in this accession we are paying our respect to those comrades who have sacrificed their life with a high nationalist spirit, a high revolutionary spirit, and a high spirit of affection toward people and classes. We all want to pay our respect to their soul and determine to learn from their great role model. We want to express our gratitude to

those comrades by carrying on the great revolutionary tasks given to each of us by the Party. We all determine to turn this unforgettable sadness into the sharp and constant moral and physical forces for attacking on the task in this year of 1977 and the years ahead, with a high revolutionary spirit, a high nationalist spirit, and a high spirit of affection toward people and classes. With the determination to follow the role model of our combatants, who have sacrificed their life, we, in this occasion, would like to tell about the substance of this great gathering which is set to hail the 17th anniversary of our Party. We altogether will examine and study about the Kampuchea revolutionary movement of the Kampuchean people under the leadership of Communist Party of Kampuchea and the other revolutionary movements of our people from different generations as we are working to liberate the country and lead it to a real independence, sovereignty, and territory integrity. We do this in order to ensure that Kampuchea will exist forever and not lose any more territory as it used to happen every year in the past when it was under various oppressive classes rule.

In order to grasp the matters easily, I would like to break up my speech into several main parts as follow:

- 1st part:** About the struggling movement of the people of Kampuchea prior to the inception of the Communist Party of Kampuchea. This started from the slavery period up to 1960 in which the Communist Party of Kampuchea was born.
- 2nd part:** About the Democratic National Revolutionary Movement under the leadership of Communist Party of Kampuchea (from 1960 to 1975).
- 3rd part:** About the new period of Kampuchea Revolution which is the continuation of doing Socialist Revolution and Socialism Building and protecting the Democratic Kampuchea.

These three parts, which I just mentioned, describe briefly the history of the revolutionary struggling movement of our entire Kampuchean population. After comrades see these three parts, you can see the history of the struggling movement of the entire Kampuchean people from the beginning to present. What I want to tell here is the general view on our revolutionary movement. Although it is not in details from every angle and all parts, it is the general view of our revolutionary movement which tells us why we are able to seize the victory. The reasons were that because we prepared the strategy and method for our struggling movement, we tested the struggling movement of our people continuously, and we set the correct line for politic, for forces building, for military organization, and for the economy continuously. That is how we have seized the victory. We have looked on all aspects of the struggling movement of our people from the beginning to present in order to confirm whether the Communist Party of Kampuchea is the correct or incorrect Marx-Lenin Party, or whether it is the real revolutionary party of the proletariat class or it is the fake one. My suggestion is that all comrades can judge this based on the substances of the revolution movements we examined continuously. So, this is not just a one time only meeting in which we raise this up but forget about it after we return to our normal work. It is the meeting to examine,

judge and learn continuously altogether about the experiences of our revolution movement under the leadership of the Communist Party of Kampuchea.

x x x

**I would like to tell you the 1st part about
the struggling movement of the Kampuchean
People prior to the inception of the Party which
was from the slavery period up to 1960.**

Our Kampuchea history has existed over 2,000 years. The history has specified that, like all the countries in the world, Kampuchean society came through many different social periods. The Kampuchean society was a communist society during the pre-history period. After the communism, the Kampuchean society became the slavery society. After that, the Kampuchean society went into feudalist society. After feudalist, the Kampuchean society became the capitalist. After the capitalist society, our Kampuchean society has just arrived in a new society called socialist society. These are the types of the societies we have come through.

In the framework of the pre-history communist society, there was not yet classes classification. So, there was not yet class struggle during the pre-history communist society. When Kampuchean society went into the slavery society period, the classes classification came into existence. There were master/owner of the slave and the slave, or, as they were called, the master/owner of the bondman and the bondman. In the feudalist-landowner society, there were landowners and peasants, while in the capitalist society there were capitalists and workers. These are the real nature of each society existing in our country in the past. During the periods of slavery society, feudalist society, capitalist society, and especially during that of the feudalist-capitalist one, our country was also under the oppression of other foreigners. For example, let's talk just about the recent periods when we were under the foreigners imperialists like the French, Japanese and American. During these periods, we called our national society the colony and semi-colony society. So, there were foreigners coming to oppress our country also.

Did the class-conflict exist in the slavery, feudalist, and capitalist societies? Yes, class-conflict existed. As some comrades studied the history of our Kampuchea previously, you know that our history has clearly specified that it has been for a long time ago that class-struggle between the oppressed classes and the oppressive classes has existed.

1-In the slavery society, there were struggles between the oppressive and the oppressed person. The oppressive person was the master/owner of the slave, while the oppressed person was the slave or the bondman. These two types of persons were the adversaries. They are the dead and life opponents. The slave who rejected the oppression joined together to resist and fight against the slave owner and the oppressive person. Did this condition exist? It, in fact, existed because of the social and oppressive reasons. Scientifically, it existed in the society, and it confirmed that it existed in our history. In the slavery society, the oppressed classes resisted the oppressive ones. However, their resistance/struggle did not stand on the correct line and right way. The history has confirmed that the struggles made during that period resulted in both the victory and failure. That was because some slaves became the military commanders after they had defeated the owners of the other

slaves, and then they made themselves the owners of the slaves. They took on the throne as the king and in turn oppressed the slaves. This line does not serve the slaves of the mass of the oppressed classes. This line served their personal interest and their clan after they took over the throne and oppress others. If they oppress others, do the oppressed person accept it? They do not. They will fight back. This is because the slave and the oppressed persons are not liberated. This was what happening during the period of the slavery society. Based on our experiences, it showed that the resistance/struggle failed because the line did not serve the mass who were the oppressed classes. From the beginning, some persons were able to deceive the mass people. But as the result of their oppressive acts, the oppressed classes could see who they were and they fought back. To examine the situations then and now, we can see the differences of their real natures. The real nature of our revolution is to smash the oppressive classes and liberate the people of the oppressed classes. We study these experiences so that all of us here in this meeting and countrywide can understand that if our Party, which is now in power, still does the same as what those persons had done during the slavery period, the mass worker-peasant will topple us. If our line to serve the worker-peasant classes and the mass is correct, the people will support us, and we will become the great and strong forces. We then can defend and rebuild the country quickly and solve the people's livelihood prosperously because our Party represents the interest of the real classes of the poor. Otherwise, if we oppress and destroy them, the people will fight back. They will not keep us. These were our experiences from the past. We must always examine our selves, the entire Party and other places, which include the factory, port, energy, salt field, and all other places. If it does not represent the base people who are the oppressed classes, this Party is meaningless. The Party's members of this Party do not have the meaning of the proletariat class; these cadres are meaningless; these Party's members or these chairpersons are meaningless and are not the representatives of the proletariat class anymore. The nature of this Party, of cadres, and of the Party's members will become that of the other class and will be in conflict with the proletariat class.

What can we learn from the experiences of the slavery society then? The good point was that the oppressed people, who were the slaves, resisted against the oppressive classes who were the slave owners. The people, who were the slaves, were trained and tempered in the struggling movement bravely and continuously. We have to learn this important lesson from our poor people who dare to sacrifice everything in order to liberate their class and destroy the oppressive class. But another lesson that we have to learn from them was that they lacked a correct political line to lead them toward a victory.

2-In the feudalist society, the history of our country has confirmed that two classes existed; they were the feudalist-landowner class and the peasant class. The feudalist-landowner class was the warlord who oppressed the peasant class in all forms. So, the peasant class, who was oppressed, was in conflict with and resisting against the feudalist-landowner. The resistance of the oppressed peasant class against the oppressive feudalist-landowner class took place throughout the country. In their struggling, some peasant movements were suppressed and smashed by the

feudalist-landowner although other movements won over the feudalism-landowner warlord. However, those peasant movements, who had won over the feudalism-landowner warlord, did not have the correct political line to serve the oppressed peasant class and liberate it from the oppression. On the contrary, some peasants, who had won over the feudalism-landowner at some places, made themselves to become the feudalism-landowner warlord, and in turn oppressed the peasants. If this happened, could the oppressed peasant class accept these new feudalism-landowner warlords? They in fact did not accept them. They would join together to resist and smash these new feudalism-landowner warlords like how they had done to the former feudalism-landowner warlords. This shows that there were the movements of the oppressed peasant class against the oppressive feudalism-landowner class, but these peasant movements were defeated continuously. What lessons can we learn from the struggling movements of the peasant class against the feudalism-landowner warlord class? The lessons are as follow:

-One, the oppressed peasant class must absolutely rise up to resist. This resistance must be made continuously and on a long term basis through different movements. And in the struggle, arm resistance and war are important. Through this struggle, the oppressed peasant class will be able to train and temper themselves with their own fresh blood bravely and cleverly during their attack to defeat the enemy.

-But another lesson shows us that the great heroic struggling of the oppressed peasant class during that time were defeated continuously. Why? Because there was no correct line for gathering up forces of the oppressed peasant class extensively, so that they could become the mighty forces to smash the oppressive class who were the feudalism-landowner warlord.

Also, during that feudalism society period, our Kampuchea was invaded by the foreigner enemy who were the reactionary feudalism and foreign colonist. During the time of their invasion, these feudalism and foreign colonist created antagonistic conflicts within Kampuchea and her people. The reactionary feudalism and foreign colonist invaded and oppressed Kampuchea and her people, especially the peasant class. So, the nation and the Kampuchean people, especially the peasant class had rebelled to destroy the enemy from outside so that they could liberate the nation and the people, especially the peasant class, from their oppressive yoke. The arm resistance movements rose everywhere continuously in the form of war in order to liberate the people and country. These arm resistance movements were failed at some places but successful at others. But their victory did not last long because they did not have the correct and true line to liberate the nation, people, and mass, who were the real oppressed peasant class. After their victory, this group cared only about their personal interest and their clan. They made themselves the warlords in the provinces and sectors. They throned themselves as the big and small kings who continued to oppress the peasant class. When the people and peasant rebelled against them, this group fled to join with the foreign feudalism reactionary and colonist, selling out land to foreigners in order to hold on their throne as the big and small kings. They became the satellite of and joined with the outsiders to oppress their own people and peasant.

The resistance movements of the oppressed people-peasant took places continuously during the feudalist society period. In fact these resistances had a great heroism although they had been defeated continuously. But they were defeated because they did not have the correct and true line to serve and liberate the oppressed nation and people.

3-Later on, during the period of the feudalist-capitalist society:

Shortly after WWII, there were many Cambodian resistance movements. We can now look at these resistance movements which have a different character from the resistance groups of the previous periods. These movements became different because they were in a situation when the international colonist and imperialist wanted to test the strength of the oppressed nation and people. We can briefly talk about various kinds of the resistance movements of our people during these periods as follow:

1-There was a resistance movement called <<the Struggling Movement for National Independence >>. During this time many political parties were formed. They included the Democratic Party, the Freedom Party, the Neang Kunghing Party (នាង គង្គីង), the Hannuman Party (ហ្សូម៉ាន), the Arrow Party, and many others.

These political parties competed in the election for, in their own term, an independence. In fact, these parties were: 1, born from the French colonist law, 2, had compromised with and received permission from the French colonist, and 3, they represented the feudalist class, the bourgeoisie, the landowner, and the capitalist in the upper class. Was this the real struggle of the people and for the people's interest? Was it the real national struggle for national independence? No, it was not. Not at all. The real nature of this kind of struggle was that of the French colonist. They served the interest of the feudalist class, the bourgeoisie, the landowner, and the capitalist in the upper class. These fake struggling movements could deceive the mass for just a short time; but they were cursed at, rejected and opposed by the people later on.

2-The fascist Japanese and American CIA had created a movement for an independence called <<the People Movement>> or << the Free Khmer>> with Soeung Ngoc Thann (ស៊ីង ង៉ុក ថាន់) as its leader. The banner, raised by Soeung Ngoc Thann at that time, stated that they were demanding for an independence from the French. It was able to fool some students for a short time at the beginning. Later on, this <<People Movement>> or <<Free Khmer>> was cursed at and damned by the people, who were opposing him and accusing him of being the leader of the traitors. In reality, Soeung Ngoc Thann and his clan would demand for an independence from the French and hand it over to the American imperialist so that the American imperialist could use Cambodia as their military base for their invasion based on their new colonial policy.

3-Another movement was the real struggle of our people, especially the movement of the poor peasant to conquer the national independence from the French imperialist. This revolutionary movement took places in many places in our country, where many things had been sacrificed, arm resistance was carried out against the enemy, and military units were organized subsequently. We also built

our base continuously. But this resistance movement of our people and the subsequent revolutionary results were vanished as the consequence of the 1954 Geneva Agreement. What caused this to happen? The fresh blood lesson from this brave struggle of our people confirmed that we had failed because our people did not have a correct and bright line to lead them on how to do the right revolutionary struggling. Which strategy and method should be used in the struggle? What was the objective? Which forces to rely on? Which form of struggle to be applied? And how to do it independently and masterily with self reliance. There was none.

When one does not have a correct line to lead his way, he is like a blind man. And regardless how strong he is physically and mentally, he will absolutely not be able to win. On the contrary, he will become confused and disoriented; he will fall in the darkness and grasp the wrong thing, and will face with a failure and destruction.



In the occasion of the 17th anniversary of this Glorious Communist Party of Kampuchea, our cooperative peasants determine to storm the attack on the paddy work in order to produce rice crops as much as possible in order to complete the plan assigned by the Party, and even to successfully and absolutely exceed that plan.

In this photo: The peasants of Trăm Kâk (ត្រាំកក់) district cooperative are storming the attack on putting fertilizer and taking care of the rainy season rice plants properly so that they can grow well.

In conclusion, the struggle of our people has been in place for a long time ago, starting from the slavery society period until the French period, but they were defeated subsequently. This long struggle of our people has given us two important lessons and experiences as follow:

The best lesson which we should learn from them is that our people are brave, sharp nationalist, and daring to resist and sacrifice everything for fighting against the national enemy who is the invasive enemy, and for resisting the oppressive enemy who is the class-enemy. This is the special good point. We must see this point clearly. If we do not see this point, we will underestimate our people. If we do not learn about our people's struggling movements from the beginning, we will think that our people are afraid to resist or do not know how to resist, or that our people are lazy and weak, or our people are coward. But, in fact, it was our people of many generations who struggled continuously and shed blood continuously. They dared to resist either with empty hand or with weapon. They did arm struggles again and again and repeatedly. Are these people the brave people or the coward one? They are the real brave people. They are the great people. They are the real people with a tradition to attack. We must promote this lesson, this experience, and other good points of our people so that they will not be buried again. In fact this is the real struggle of the people. It is not the composition of any authors. The struggle of our people is like that. So, whether or not we believe in our people is depending on our examination of their struggling movements. Our people of all generations dared to resist the invaders from outside. They resisted the French invader, the Japanese invader, the American invader, and other invaders subsequently.

Therefore, all of us and all of our people believe in our people. We strengthen and expand our belief in them. We stand firmly on our people side, and rely on our people. The people forces can accomplish all revolutionary tasks.

Second lesson: Regardless how brave we are, if we walk on the wrong road, walk on the incorrect road, we will lose our direction, and we will become exhausted. We will walk toward the destruction, disaster and defeat. This is the 2nd lesson.

In the past we did not have a line. The people were very brave, dying and sacrificing, but we still failed because there was no correct line. There was no line to fight against the outsider enemy, who were the invaders, and to fight the oppressive classes, who were the domestic enemy. When there was no correct line, we could not gather up the people to do the revolution. So, based on this wrong experience, we can see what is the right one? There must be a line, and there must be the right party of the worker class to lead with a correct line. The mass people forces are very powerful when they are gathered up by a correct line. There must be now a line. But what kind of line it is? However, if the line is copied from others, it is also wrong. The line must base on the stance of independent-mastery and self determination for our own destiny. Self-reliance means to rely on own people, on own military, on own Party, and on own revolutionary movement of the mass, and basically within own country. So, we must prepare a correct line in order to seize the victory. Therefore, we must prepare our strategic line and method for the Democratic National Revolution about which I will tell in part 2.

x x x

**I would like to tell the following part 2, which is
about the Democratic National Revolution movement
under the leadership of the Communist Party of Kampuchea
from 1960 to 1975**

Because our people's revolution movements experienced failures continuously in the past centuries, our Party prepared a line in order to lead our Kampuchea revolution toward a victory. In 1957, we formed a committee to develop the Party's political line. The members of this committee composed of cadres working in the countryside and in Phnom Penh. They researched the history of our people struggles, studied about their wrong and right experiences and used them as the lessons for the establishment of the Party's line. At the same time, the committee also examined the experiences of some of the other revolution movements in the world. Based on the wrong and right experiences of our Kampuchea revolution movements and of those movements in the world, the committee had drafted the Party's line which was based on the Marx-Lenin stance. It stated that we had to carry out our works by our selves with the independent-mastery stance, and based on the practical situation in Cambodia and Cambodian society.

I would like to tell that there were then tense and tough fighting inside and outside of the country. Inside the country there was an election in 1955, during which the enemy destroyed many of our members. In 1956, the enemy continued harassing us badly; and in 1957 the harassment was intensifying. Then, in 1958 there was a second election, in which the harassment was harsher, and many of us were arrested in the countryside. In 1959-60, the arrests were intensifying in both places, the countryside and the city. In 1959, about 90% of our revolutionary forces in the countryside were destroyed. They were arrested and killed by the enemy, and were persuaded by the enemy to join them. In the city our forces were expanded after new people had been recruited. However, these forces were destroyed again after some of us had been arrested, killed, and persuaded by the enemy to join them etc.... The situation inside the country was tense like that. Outside of the country, the situation was complicated because the revolutionary line in the world was still obscure and confusing. In that situation, our committee developing the line had learned from the experience of the 1955 election that the people in countrywide, during that time, were supporting the revolution and the progressive group, but against the reactionary group and the American imperialist. But the people could not vote for the progressive group because the ruling class had gun, weapon, laws, court, prison, and other instruments to suppress our people. During the 1958 election, it was clear that the people still loved the revolution and supported the progressive persons but were against the American imperialist. They wanted the progressive persons to run the country in order to solve the problems of foreign affairs and other issues and people livelihood. But during the 1958 election, the enemy still used their gun, weapon, laws, court, and prison to suppress our people and prevented them from voting for the nationalist and the progressive persons. Based on that experience, should we still continue our struggling through the election mean, or should we use the other forms of struggling in the effort to liberate our population and people? Practical situation and movement required that we should solve the problem accordingly. This experience confirmed that we must be

independent-mastery and self-reliance and using the experiences of own revolution movement to determine our practical line. Therefore, this committee drafted the Party's main line and submitted it to the Party's assembly which would be held in 1960 for a consideration. The 1st great assembly of the Party's representatives was held on 30 September, 1960 in Phnom Penh during a tense situation and while we were being harassed badly by the enemy.

I would like to give the example about our important intellectual cadres like our comrade current president of the state presidium. He at that time was harassed, arrested, imprisoned and chained up by the enemy. The enemy did not only harass the intellectuals, they even mercilessly harass laborer, worker, peasant and ordinary people. Even in such a gloomy situation, we were still able to hold our 1st Party's representatives assembly successfully right in the compound of the Phnom Penh train station.

In this assembly there were 14 peasant representatives working in the countryside of various Zones countrywide and 7 urban representatives attending. There were 21 persons in total. These 21 persons were attending the Party's representatives assembly while the situation was very tense and the harassment was serious. It was the life and death battle between the enemy and us. If the enemy found and arrested us at that time, it would be a disaster for our leadership machine, our Party's line, and the whole fate of our revolution. But we had determined that we must do it because the revolution needed a correct line to lead immediately. If there was no correct line to lead, the revolutionary movement would be down and dull subsequently, and that would lead to a total disaster for the revolution. So, we were forced by that situation that we must hold the 1st Party's representatives assembly regardless whatever would happen, and we must do it decisively in order to decide on the Party's line so that we could use it to lead the revolution toward a victory. I just told you that the great assembly of the Party's representatives was held for the 1st time on 30 September 1960. In fact, it was held for 3 days and 3 nights, starting from 28, 29 to 30 September 1960. It was held for the whole 3 days and 3 nights inside the closed door room where no one was allowed to get in or out. This great assembly was the turning point and a historical event of the Cambodian nation and people, of the Kampuchea revolution, and of the Kampuchea worker class. And it was the day in which our Communist Party of Kampuchea, the correct Marx-Lenin Party was really born.

This great assembly decided on three main issues:

First: Decided on the basic strategy for the Democratic National Revolution.

Second: Decided on the Party's statute.

Third: Decided on the forming of the Party's Central Committee to lead countrywide.

Following, I would like to tell about some substances of the basic line of the Democratic National Revolution of our Party. How did we decide at that time? Let's examine things then and now in order to see whether they are correct or not. In fact, our subsequent victories until that of the 17 April 1975 are clearly correct. However, we have

to review the reason and the scientific analysis that prompted us to decide on our basic line then.

First point: The great assembly had analyzed and determined correctly what the real nature of the Kampuchean society during that time was. What kind was Kampuchean society at that time? What kinds of conflicts were within the Kampuchean society then? We must find this problem, and finding it was the key and basic work for determining our task. If we analyzed the nature of the Kampuchean society correctly, we would be able to set a right task. If we analyzed the Kampuchean society incorrectly, we would have the wrong revolutionary task.

Cambodia at that time was a satellite of the imperialist, especially the American imperialist. It meant that Cambodia was not independent. Cambodia was not free. It was semi-slavery. It was a satellite of the imperialist. To say it conclusively, it was the satellite of the American imperialist. That was one analysis. Did this analysis contradict with that of the other persons? Yes, it did. There were contradictory views within our internal ranks, our elements, and national society. This was because in our national society some said that our country was being independent while others said that we got an independence since 1949. There were some others saying that we got an independence since 1954 as a result of the Geneva agreement. Regardless when we got an independence, in conclusion, these two opinions claimed that Cambodia was independent. But, in reality, was Cambodia independent or not at that time? Based on our analysis, Cambodia was not independent. The economy was not independent, the culture was not independent, the social affair was not independent, and the politic was not independent. Some sectors were independent but others were not. Non-independence meant it was still a satellite of the foreign country and the imperialist, including the American imperialist who was the leader. Military was not independent either. The Khmer-American military agreement made on 16 May 1955 confirmed that we were not independent. Besides this, the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization also casted its <<shadow>> over Cambodia. So, although its appearance was in the independent and neutral form, its substance and nature were not because the economy and culture were dominated by that of the imperialist. The nature of the social life was dominated by that of the imperialist, especially by that of the ruling classes. We determined that Cambodia was a satellite of the imperialist, meaning that it was a semi-colony country. We made this analysis, and we made it clear that conflicts were existing. This analysis was based on the fact that Cambodia was oppressed by other countries, economically, culturally, socially, politically, and militarily. So, it was not independent. It was not a total slavery, but it was a semi-slavery. Was there a conflict if it was semi-slavery? Yes, there was. There was a conflict between the Kampuchean population and the imperialist, especially the American imperialist who came from outside. They did not invade us through war, but they invaded us economically, culturally, socially, and militarily. They controlled everything. So, in reality, there was a conflict. Automatically there was a conflict. But, some people were trying to burry this conflict by claiming that there was no conflict at all.

There was a conflict between the Kampuchean population and the imperialist, especially the American imperialist. So, we had to solve this conflict. This conflict must be solved through the correct revolutionary tasks, meaning that the entire forces of the

population must be gathered up to fight the imperialist, especially the American imperialist in order to get an independence, sovereignty, and territory integrity.

This task is the national revolution task. National revolution task means attacking and kicking out the imperialist and liberating the country from them. This was what we found. After this finding, we must have a firm stance. If we did not see this, we would not have the correct task, and would not be able to fight the imperialist. And even if we saw this, but if the stance was not firm, the task would not be correct. Then, we would be reluctant and fighting it indecisively with an unclear stance. Our Party determined that this conflict was obviously existing inside Cambodia. So, we were tasked to gather up the entire forces of the population to fight the imperialist, especially the American imperialist. We collected whoever wanted to fight against the imperialist, especially the American imperialist. This was a correct task. As for the oppressive reactionary classes, they said during that time that who they should resist since there was no American in the country. For us, we analyzed the situation sociologically. We examined what was the real nature of the society, of the economy, of the military, and of the culture. Were these sectors independent or not? That was how we examined them. We did not only examine their appearances. In reality, the economy, culture society, and military were not independent. They were dependent on others or were in the semi-slavery condition. If that was the case, did we want an independence? The people wanted an independence; so, we had to be tasked to gather up the people to fight the imperialist, especially the American imperialist for an independence. This is one point.

Second point: The great assembly analyzed and decided on the conflict in the Kampuchean society directly. During the time the line was being developed, there was clearly classes classification within the Kampuchean society. There were worker class, peasant class, secondary capitalist class, capitalist class, and feudal class. It was clear that 5 classes were existing. How was the status of the conflict within these 5 classes? The conflict was complicated. There were conflict between the worker and capitalist, the conflict between the secondary capitalist and capitalist, the conflict between the peasant and landowner, and the conflict between the peasant and capitalist etc...existing. The conflict was very intricate. But what was the outstanding and dominating conflict during that time? In order to find this out, we must try to find out which conflict impacted the people the most, and which class oppressed which class the most. Based on our examination of the Cambodian society during that time, the peasants composed of 85% of the population in the entire country. So, the peasants were in the absolute majority. Were the peasants oppressed by whom? They were oppressed by all classes included the landowner and the capitalist classes. However, the peasants were oppressed by the landowner the most and more directly. So, 85% of the population, who were peasants, had the conflict directly with the oppressive feudal landowner class. So, we concluded that among these conflicts, the outstanding one was that between the peasants and the landowner. And it was outstanding because the peasant class (85%) represented the majority of the entire population. It was important to solve this biggest conflict first in order to collect this biggest force to be on our side. So, in the Cambodian society during that time there were many complicate conflicts, but the outstanding and dominating one was the conflict between the peasant class and the landowner class.

The landowner oppressed the peasant in all forms. We could see the peasants were oppressed everywhere. We collected the documents about that and examined them personally for many years at the bases, villages, and communes in the countryside. I want to tell you an example in Battambang province. From 1957 to 1958 Thmâr Kol (ថ្មីគោល) district covered a large area of rice field, but 90% of it was in the hand of the landowner. Out of tens of thousands of population in the district, just 4 to 10 persons owning 90% of lands; the remaining 10% was shared among tens of thousands people. That was why we determined that there was a pauperization in the countryside. Pauperization meant to make the peasant to become poorer. For the rich peasant, if they labored their paddy by themselves, sooner or later they would become mid level peasants. For the mid level peasant, if they labored their paddy by themselves while being partly oppressed, it would not be long, they would become the low level mid-peasant. And for the low level mid-peasants, they would become poor peasant after a short period. As for the poor peasants, in just a short time, they would lose all their land; so they had to go to work as the worker-laborer or cyclo driver or trailer driver in the city. This was called the pauperization in the countryside. However, the landowner would become richer and richer. That was the status of the conflict in the Cambodian society during that time. So, this conflict existed pervasively in the Cambodian society countrywide.

-I now would like to tell about a documented story in Daun Tei (ដូនតី) commune.

Daun Tei commune was in the east part of Kampong Cham which is now in the East Zone. We examined how the feudalist landowner came to oppress people there and in what form. A black short/trunk at that time cost only two or three Riels only, but the land owner sold it to the peasant on credit for the price of 10 to 15 barrels of rice. The peasant bought the trunk on credit and would pay for it after their rice crops collected. When the harvest season arrived, the peasant took 10 to 15 barrels of rice to pay the landowner for that trunk they had bought. Generally, a mid-peasant couple in Daun Tei commune had three children. So, an average family had 5 family members, and in a year the whole family needed only 30 barrels of rice for food and next season seed. But, if they spent 15 barrels for just one trunk, and 30 barrels if they wanted two trunks, that was an equivalence to the whole year of food ration of a mid peasant family. This was a very serious oppression in the countryside.

One who did not look at this problem did not see how serious the oppression was. So, this was the life and death conflict. It was a deep conflict within the Cambodian society, and it affected 85% of the population. That was why the great assembly of the Party's representatives determined that that type of conflict was the adversary conflict. So, how did we solve this conflict? We must incite the peasant to resist and fight against the feudalist landowner class. This was the only solution. But in order for the peasant to win their fight, they had to join hands together to do it.

Based on our experience, if 85% of them were collected, the remaining ones would soon follow although there might be a small number of people not wanting to join. And because of that, the Democratic Revolution task was developed.

The Democratic Revolution meant to liberate the people from this condition. Obviously, liberating the people means to liberate this 85% majority of them who are in this peasant class. If we can liberate 85% of the people successfully, it means we have liberated the people countrywide. The majority of the remaining people will follow this

force. This force is the great revolutionary force. This is not just in quantity, but it has a quality of the life and death conflict. To find this force is to see the key to the victory.

However, if we see that our peasant are undeveloped, not hygienic [unhealthy], poor, ignorant and cannot do a revolution, we are making a wrong analysis. We do not analyze the conflict in the society in a sociological way. In fact, this 85% is the great force in terms of quantity, plus, they are in a serious conflict. If they have conflict, their wrath is strong.

But why this conflict has been buried? This is because the landowner class, the ruling officials, and the guru of the oppressive class want to burry it. Also, the ideological myth about the ill fate or bad deeds from the previous life etc... has deceived the people, preventing them from seeing this conflict. In reality, there is a conflict. We will not see that the conflict has existed unless we use the sociological analysis. The peasant class must be incited to see the conflict. They must be incited to see the conflict and to develop class wrath in order to resist. This is the key to determine the victory. If we analyze like this, we will become more confident.

In conclusion, there are two tasks for the Democratic National Revolution, one of which is to fight the imperialist and another is to fight the feudalist landowner. Through this line, we have to incite poor peasant and low level mid-peasant to rise up.

Cadres should go to live in the remote areas in the countryside but not in town. When staying in the remote area, we will find out how many barrel of rice a peasant needs for food, and how many barrels of rice could buy a trunk. How the poor and lower level mid-peasants are being oppressed. We can find this out if we live with them constantly. And we can explain to them about how they are being oppressed by the feudalist, semi-feudalist, trader and capitalist. Comrades can also see how the resistance movement took place in the countryside since 1964.

The resistance movement in 64, 65, 66, and 67 was overwhelmed. We followed this movement and saw clearly that it was very strong. The movement in 64 and 65 was very strong. It was even stronger in 66. In 67 it was greatly strong. Tens of thousands of peasants demonstrated and revolted in front of the district, commune, and provincial headquarters, complaining about the loss of their land. They sent letter to their representatives demanding the solution, and, in particular, they armed themselves with knife, machete, and ax, the typical weapons of the peasant. Armed with machete and knife, the poor peasant surrounded the police and soldier posts and resorted to revolutionary violence because the ruling classes did not want to solve the problem of the land which had been robbed from them. The ruling classes were collaborating with the landowner. Since the ruling classes were themselves the feudalist landowner class, how could they solve the problem for the peasant. The problem could not be solved then. Lying to and deceiving the peasants could be made only once. When they kept lying to the peasant repeatedly, the peasant became angry with them. That anger was the class-wrath, and that class-wrath was the consequence of the class-conflict.

When this happened, the problem could not be solved; so, the poor peasant did not fear for their life anymore, they attacked the land robber. The peasant was not afraid of dying anymore because losing all lands was like losing life. That was the arising movement of the peasant. The movement of the peasant countrywide was very powerful.

Some people had the idea that how the revolution could be done with just the empty hand and without any forces. That was because they did not see our rising and

awakening people. This awakening was not the result of the propaganda and educational works, but it stemmed from the struggling movement of class-wrath and class-conflict. If the problem could not be solved, the people must resort to revolutionary violence. This wild force was born because of the experience they had come through. So, we were able to whip up the peasants, 85% of the country population, successfully.

This force was great. This was why we dare to resist. Why did the Party believe in the people? The Party saw the existence of class-conflict in the people and their struggle to solve that conflict by themselves. We just directed them to unite and do it collectively, but not individually. This analysis was decided in the 1st great assembly of the Party's representatives, which opened the way for us to see the right direction. If we did not find that during the assembly, we would lose our direction.

Some people thought that struggling in the parliament was more powerful/effective. Struggling in the parliament was also done by the Party, but it was in the secondary form only. It was not the strategic force and method. The struggling through the media channel was that to expand the knowledge to the mass, but it was not the basic force. The basic force was the peasant force. In our country the situation was different from that of the industrialized countries.

Unlike others, our worker force was not the main force for our revolution. At the beginning, we also worked actively within our worker community. Since 1955, we worked with the workers and moved them successfully throughout the country. The associations were then organized to whip up the worker movement countrywide. Comrade deputy secretary was tasked to lead the workers. But the number of our workers was too small. There were worker movements in each factory, but they were destroyed by the enemy subsequently. Whenever the movement rose up, the enemy smashed them. For example, at the train unit, the worker movement was the strongest one in Cambodia. But the enemy had destroyed many of us there. Some of our comrades, who have survived that period and are now with us here, have become insane because they were mistreated badly at that time. The worker class was very good and had the leadership nature, but they were small in number, and because they worked in the factory and work camp, they were totally in the enemy's hand.

Therefore, our analysis about the conflict between the peasant and landowner in the Cambodian society at that time was basically correct. Regardless whatever any persons were saying at the time, we still believed in our force. Regardless how difficult it was, we still believed in our people force because they were struggling so hard, and their struggling was under the correct line of our Party's leadership. The struggling then was in all forms, and even the girls had joined our movement. Among many events there was one event which I want to bring up here as an example so that you can see how broad our people's struggling movement was at that time.

Krâvar (ក្រវាវ) village was in Krâvar commune in Baray (បារាយ) district, situating in a remote area on the upper land along the forest range on the Chinit (ជិនិត) riverbank. The enemy mistreated the people there badly. They especially took away people lands.



In this photo: Our cooperative peasants in a blacksmith workshop are producing all kinds of tools so that they will have enough of them for use in the upcoming harvest season.

When the people rose up and resisted, the enemy arrested all the men in the village, leaving only the women and children behind. The Party instructed the villagers to resist locally and to protest at the parliamentary level. The women in the village said how they could go to protest at the parliament since they had never come to Phnom Penh previously. They did not know where the parliament was and whom they could log their complaint with. We had told them that they could ride the bus from Kampong Cham to Phnom Penh; and when they arrived, they could tell the cyclo driver to take them to the house of Chao Sèn Kosâl (ចៅ សែន កុសល), who was the president of the parliament at the time. We told them that the cyclo driver knew where his house was. When they arrived at his house, they could insist him to help.

They later left in group including children. In Phnom Penh, they told the cyclo driver to take them to Chao Sèn Kosâl's house and stayed in front of it for three to four days. They insisted that he had to help or they would not leave. They were staying there until Chao Sèn Kosâl agreed to help them to give back their land and to release their husbands back home.

This is to show that even these people were illiterate, never knew the city, the bus, and Phnom Penh, and the parliament, but, under the leadership of the Party, they dared to resist. So, the people force was so great, they could overcome everything. The people could use any forms to resist/struggle in any way they wanted. This is our people force.

How did we do it? We could succeed because we had analyzed and solved the conflict rightly, and we incited [took side with] the right party in the conflict. And that was the line we had developed.

After we analyzed the conflict in the society in Cambodia, how can we determine who are the enemy and who are the forces of the revolution. There are two enemies to be attacked: The 1st one is the imperialist, especially the American imperialist; and the 2nd ones are the feudalist-landowner and reactionary comprador. In our forces, there are worker, peasant, secondary capitalist, national capitalist, and the nationalist progressive dignitaries. All available forces in the national society must be collected. If just a small number is collected, we cannot win. If just a reasonable number is collected, we will win reasonably. If many forces are collected, we will win many. But if the strong forces are collected, we will win strongly. This is the winning and losing factor. So, how do we collect the worker force, the peasant force, the secondary capitalist force, the national capitalist force, and the nationalist dignitaries? That we have to follow our line.

And then which conflict is the important one to be attacked first? The main conflict to be attacked is that with the imperialist and feudalist landowner.

So, with the above forces, if there is a minor conflict, we should solve it together with them because we need to gather up forces to attack the imperialist enemy, especially the American enemy, and the feudalist-landowner and reactionary comprador regime. Based on this line we can collect all forces. We can assign our forces to work with different groups. We should send cadres to work with workers, peasants, secondary capitalist and intellectuals, students and monks, national capitalist, and the dignitary nationalist and progressive persons. This means that we must collect as many available forces as possible. We do not just work with the workers and peasants but with the

secondary capitalist, students and monks, intellectuals, national capitalist, and the dignitary nationalist and progressive persons.

But how can we collect them? This cannot be done unless we have the correct politic and reason about which they can understand. Also, they will support us if they can benefit from our work. When we speak with them, they can either agree or disagree with us, but we should keep on discussing with them again and again. If in the past they did not see that American imperialist was bad, after our routine talks with them, they will see otherwise. After that, they will join us to fight the American imperialist for independence, peace and neutrality.

Each of these forces has its own role, but the main forces are the peasant ones, who compose of 85% of the total forces. If we can collect many peasant forces, the other ones will follow subsequently; then, we will be able to collect over 95% of the total forces. These 95% forces are, in general, responsible for fighting the enemy, but they are in different categories; they are strategic forces and methodic forces. We have decided that the worker-peasant forces are basically the strategic forces.

In their role, the secondary capitalist forces, such as students and intellectuals, are the allied forces of the worker-peasant. Because of their class background, they still play the same role then and now.

The national capitalists are the supportive strategic forces in the framework of the Democratic National Revolution. They are not the basic forces because the national capitalists are sometimes with the enemy and sometimes with the revolution. They follow the direction of the wind; it depends on how strong or weak the wind is.

The methodic forces include those dignitaries in the feudalist bourgeoisie, capitalist comprador, and landowner, who will agree more or less to resist the enemy. We have to try to collect these forces. For Samdach Pen Nuth (ប៊ែន ណុត), Prince Sihanouk, the Mohanikay Patriarch Chuon Nath (ជួន ណាត), and the Dhamayut Patriarch, we should attentively collect them to be in our forces. We should collect them all. Our line is correct, and we basically apply it correctly, and that is based on the Front's line to collect all the national and people forces. This line is firm and extensive and is based on the alliance with the worker-peasant under the leadership of our Party. We have received good results continuously in organizing the revolutionary strategic and methodic forces. This makes us stronger and isolates the enemy farther. Here, I want to say that we can collect as many forces as possible, and we can divide up the enemy forces making them to fight against each other.

Our line is to classify the enemies into three categories.

1st, take the opportunity to persuade any enemy who want to be on our side.

2nd, neutralize some elements so that they are not able to attack us.

3rd, isolate the savage groups so that we can attack them when there is a chance.

Through this strategy, we have the opportunity to divide the enemies up and cause them some internal conflicts.

‘A’ Sim Var (ស៊ីម វ៉ារ) and ‘A’ Sâm Sary (សំ សារី) have the same real nature.

They are the CIA. Sim Var is in the Free Khmer movement of Soeun Ngoc Thann who is also the CIA. Sâm Sary is a CIA, but, in certain circumstances, we can break them away from the others. We used to persuade Sim Var to attack Sâm Sary. During that time we joined in the Front with Sim Var to topple Sâm Sary successfully. After cooperating with us for two to three years, Sim Var turned back to attack us, but we dealt with him accordingly. It was the opportunity for us to collect forces to fight the enemy. If we were rigid, discriminating, and not knowing how to take the opportunity to collect forces to serve the revolutionary movement, we would lose forces. But this force was the methodic force. The strategic forces whom we strived to collect were the workers and peasants, especially the poor peasants and the low level mid peasants who were living throughout the country.

I would like to emphasize that if we did not apply this line to collect forces, no way that we were able to seize the victory. In the past, during the Democratic National Revolution, we could seize the victory because we had organized forces based on this line. It was right that we collected forces based on this line. We knew who the strategic forces were and who the methodic ones were. We dared to resist, to unite, to make a concession, and to tolerate in order to unite and attack the main enemy. That was the Party’s line. It was our leading line.

I would like to emphasize that while we are now doing socialist revolution and building socialism, we should not risk doing it carelessly. Currently, during this socialist revolution and socialism building stage, if we do it carelessly, the people will not support us, and we cannot move forward.

The past two years were the key years. It was very hard for us to move through these years because we had just come out of the disastrous war. But we were able to pass through these years successfully and impressively on our own. How did this happen? This was because the people themselves did the revolution. If there were no people forces doing the revolution, we would not reach this stage. Basically, we organized forces rightly. We were not 100% right, but we were mostly absolutely right. Yes, there were some shortcomings, but merits had the leading role and dominated during the process of forces organizing. So, we were not subjective in doing the revolution, and we did not just do it spontaneously. The revolution does not divide the forces up, it gathers up forces as much as possible. This revolution is so great and profound because it replaces all old things with the new ones. That is a big upside down. So, this is not a simple work. The forces must be thoroughly organized in order to win.

We have stood on this principle since the 1st great assembly of the Party’s representatives, and we adjusted its wrongs or rights along the way in order to organize, strengthen and expand our forces. That was why our forces were so strong during the Democratic National Revolution. And because the forces of the masses were so strong, we were able to accomplish everything included politic, military, economy, and social affairs. Our war at the frontline was strong and so was our food production works at the rear line. The entire population was actively moving, and no force was left burying.

We had good lesson and profound and sharp confidence in our work in organizing the revolutionary forces to fight the enemy and seize the victory.

What were the forms of struggle after this force had been organized?

The forms of the revolutionary struggle decided by the 1st great assembly of the Party's representatives were as follow:

The 1st form of the struggle was to apply the political struggle and use the revolutionary violence. This meant we had to use revolutionary violence by doing the politic and arm struggles at the same time. Violence was the wild form for dealing with and attacking the enemy.

The 2nd form included the use of the legitimate, semi-legitimate and illegitimate forms, but take the illegitimate form as the basic one. We used the illegitimate form as the basic one because doing revolution was, usually, already and illegal act since there was no law of the oppressive class permitting us to do the revolution. Gathering up people to struggle is already illegal. But do we dare to struggle or not? If we do the revolution, we must dare to struggle because the revolution is illegal. Doing the revolution is to overthrow the old state power and replace it with the new one. That was the reason the Party's line decided to use the illegitimate form as the base. We bring this up here now in order to make it clear about our view and stance. If we are not clear about that, we will struggle only in the legitimate form. And if the law does not permit us to struggle, we will not dare to do it; this means that we are not doing the revolution. So, this form of struggle is the revolutionary principle toward the victory.

The 3rd form of the struggle included the open struggle, half-open struggle and the underground struggle, using the underground struggle as the basic one. At the same time we were making open struggle, half-open struggle and the underground struggle, we had to make the underground struggle as the basic one. We did that because the enemy did not permit us to do the revolution. So, in order to do the revolution and move the people to do it, we had to make contact, propagandize and live with them so that we could incite them secretly. The open form was not enough, as it is extensive but not going deeply inside the people.

For example, if we publish 100 newspapers, we write only about things within the framework of the state law and that of the feudalist-capitalist class. So, the substance of the revolution does not go deep inside the people. The substance of classes and that of the struggle to overthrow the oppressive classes do not reach the people at the bases. The substance of the revolution will not reach and go deeply inside the people at the bases unless we go to work within the people directly and secretly. The activity line and the form of struggle must be correct in order to seize the victory and gather up forces successfully. That was why the Party assigned the members to take on different kinds of works. For example, who should do the open work, who were to work as the members of the parliament, who should work in the government (the government of the former regime), who should be the civil servants, who were to work openly in the mass organizations, and who should work as the journalist. But we all were working to incite the people. That was how we shared works among our selves. But there was section doing the underground work. They incited the people secretly. There were the open and the underground sections in both places Phnom Penh and the countryside. The underground movement was our base, whose works were to protect the revolutionary

forces and at the same time incite the people. If we all did only the open works, the enemy would see and attack us. These were the forms of struggle we made then in order to use our forces within the people effectively. We did not use the forces wildly or wasted them unreasonably. Through these forms, we were able to struggle throughout the country. We were able to carry out the struggle in the countryside, in the city, openly and secretly. We were able to carry out the struggle in the parliament, the government, the associations of the mass, the media, and the educational associations. We even worked in the cremation [funeral home] association, the pagoda and Buddhist protection association. We moved, gathered up and incited the mass to struggle in various forms in accordance with our slogans. We used all kinds of forms within the people warfare framework. Although just political struggle was carried out at that time, all kinds of its available forms were used. When all kinds of forms were used, we were able to attack the enemy, big or small, from all directions. These were the routine incitement activity and training for the people. Because all of these forms were used, we were strong. If we made the struggle only in countryside, we would not have any control over the city forces; and if we made the struggle only in the city, we would not have the countryside forces. Therefore, we made all kinds of the struggles simultaneously in the countryside, in the city, openly, secretly, legitimately and illegitimately.

As for the roles of the city and countryside movements, we should not be too far to the left or too far to the right. If we focus only in the countryside and think that the city is not important, it means too <<left>>. But if we think that the countryside is useless, but the city struggle will draw world attention, it is too right. And if that happens, we abandon the strategic forces. Our Party is neither <<left>> nor right because we struggle in both sectors, and our basic struggles are:

1st is to struggle in both places the countryside and city.

2nd is to use the countryside as the base.

The struggles are to be carried out in both the city and countryside, but use the countryside as the base. This is our line. Why do we use the countryside as our supportive base? And why do not we use the city as the main support? The city cannot be used as the main support because, geographically, it is small and containing many people. Plus, the enemies are everywhere in the city. The parliament, the court, the prison, the police and the soldier are all in the city. The enemy networks are everywhere, and the class system in the city is mixed and very complicate. The countryside is wide and there are few enemies living there. In some villages, there is no enemy or soldier at all while in other villages there are one or two soldiers or policemen only. This means that the enemy's force in the countryside is weak and having gap. There are many peasants in the countryside whose class is very good.

These were the reasons we had chosen the countryside as the supportive base for the revolution. First, the peasant forces were our political support, and second, for economic support, we could stay with the people and worked with them to produce food to support our selves. Third, they were our military support, and fourth, they provided shelter for our leaderships.

This is the meaning of the countryside support. This is how we prepare our journey. It was since 1960 when the members of the Party Center went down to work in the countryside; and from 1963 on, most Party Center members (90%) went down to the countryside. We must go to the countryside to incite the mass peasants directly. But we

still worked to incite the struggle in the city. We did that in order to pull the enemy legs away from each other so that they became off balance. We tore them apart to prevent them from gathering forces to attack us in the countryside and the city. We fought two battlefields at the same time to weaken the enemy. So, after the Party's line had been absorbed, there were strong struggling movements in Phnom Penh, in other big towns, and in the countryside.

-In 1963, all kinds of American aids were denied. That was the result of our people, students, intellectuals, workers-laborers, and monk struggling along with that of our dignitaries working in the parliament and the government and also the pressure from the countryside forces. This was one important event during the time of our people struggling.

-In January 1964, the great demonstration by tens of thousands people was held in Phnom Penh against the American imperialist and the traitorous LON Nol. Later on in March, the anti-American imperialist great demonstration was held by hundred thousands of people to attack the American embassy. The demonstrators took the American flag down and stepped on it on the ground. This was the great struggle of the people in the city.

-In 1965, we cut off diplomatic relation with American. This was the result of our people glorious subsequent struggling movements etc...

While these events were taking places, it gave the opportunity to the countryside to build up and expand their revolutionary forces.

How was the struggling in the countryside? The people continued struggling against land grabbing. This happened in 64, 65, 66, and 67. The struggling was relentless. In 1967, the situation of our people in the countryside throughout the country became fully ripen. So, the people armed themselves with machete, knife, ax, and club to attack the police and soldier positions, using high level of violence. Because the situation was ripen then, in 1967, there was an arm uprising in Samlaut (សំឡូត) in Battambang province. The people rose up by themselves. At that time the Party Center did not decide yet to take up arm uprising countrywide, but Battambang exploded before anywhere else because the peasants' struggling movement was boiling. But in that year of 1967 the Party instructed the Northwest Zone to hold back their arm uprising and wait for the entire country to prepare our selves first so that we at the other places could do it simultaneously. However, if Battambang decided to fight alone, the enemy would be able to gather up forces to destroy the revolutionary forces there easily.

So, in 1967 the situation in the countryside was tense. It was like the dry rice hay in the rice field during March and April, which was very dry. In such situation, if it caught a spark of fire, the blaze would spread throughout the country. The situation was ripen like this. We examined, analyzed, and grasped that the situation of our people movement was like that at the time. That was why in mid 1967 after the experience of the arm uprising in Samlaut of Battambang province, the Party decided that we had to start the arm struggle against the enemy soon in order to protect the revolution and create the conditions for us to strengthen and expand our revolutionary forces further. If we did not take on an arm struggle at that time, the enemy would definitely destroy our revolutionary forces. We must start the arm struggle because the people were already ready. The people were boiling; the class wrath was boiling; the national wrath was

boiling. The people had already tried. They struggled with just their empty hand, with club, and with machete against the enemy.

The situations in the countryside and the city were like that. That was why the enemy was off balance and not able to deal with our revolutionary forces. It was because we were fighting in the city and the countryside simultaneously.

Through this experience, the Party decided that if we still kept doing political struggle and ignoring the arm struggle, we would not be able to protect our revolutionary forces. Furthermore, we would not be able to strengthen and expand our revolutionary forces.

So, we started the arm struggle/uprising in 1968.

In January, an arm uprising took place in the Northwest Zone. We confiscated 4-10 guns, and continued our attack on the enemy further. The enemy made counterattacks.

In January, an arm uprising took place in the Southwest Zone. The Southwest confiscated more guns than any other places because they were rioting against the police and soldiers and seized about 200 guns from them. Nearly 200 guns was not a small number at that time. So, we had strong forces for the attack. We had not used gun to attack, but the empty hands to do it and to confiscate the guns through mass rioting.

In March 1968 an uprising took place in the East Zone. But, there, we were late for gun seizing because while the Zone secretary was preparing an assembly meeting to riot, like how the Southwest had done, the enemy moved their weapons away. So, the East Zone had empty hand but 3-4 guns only. So, the enemy mistreated and persecuted our revolution movement there for many months afterward. After our arm uprising in March, we were persecuted by them during the months of March, April, May, and June. The ordeal took more than 3 months. Many of our bases, houses, villages and people were destroyed and dispersed. It was not until July when we were able to counterattack on the enemy. We organized our forces to attack one enemy's post where we destroyed them and confiscated 70 guns, which became the capital for us to create our military forces there at that time. The people at the beginning had only the empty hand, but because they were armed with the revolutionary violence, training, and experience, they were able to confiscate guns from the enemy.

The North Zone took on an arm uprising in March 1968 also and confiscated only 4 guns from the police. There, we faced with some difficulties while we were fighting the enemy forth and back.

The Northeast Zone took on an arm uprising on 30 March, 1968. We had only 4-5 guns, confiscated from the enemy earlier, plus 3-4 guns, which were used for protecting the Center Office, to attack the enemy. So, in the Northeast Zone, we had even less than 10 guns for fighting against the enemy.

Speaking about the weapon, only the Southwest Zone had the most. The other places had just a few guns. What type of guns were they? They were obsolete. Among 10 bullets, only one could be fired out. Although we were in that situation, we were still able to fight. Our guerilla movements fought in January, February, March, April and May, and expanded countrywide. Out of 19 provinces in the country, we had our guerilla movements in 17 provinces. We fought and at the same time confiscated the enemy's guns. No Zone was able to reinforce another because they were far away from each other. One leadership was in the Northwest Zone, another leadership was in the Southwest,

another was in the East, another one was in the Northeast, and another was in Phnom Penh. We were far away from each other. When we needed to contact each other, it took us one month to do it. In order to make a contact with each other, we had to ride the elephant and walk, and we had to evade the enemy's checkpoints. So, when we arrived at one place, the situation had been already changed. For example, if this month report was sent to the Center Office in Rattanakiri (រតនគិរី), until the report arrived at the Office, the situation had already changed. When the instruction of the Center was sent back, it was already behind the practical situation. Only the policy line and important objectives could be instructed. So, each place must be independent-mastery and self reliance and carrying out the Party's line correctly. But each place was able to protect their forces and expand them successfully. As the result, from 1968-69 to March 1970, we had built the following bases:

1st : The supportive bases:

In the Northeast Zone, we had strong supportive bases and more than 30 thousands people in the bases. They were called the supportive base because they could not be infiltrated by the enemy. In total, there were more than 60 thousands people in the supportive bases in the Southwest, East, Northwest and other Zones. Over sixty thousands people in the supportive bases was not a small number.

2nd : The Chhlop/Militia bases:

The Chhlop bases were second to the supportive bases. Although we had control over these bases, they could be infiltrated by the enemy. The enemy were not able to infiltrate these as often as they wanted , but they could infiltrate them. Throughout the country from 68-69 to early 70, we had about 3 hundred thousands people in our Chhlop bases.

3rd: The Chhlop zone:

The Chhlop zone means the place for the enemy and for us also. It was the battleground where we could go to attack the enemy or the enemy could come to attack us. In the Chhlop zone, we had about 7 hundred thousands people in total countrywide.

So, during the internal war from 1968-69 to early 70, we had more than 1 million people already in the supportive bases, Chhlop base, and Chhlop zone.

This number was not small. These forces were only quantitative, they were the base people forces who had come through training and struggling continuously. So, these forces were very strong. Even with the empty hand, we could organize many forces like that. In 1968, we had only empty hand. We had no gun, no medic, no medicine, and no rice. But, still, we dared to struggle because we grasped firmly our people forces. If we were able to grasp them, these people forces became the revolutionary forces, the Chhlop forces, and the arm forces to attack the enemy. They were the forces, who produced foods to support themselves, who were the medics producing medicines for themselves, and the messengers, who could do anything in both the frontline and rear line.

As of early 1970, our troops in the entire country were about 4 thousands. This number was not small for the guerilla warfare; and especially, they were the good quality military.

I want to take the vanguard unit of the Northeast Zone as an example here. Comparing to the Southwest and East Zones, the Northeast had the least vanguards. In 1968, the Northeast Zone had only 70 vanguard troops who were organized into 7 groups. Each group of 10 troops had only 3 guns in addition to a couple of grenades, some muskets and crossbows. In 1969, they increased to 10 groups, and in late 69, they were organized into platoon units. In early 1970, they were organized into the company unit, but only 30-40% of the troops were armed.

But, I would like to tell that the enemy had attacked us fiercely since we were having only 7 group units. In early 1969, 'A' Chou Long (ជូឡុង) [Nhek Chou Long] who was the chief of the general staff, 'A' Nol, 'A' Tak (តៈ) [Sirikmatak], 'A' Sāk Sut Sakhân (សាក់ ស៊ុត សាខន), and 'A' Sostene [Sostene Fernandez] and their other military commanders and (1/3 of their entire arm forces), included the infantry, tank unit, artillery unit, and air force went to attack us in Rattanakiri. In the Northeast Zone, our vanguard unit had only 150 troops. Of these 150 troops, we took turn to fight against them; while 70 troops were fighting them, the other 70 took a rest because we did not have enough guns. Using the guerilla tactics, we were able to fight the enemy, to defend and expand our supportive base, our Chhlop bases and Chhlop zones. We did not just stay in Rattanakiri but we even went into Steung Treng (ស្ទឹងត្រែង) and Mundulkiri (មណ្ឌលគិរី). We were advancing deeply. That was why during the minister cabinet meeting in 1969, as the chief of the general staff, Chou Long reported to the meeting that the situation in Rattanakiri was critical. Lon Nol said in the meeting that in Rattanakiri, the Khmer Rouge had captured and controlled over the territory of about 3 times the size of Kampong Chhnang province.

At other places the situation was the same. The Southwest had attacked Kampot (កំពត), Takeo (តាកែវ), and Kampong Speu (កំពង់ស្ពឺ) continuously. The East Zone attacked up to the National Road 7. During the night, the East Zone troops took control over the whole Road 7. So, from 68-69 to early 70, in the entire country, we had only 4 thousand troops in total, but these troops were in strong quality who attacked the enemy actively.

As early as 1970 we had about 50,000 Chhlops in the entire country. These 50,000 Chhlops were fighting the enemy actively. They were able to engage in fighting alone or in a two or three person team. They could fight with just 1 gun, with only musket, crossbow, hand grenade or landmine. These forces fought actively. They were not in the defensive position. They did not wait for the enemy to come to attack them. They went to fight the enemy at their position. They followed the defending and attacking tactics. In order to protect their base successfully, they must go to look for and attack the enemy in their position. If we attacked the enemy first in their position, the enemy would not be able to come to ours. So, the Chhlops went to attack the enemy's positions everywhere. They were the base people who knew the local geography well; they knew the terrains, forests, and creeks.

The enemy came to attack us with their infantry, tank units, artillery pieces, military trucks, and aircrafts. But in the Northeast, like in other mountainous areas, the

enemy's aircrafts, artillery pieces, tank units, and military trucks were not effective. Their aircrafts and artilleries bombed and shelled us, but they could not hit our people because the forests were so thick. They hit the forests only. Their tanks and trucks were not effective because they could not pass through the thick forests and hills. Their infantry troops could not deal with our bamboo spike traps and pit traps. We cut down the trees across the trail and road to block their move. If they forced their way into our territory, they would be trapped in the forests, and our Chhlops would masterily attack them at will. This was the people war which was based on the guerilla warfare tactics. Using the guerilla tactics, we could launch the attack everywhere, and any one of us could do it. The local people could organize themselves to attack the enemy without any help from the regular military unit. On this point, I want to specify that our people war line, which was based on the guerilla tactics, was very powerful. So, because we had 50,000 Chhlops in countrywide, we could attack the enemy at anywhere we wanted to. We did not stay still. We went to attack the enemy at their positions everywhere. A team of Chhlop composed of 3 persons and a group composed of 10 persons. Each day these teams would go to look for the enemy to smash or wound at least one head of them. If these 50,000 Chhlops throughout the country were doing like that, can we figure out how many enemy heads we could smash each day. That would be a large number, and the enemy's forces would be shrunk by our Chhlop forces. We were confident with our people war line. We did not believe only in weapon, but in our people war line.

There were 4 thousand troops in our regular military units and 50,000 Chhlops. Immediately followed the coup d'état by the American imperialist and Lon Nol in 1970, these troops became the Sector military, regular military, and the vanguards. They were reorganized into company and battalion units. Troops in these units were not recruited from the ordinary villagers; they were the Chhlops who had fought in the battlefields in the past two or three years. They were reorganized into the regular military units. These units had fought vigorously in the past. That was why they surprised the enemy in the battlefield.

The American imperialist and its Asiano system and spy network strategically underestimated our forces ability. They underestimated our politic and military ability. Politically and strategically, they thought that, followed the coup d'état, Lon Nol would be able to take the <<Khmer Rouge>> on his side. But it happened otherwise. The Kampuchea Revolution was instead collecting the Kampuchean population and people throughout the country to fight against the American imperialist blazingly. So, strategically, they were politically wrong. Secondly, they thought that we would not have enough troops to fight them. They thought that after the coup d'état, their well armed military would join with Lon Nol troops to destroy us in just a short moment. But, in fact, we already had 50,000 Chhlops who had been trained well in fighting.

Just shortly after the coup d'état, the mass people were demonstrating and rioting throughout the country, attacking the enemy like the thunderbolt from all 8 directions. The people destroyed the whole layers of the enemy authority in the villages, communes, districts, and some provinces, and then reorganized our new revolutionary authority in those places. We had confiscated tens of thousand guns from the enemy and took them to arm our National Liberation Forces, who then included the vanguards, the Sector troops, and the district, commune and village Chhlops. So, at that time we had enough regular soldiers plus the Chhlops for the war.

Our combatants were masterily launching the attacks on every place in the country. So, strategically, American imperialist was also wrong militarily. But, even if they could estimate about our forces rightly then, they still could not win because the national liberation people warfare was undefeatable. We could say that our people warfare was undefeatable because this people warfare line stemmed from the people themselves.

Almost all of our people were making war and attacking the enemy in all battlefields and all sectors. They used anything to attack; anything they were able to invent. We were confident with and we proudly believed in our people and arm forces for their ability to liberate and protect our country.

We stood firmly on justice and on the correct revolution. We did not invade or persecuted anyone. Furthermore, our people warfare to liberate and protect the country was characterized as a scientific one. Mass people depended totally on the mass. Our female combatants were also very brave. In our military history there were female battalions and regiments units fighting directly in the frontline, especially in the lower Mekong battlefields, in the battlefields around Phnom Penh, and in various battlefields during the final assault into Phnom Penh in 1975.

As for our Party's line on building the arm forces, we did the following:

1-Organizing the arm forces by our selves based on the independent-mastery and self reliance stance, using people who had fought directly in the battlefield. When there are revolutionary people, there are revolutionary arm forces. When the revolutionary people are strong, the revolutionary arm forces are strong, the vanguard, the Sector troops and the Chhlop are strong, and they can launch the attack wherever and whenever they want.

2-As for our line on building military cadres, we built, strengthened and expanded them in the battlefield directly. The revolutionary military cadres, who came from the direct combat, had good experience and good political, ideological and organizational stance. They masterily and clearly knew about our situation and the enemy situation. They were able to carry out and follow the Party's line of attack effectively and correctly.

3-As for our line on arming and using weapon by our revolutionary arm forces, we basically and importantly stood on the stance of self-reliance. Self-reliance meant we went to attack the enemy at their position, confiscated and used their weapons to attack them. We took care of the weapons well, invented the new ones, and used them to fight the enemy effectively. The aids from foreign friends were optional, and we would accept them only in the situation we were in need for them.

Obviously, during our people 5 years war against the American imperialist invader, over 80% of the weapons we used to fight the enemy had been confiscated from them. Furthermore, our line on using weapons was that we just used whatever available. If we had less, we used less; and if we had more, we used more. We managed them carefully based on the necessity of each battlefield. We were not ration-ism. In general, mostly, only 70% of the troops in our each vanguard unit were armed during the 5 years war. Because our revolutionary troops at that time applied our Party's line correctly, they had the quality to attack the enemy vigorously and effectively. We must continue to learn from this experience and apply our Party's line on military organizing further based on the independent-mastery and self reliance stance.

While our country was still poor, we had to apply the military and people warfare line of our Party so that we could independently and masterily rely on our self in all circumstances.

As for the line on fighting the enemy, our Party determined that we must fight them militarily and politically. We must take the people from the enemy to our side, cut off their food supply line, destroy their spy network, persuade the enemy's troop to defect and stop attacking their own people. Since we followed the Party's line to fight the enemy in all sectors, we became stronger and were on the upper hand, while the enemy were shrinking and exhausted in mass day by day. Because their military was defeated, and more and more people had left them, they ran out of manpower and force and became isolated. They ran out of food supply, prompting their American master to transport foods to them every month. On an average, American had to transport 40 thousand tons of food supply each month to feed them just in Phnom Penh alone.



In this photo: Our revolutionary female combatants southwest of Phnom Penh are attacking to take care of the vegetables in the gardens so that they can grow well and quickly and yield as much crops as possible.