



Pol Pot's Nephew Called to Testify

By: Heather N. Goldsmith, J.D., Northwestern University School of Law

On Monday, April 23, 2012, the Trial Chamber of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) continued trial proceedings in Case 002 against accused Nuon Chea, Ieng Sary, and Khieu Samphan. The day was devoted to the examination of prosecution witness Saloth Ban, who was Pol Pot's nephew and the Secretary General for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the period of Democratic Kampuchea (DK). Although frequently prompted with leading questions, the witness recalled few specifics of the regime throughout his testimony.

The Day Begins

At the start of the day's proceedings, Chamber President, Nil Nonn announced that the next witness requested to have a duty lawyer present, had taken an oath, and had no relation to the accused.

Michael Karnavas, international defense counsel for Ieng Sary, took the floor, stating that the list of documents the prosecution intends to use when examining the witness has yet to appear on the court system. He suggested that it would be useful to have a tentative list on Friday for a witness that appears on Monday and asked the prosecution to inform them of their intentions. Mr. Vincent de Wilde, senior assistant co-prosecutor, responded that he posted the documents on Friday and did not know why they had not been made available to all parties. He offered to make a photocopy of the list available, reminding the Chamber that they were specifically asked not to email the list.

Saloth Ban Brought Before the Chamber

The witness Saloth Ban then entered the court with his duty lawyer. He began his testimony by telling the Chamber that he is a 67-year-old retired soldier with five children. He also stated that he had taken the oath and was not a blood relative of any of the accused.

The President reminded him of his rights and duties as a witness, specifically that a) he may refuse to respond to any questions that he believes may incriminate him, b) he must respond to the questions put to him by the Chamber or any party except in the case where he needs to make comments or is concerned about self-incrimination, and c) he must only say the truth he knew or experienced personally. The duty counsel was then instructed to advise the witness not to respond if he thought it could incriminate him.

The Prosecution Questions the Witness

Dararasmey Chan, senior assistant co-prosecutor, began the prosecution's examination of the witness. The witness stated he was the nephew of Pol Pot, his mother and father were farmers, he had nine siblings, and his family was considered to be part of the peasant class in Democratic Kampuchea (DK). During the regime he served as a messenger, a cook, and a medic. He clarified that he had not been qualified as medic but was sometimes asked to give injections. He reported that he failed his diploma exam and did not get accepted to college.

Saloth Ban next testified that he had a brother believed to be a Vietnamese soldier. He was not sure whether his brother also had a relationship with Pol Pot because the witness did not maintain a relationship with him during the regime.

He was asked whether he was ever abused in the judiciary, and the witness said he was imprisoned for ten days. Mr. Dararasmey inquired whether Pol Pot invited him to join the revolution when he was thirteen years old, but the witness said he did not.

The Prosecution dove into the witness's work history, but the chronology was unclear. The witness appeared to testify that his first job in the revolution was as a security guard in various locations that he could not recall. In 1967 he had several jobs in Phnom Penh, including a conventional construction worker and pedaling a "cyclo" at night. He left Phnom Penh because he was accused of being a traitor, so he fled in Krait Province where he lived, without Pol Pot, from 1966 -1967. The witness then went to Ratanakiri Province, where he met many people including Son Sen, Ieng Sary, and Ieng Thirith. He did not know whether they were part of the Standing Committee nor was he aware of the relationship between Pol Pot and Ieng Sary.

Saloth Ban next testified that the office in Ratanakiri was in a village of an ethnic minority, but he could not remember the name. He said that he had heard of Office 100 and 102, but he did not know where they were or their purpose. Similarly, the witness stated he did not know the Secretary of either office.

The witness was then asked if he saw Nuon Chea "back then," and he responded that he saw Nuon Chea once while he was at Office 100 to fight against the "American Imperialists."

The witness testified that he joined the Communist Party of Kampuchea (CPK) in 1968 and that there were no specific requirements for joining. He had decided to join the party to liberate the country from American Imperialism, he stated.

Mr. Dararasmey asked if the party used an armed struggle against the Center from 1969, but the witness did not understand the question. The prosecutor inquired again whether the party waged an armed struggle from 1969, causing Mr. Karnavas to proclaim that there had been a number of leading questions but this one was so blatantly obvious that he felt compelled to object. The objection was sustained.

Moving on, Mr. Dararasmey asked the witness if he was trained on political ideology when he stayed in Ratanakiri Province. The witness said he did not know what ideology was back then but noted that he received trainings from a number of instrumental documents, including *Minority Solidarity*. The witness thought this document was instrumental because they wanted to build solidarity of minorities to liberate the country. He was asked about the tactical and strategic groups, but the witness said he needed a white board to answer the question.

Mr. Dararasmey instead chose to go on and asked the witness about the policy regarding ethnic minorities in the northeastern part of the country. The witness responded that it was a combination of respect and “continuous improvement of their weaknesses.” He was asked who told the ethnic minorities to abandon their traditional beliefs, and the witness replied, “In this universe everything is tangible but they are invisible, and we have to adopt an approach to explain them.”

Saloth Ban was next asked if Pol Pot used other documents to influence the ethnic minorities. The witness said it varied by period. Son Arun, defense counsel for Nuon Chea, then interjected, stating that this morning he failed to hear the prosecutor mention a specific period and asked the chamber to remind Mr. Dararasmey that he needs to be clear on the period when he asks question. The President noted that he had the same observation, reminding the prosecution to be specific in terms of time periods. He also explained to Mr. Dararasmey what a leading question was and instructed him to stop asking questions that gave the witness the facts in the question.

The witness was then asked whether Pol Pot taught him about the establishment of DK. The witness reminded the lawyer that he did not specify a time period and noted that the answer varied by time. When asked to tell the court of the principle of the party lines of the CPK, the witness responded he did not know because he was not the founder of the party. In response to a question on whether there were any points of contention when adopting the political lines of the party, and the witness said, “It was not my business; I only minded my business back then.”



Mr. Dararasmey requested the witness to specify the principles of the party. Saloth Ban responded that he could not remember them all but recalled there were twelve moral principles. He stated that he did not know the punishment for breaching one of the principles but knew that people needed to have a “common refreshing.”

The prosecution asked if the witness accompanied his uncle Pol Pot when he left from 1969-1970. Saloth Ban responded he did not even know Pol Pot went to China at the time. He was further asked about who would make decisions about the armed struggle during Pol Pot’s absence, but the witness said he did not know.

Saloth Ban was asked when the Central Office was relocated from Ratanakiri Province. The witness testified he did not know the reason for the move because it was confidential, recalling that he was only an “ordinary combatant” during this time. The witness said that it was a jungle, and therefore the leaders stayed closed to each other in separate huts. The witness was asked if he saw Khieu Samphan there. After receiving clarification of the time period, he stated he did not see Khieu Samphan there in 1970.

The witness testified that the Central Office held meetings when necessary. He contended that he only knew the faces of the members of Central Office and Standing Committee but could not give the details of people’s membership status.

Mr. Dararasmey then showed the witness three photographs. On viewing the first photograph, the witness could not recall where it had been taken, but he noted he recognized the slogan. Mr. Dararasmey informed him that the photograph had been taken during the third session of the General Assembly in 1971, but the witness said he still could not recall the photograph. Saloth Ban claimed that he did not attend this assembly nor did he know the purpose. Mr. Dararasmey asked the witness if he recognized anyone in the photo, and the witness said he was only sure of Pol Pot. The witness said he could not recognize others in the photo because his eyesight was not good and the photo is blurred. Mr. Dararasmey asked whether the witness recognized Nuon Chea, and the witness said he could not say for sure but thought Nuon Chea was likely to be the person with a scarf around his neck.

The witness also could not recall the location of or circumstances behind the second photograph. Moving to the third photograph, the witness also said he did not know the location or circumstance of this photo but could recognize his uncle.

Mr. Dararasmey then inquired whether Saloth Ban lived with Pol Pot and Ieng Sary, and the witness responded that he mainly stayed with Pol Pot. The witness was asked if he learned of the goals of the CDK while living with his uncle. The witness said he did not know it clearly. When requested to elaborate on the twelve moral principles, Saloth Ban said the only one he could remember was that he could not steal even one chili.

The witness was asked again about what it took to join the CPK, and the witness reminded the prosecutor that he already said that he did not know. He then provided a more thorough explanation, however, remarking that one could be considered for membership after achieving 50-60 percent of the moral principles.

Saloth Ban was then asked where the enemy class of the party was, and the witness said that, based on his understanding, it was embedded in a class that destroyed a nation and its property. Mr. Dararasmey asked if the enemies were located in the city or the countryside. The witness maintained that he could not provide details because it was the policy set up by the upper level.

Saloth Ban was also asked whether religion had an impact on the party policy. The witness said he heard Buddhism was the religion of the State, and those who believed other religions would be re-educated for the sake of country as a whole. The witness did not know the punishment for failure to abandon a religion. He also claimed that religious leaders were not considered enemies and that no force was used to have the Buddhist monks disrobe. Rather, he contended, at the time people gathering in bright colors were shot at and therefore the monk's disrobed on their own.

The witness was then asked whether the Chams were considered enemies, and the witness said he did not hear the leadership speak about this. Regarding the members of Lon Nol government, Saloth Ban stated that they were considered to be "the front" not "enemies."

Court Takes Morning Recess

At this point, the Chamber adjourned for a 20-minute morning break. Ang Udom, defense counsel for Ieng Sary, made his usual request that his client be permitted to waive his right to be present in the courtroom and retire to his holding cell to observe the remainder of the day's proceedings via audio-visual link due to his health concerns. As usual, the President granted the request, requiring that a waiver be submitted to the court with the defendant's signature or thumbprint.

Court Resumes

After the break, the floor was returned to Mr. Dararasmey, who informed the witness that he would now focus on the period between 1973 and 1975. Turning to the subject of the DK's finances, the witness testified that, to his knowledge, there was preparation to print bank notes during this time. The witness changed his answer, however, and stated that the preparation took place after 1975. Saloth Ban also said he thought the market was functioning normally during this time. He said that in 1970, 1971, and 1972 bank notes printed by the Lon Nol administration were used and they stopped being used in 1973, 1974 and 1975. Mr. Dararasmey asked the witness to clarify the means of payment in the liberation zones. The witness said it was by period, and that they "subsided" in 1973 and were abolished in 1975.

The witness next testified that they had to mobilize their own forces to conquer the enemy. The witness also stated that the party would say, "Human beings have to seek for the truth, to make sure it is true and certain."

The questions turned to the abolition of private ownership; the witness said it was not a "desire" but a "direction for proper collectivity in order to defeat the enemy." He clarified this meant that abolishing the market was a necessity. Mr. Dararasmey then asked Saloth Ban if he heard the word "collectivity" at the time in question, and he responded, "If they did not have solidarity they would not achieve anything." The witness clarified that a collective regime was a "centralized democracy" but could not recall when the centralized democracy was established because he "only implemented it." He did remember that he heard the word "cooperative" from

the “early beginning.” Mr. Dararasmey asked if cooperatives were established in the liberated zone between March and April 1975, and the witness said he could not answer because he was not involved.

The prosecution requested the reasons that people were chosen for the cooperatives. The witness did not understand the question, so Mr. Dararasmey asked if the witness knew the intention of the establishment of the cooperatives. The witness said he could not respond because he was not an expert in this area.

Mr. Dararasmey then asked if Saloth Ban knew the policy for spouse selection in the party from 1975. The witness said he did not know.

Mr. Karnavas objected, repeating his assertion that the questions were leading. He noted that the facts being presented were not in evidence from this particular witness. He clarified that the word “leading” meant suggestive of the answers. The President thanked Mr. Karnavas and again reminded Mr. Dararasmey to avoid leading questions.

Mr. Dararasmey rephrased his previous question, requesting Saloth Ban to clarify whether there was a policy for spouse selection. The witness repeated that he did not know.

The witness was then asked if he was close, “as always,” to Pol Pot while they were in Udong, and the witness said that he was there as an ordinary combatant to be at Pol Pot’s service. Mr. Dararasmey asked who served as Pol Pot’s bodyguard, and Saloth Ban responded they all shared in the responsibility.

He was asked if there were frequent meetings between Pol Pot, Khieu Samphan, and Ieng Sary, and the witness said there were not usually group meetings. He denied knowing the substance of any meetings. The witness also did not know who came up with the plan to attack Phnom Penh or where the meeting was held.



Mr. Karnavas objected again to the leading nature of the questions. He argued that Mr. Dararasmey was insisting that there were meetings with Ieng Sary, but he had yet to establish that such a meeting took place. He remarked that he is getting “agitated because the gentleman should know better, insisting that “suggesting a name was improper.” The President sustained the objection.

Moving on, Mr. Dararasmey asked where Saloth Ban was when Phnom Penh was evacuated. The witness responded that he was guarding the hut of the leadership by himself. He was asked what he observed during the evacuation, and the witness said that it was a jungle so he could not see anyone.

The witness was next asked where Ieng Sary was between 1973 and 1975, but he responded that he did not know. He also stated that he did not know at the time if Ieng Sary went overseas, maintaining that he did not learn of Ieng Sary's travels until Ieng Sary returned to DK after the liberation of Phnom Penh. However, Saloth Ban did not know the specific country, purpose of the trip, or who accompanied Ieng Sary. After Mr. Dararasmey asked him to try to recall some of the names of the people who accompanied Ieng Sary, Saloth Ban was able to remember two names.

The witness next testified that he once went to Beijing with Ieng Sary after the liberation of Phnom Penh to meet with the United Nations. Mr. Dararasmey asked who else was on the trip, and the witness was able to recall a few names, noting they were all from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The witness said he did not know about Ieng Sary's affairs in Beijing or where he went, adding that he did not know the language.

The witness was asked if there was a selection process for intellectuals to join the CPK, but the witness said he did not know the details.

Saloth Ban was then asked about the Central Committee meeting in 1974. He responded that he had not attended and did not hear anyone talk about the meeting. He was then asked whether he knew where Ieng Sary went after he returned from the overseas trip, and the witness again said he did not know because he was not Ieng Sary's bodyguard.

Mr. Dararasmey reminded the witness that he testified he was very close with his uncle Pol Pot and asked whether he knew the chief ideals Pol Pot discussed with his subordinates. The witness reported that such details were not provided to the subordinates, but he received specific instructions that he had to do his best to guard and protect his uncle.

The witness was asked to describe the condition of the people who were evacuated. He responded that when he returned to Phnom Penh it was already quiet.

He was asked if he was Pol Pot's bodyguard between 1970 and 1975, and he responded, "Yes, most of the time I was close to him." Mr. Dararasmey asked if he "stayed close" to any other leaders besides Pol Pot, and the witness named Ieng Sary.

Saloth Ban was asked if he ever worked as the bodyguard for Ieng Thirith, Nuon Chea, or Khieu Samphan. He said he did not provide close protection directly but mentioned that he sometimes provided group protection during large ceremonies.

He was asked again whether the leaders met often, and if they did, how they organized the meeting. He responded that they did not meet often, and he did not know the substance of the meetings nor where they were held.

The prosecutor next inquired whether the witness saw Pol Pot and Ieng Sary go to the liberated zones. The witness responded that he never provided close protection to Ieng Sary on his travels to the countryside but noted that he went with Pol Pot on a few occasions. He said Pol Pot normally went to the countryside only to open training sessions.

The floor was then given to Mr. de Wilde, who said his questions would focus on the time period between April 1975 and January 1979. Before he began with this examination, however, he asked to clarify a few points made that morning.

First, he was asked at what age Saloth Ban left his parents. The witness responded when he was seven. Mr. de Wilde asked where he went, and Saloth Ban said he went to live with his uncle, who was the older brother of Pol Pot, then to another uncle, and then to live with Pol Pot when he was fifteen or sixteen. Mr. de Wilde asked whether Pol Pot was “in charge of him” after the age of fifteen, and the witness said that was correct. Saloth Ban explained that when they went to the jungle in 1968 or 1969 he stayed with Pol Pot all the time. Mr. de Wilde questioned whether Saloth Ban also resided with Ieng Sary when he was living with Pol Pot. The witness responded that when Pol Pot “mysteriously disappeared,” Saloth Ban was a freelance worker and stayed with many friends.



Mr. de Wilde then asked how many times the witness had met with the tribunal investigators. Saloth Ban apologized, explaining that he has a disease and cannot remember every detail. He further stated that he felt compelled to come here when he was summoned. He said he has to feed his family and has a business to deal with on a daily basis.

Mr. de Wilde informed him that he had a record of five interviews with the Co-Investigating Judges. In one, the witness was recorded to have stated, “I lived with Mr. Ieng Sary, and I had known him since I was aged thirteen. That was due to the fact I was living with my Uncle Pol Pot and Ieng Sary was living in the same home with us. And given that he lived in the same home as us, as if he was a member of the family, I loved and respect him the same way I did with my uncle.” The witness stood by the statement, and apologized that he gave the prosecution the wrong age when he was asked earlier at what age he moved in with Pol Pot.

Mr. de Wilde asked Saloth Ban if Ieng Sary lived with him and Pol Pot underground in the jungle. The witness said that he was there. He then testified that he did not see Khieu Samphan in Ratanakiri Province before 1970, but he confirmed that he did see him between 1971 and 1975, though Khieu Samphan did not live with the other leaders because he kept another residence.

Revisiting a previous statement about the mobile office, the witness admitted he used the word office but thought it should be clarified that it was not like an office because it was a mobile house. The witness explained that Pol Pot worked in this office. He was asked whether other leaders visited Pol Pot in the mobile office, and he responded that “once in a while” zone leaders would be invited to meet Pol Pot there. He was also asked if he had the “slightest idea” what Pol Pot discussed with the zone leaders there, and the witness said he had “no idea.”

Mr. de Wilde read more of the testimony previously given by Saloth Ban before the Co-Investigating Judges, specifically a section where the witness stated that he thought that the

meetings had to do with the plan for attacking Phnom Penh. The witness claimed that this statement was only his guess because he knew at this time they were going to attack Phnom Penh. Saloth Ban was asked if they ever discussed the fate of people in Phnom Penh, but he responded that he did not know.

Court Breaks for Lunch

At this point, the Chamber adjourned for the lunch break. Michiel Pestman, international counsel for Nuon Chea, made his usual request that the accused be permitted to waive his right to be present in the courtroom and retire to his holding cell to observe the remainder of the day's proceedings via audio-visual link. As usual, the President granted the request.

The Prosecution Continues to Question Saloth Ban

Mr. de Wilde began the afternoon session by commenting that the morning was dedicated to questions involving the fall of Phnom Penh, and from this point forward the questions will focus on the period between 1975 and 1979. The witness was asked to place himself in that context and to try to recall the events of the period.

He first asked the witness where he worked after his arrival in Phnom Penh in April 1975. Saloth Ban said that he started cleaning at the Ministry of Defense within one month of his arrival. He was asked if there was another Ministry on the same premises, and the witness said that the Ministry of Defense is currently the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr. de Wilde asked him to clarify whether he worked for the Ministry of Defense or Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He responded that he cleaned the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He further explained that "Pang" appointed him to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After being a cleaner there, the witness stated, he had no clear responsibilities. He did recall that when Ieng Sary returned from abroad, he assigned the witness to be in charge of the "psychological factor" of the people there.

Mr. de Wilde then asked what position Ieng Sary held when he returned to Phnom Penh, and the witness said he thought it was at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because he saw Ieng Sary speaking with foreigners. When requested to provide the exact position, the witness responded that he thought Ieng Sary was the Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Foreign Affairs. It was established that it took several months for Ieng Sary to assume this position after he returned because the Ministry needed to be cleaned.

Mr. de Wilde asked if the Ministry of Foreign Affairs moved between 1975 and 1979. The witness responded that it was never relocated.

Saloth Ban testified that he had heard that Ieng Sary was a member of the Central Committee but was never sure if this was true. He also could not answer whether Ieng Sary was a member of the Standing Committee because he was not personally part of the Committee himself.

Referring back to the witness's testimony before the Co-Investigating Judges that he had discussed earlier in the day, Mr. de Wilde stated that the witness is recorded as saying that Khieu Samphan was not a member of the Standing Committee. Saloth Ban was then asked whether this statement refreshed his memory. He responded that he only heard this from other people – he never saw it for himself.

Mr. de Wilde next asked him whether individuals were allowed to make decisions alone or were decisions made collectively in the DK regime. The witness said he was not sure about practice, but in principle, the decisions were to be made collectively. When Mr. de Wilde asked if Pol Pot was able to make decisions alone, Mr. Karnavas objected and argued both that the question was leading and that there was a lack of foundation. The prosecutor responded that he laid a foundation though the testimony provided to the Co-Investigating Judges. Mr. Karnavas explained to him that the foundation had to be laid before this Chamber, otherwise witnesses could just be asked to come in and certify their previous testimony. Mr. de Wilde asserted again that a foundation had been laid before the Trial Chamber. The President overruled the objection, and the witness responded that he did not know the details of the internal arrangement of the Standing Committee.

Mr. de Wilde reminded the witness that he had also stated that Nuon Chea was a member of the Standing Committee and asked him to specify Nuon Chea's exact role. The witness said he could not remember it. Presented again with his previous testimony, where he said Nuon Chea was responsible for the appointment of cadres of the party, Saloth Ban first said he was not clear about the matter but then confirmed it.

Mr. de Wilde questioned whether Nuon Chea was also responsible for appointing security. This prompted another objection, this time from Mr. Pestman, who noted that the witness only said that he confirmed the statement but did not say today that Nuon Chea appointed people. In response to the objection, Mr. de Wilde rephrased the question, and the witness stated he knew Nuon Chea was in charge of appointments but did not know which appointments.

Saloth Ban then testified that he knew the leaders held meetings, but he did not know the nature of these meetings. He noted that during this period he was separated from Pol Pot. He was asked where the meetings were held but gave a nonsensical answer.

The witness was again directed to prior testimony made before the Co-Investigating Judges, where he is recorded as stating that he saw several leaders meeting together in K-1 by the riverside, not at the Foreign Ministry. The witness was asked whether he remembered the meetings and the K-1 office. Saloth Ban said he knew about the K-1 office because he went there once in a while, explaining it was a place where all the leaders stayed together and had meetings.

Mr. de Wilde queried whether the witness had any opportunities to attend one or more meetings of the Central Committee. Saloth Ban responded that he never attended a meeting. Mr. de Wilde then asked him why he would go to K-1, and the witness responded it was because his wife was a cook there.

The prosecutor next asked about Khieu Samphan's role between 1975 and 1979. The witness said that he accepts what has been listed in the documents, but he is uncertain. Mr. de Wilde directed him to "just answer the question." The witness claimed that he did not follow these issues, noting he was only worried about himself.

The witness was then asked if he was aware of Office 870. He responded that there was no particular location for the office, rather "this office was on the move." He further testified that

this office was led by the Central Committee. He was then asked if he could draw a link between Khieu Samphan and Office 870. The witness said there were “relations.” Mr. de Wilde suggested that the witness explain the links. The witness said it was a long history because the office kept changing location and he did not know if there were meetings. He noted that it has been over thirty years since the events took place.

Mr. de Wilde returned to the same prior testimony to which they already referred to several times that day. This time the witness was recorded as stating that Khieu Samphan was a member of Central Committee but he was not sure if he was a member of the Standing Committee. He also previously testified that Khieu Samphan was responsible for collecting forces and Saloth Ban personally observed him going to work at Office 870. Mr. de Wilde asked the witness to provide more detail to this prior testimony. The witness said he confirmed the previous statement but was not able to elaborate further because he drew a conclusion during that time that he has now forgotten.

Mr. de Wilde next asked if Saloth Ban sometimes saw Khieu Samphan come to the office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The witness said Khieu Samphan did come to the office a few times to discuss “air tickets.” Mr. de Wilde inquired whether there might there be other reasons Khieu Samphan came to the office, but the witness denied that there was anything else. The witness also could not remember if Khieu Samphan only came when Ieng Sary was at the office.

The questions then focused on the structure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr. de Wilde began by asking about the witness’s duties once the office was up and running. Saloth Ban responded that he did not know any foreign languages and therefore did not agree with the decision for him to work there. He claimed that Ieng Sary informed him that he had to assist his work, appointing Saloth Ban as the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He further testified that he did not know what that position entailed but Ieng Sary said the main duty was to make sure everyone was in agreement.

Mr. de Wilde inquired how old the witness was when he was appointed Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The witness asked him for help with the math, noting he was born in 1947. Mr. de Wilde said that would mean he was about 28 but pointed out that that all the records said the witness was born in 1941 and asked for clarity on when the witness was born. The witness said that when he joined the army he lowered his age. He said he was actually born in 1941.

Mr. de Wilde observed that he thought the appointment to Secretary General of the Ministry of Home Affairs was done based on trust and wanted to know if he enjoyed the same level of trust for his three-year duration at the Ministry. The witness confirmed that he did.

The witness was next asked to explain the different departments within the Ministry. The witness said there were two major parts: 1) foreign affairs, which included intellectuals that knew foreign languages and 2) economic and psychological issues. He noted that he was responsible for the latter issues and knew nothing about intellectuals.

Mr. de Wilde asked him who worked in the intellectual bureau, specifically their names and functions. Saloth Ban said he did not know the details, noting he did not pay attention because he did not like the work.

Saloth Ban was asked about the units outside of B-1 that were under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He testified that there were no units outside the Ministry. He mentioned there were nice houses outside the Ministry, and if it was a good location for guests, they would clean them and allow guests to stay. For example, K-1 was a former residence. He also testified that there were guest houses in the provinces, and he made clear that the people in the provinces were notified to clean the houses in advance of the guest's arrival. The Chamber then adjourned for the afternoon break.

Upon returning, Mr. de Wilde commented that Saloth Ban appeared to be in charge of logistics but he had also testified that he was in charge of psychological questions. He asked the witness to clarify what the term "psychological questions" meant. The witness responded that he did "whatever it takes" for their people to "live with morals, be nationalists, to defend the nation, and to build the nation." Mr. de Wilde asked if it could be fairly summarized as political indoctrination. The witness said that he was not "essentially" responsible for that because there was a lack of human resources.

Mr. de Wilde inquired whether the witness was also tasked with giving the cadres "ideological training." The witness claimed to not understand the word "ideology" but responded that he "trained psychological issues about national programs." He stated that he "helped our people to protect and build the nation."

Saloth Ban was asked if he also had duties regarding intellectuals outside the Ministry. He responded that he had no responsibility for any individuals outside the Ministry. He said he did not have any "full" responsibility of the intellectuals inside the ministry either, again clarifying that Ieng Sary was in charge of that.

The prosecutor again referred to the witness's prior testimony before the Co-Investigating Judges, specifically to where he was recorded as saying that he was responsible for intellectuals coming back from abroad and others that were already in the country. The witness testified today that his duties were limited to "helping people not be in conflict concerning their livelihood." He also said he stood by the rest of his statement.

Saloth Ban repeated that there were two sections in the ministry: one for intellectuals and the other for peasants. Ieng Sary had the higher responsibility, and he noted that he was only the coordinator. He admitted that he was part of the security team. He further testified that his deputy was also tasked with security and cleaning houses for the guests.

Mr. de Wilde repeated that Saloth Ban said he was just the coordinator and Ieng Sary was the main boss, asking if that meant Ieng Sary was in complete control. Saloth Ban confirmed that this was correct. Mr. de Wilde asked if the witness obtained Ieng Sary's permission for everything he did. The witness said this was true, unless Pang was present, because Pang could decide without informing Ieng Sary.

Mr. de Wilde asked about Pang's duties. The witness said there were no announcements regarding Pang, but he suspected Pang was Chief of Office 870. Saloth Ban said he suspected this because he saw Pang visiting the office.

Returning Saloth Ban's duties, the witness established that he reported to Ieng Sary, even for issues of security. He was asked if he knew whether Pang met with Ieng Sary in the Ministry. He responded that Pang only came when Ieng Sary was absent.

Mr. de Wilde focused again on the issue of reports and asked whether the reports submitted to Ieng Sary were written or oral. The witness said they were usually oral and given during their daily meetings.

Saloth Ban then testified that at group meetings Ieng Sary would talk about technicalities of the work and self-examination within the Ministry. After being prompting, he also mentioned that they spoke about enemies. Mr. de Wilde asked whether this was because there were enemies within the ministry, but the witness refused to respond because he did not understand the depth of the question. Even after the question was repeated, the witness said that the question was related to philosophy and he could not explain it.

Saloth Ban did testify, though, that each individual, including himself, has a world view and a view of the dark side. He stated that during the self-criticism meetings people publically aired their weaknesses. He noted that if they did not, they would be on the side of the devil and likely to destroy the country. Mr. de Wilde asked what would happen if someone sided with the devil and errors were made. Saloth Ban explained that they had to change gradually. Mr. de Wilde wanted to know if there were people who did not change and continued to fail to abide by the rules in the Ministry, and Saloth Ban told him that there was no disciplinary action at the Ministry. He did admit, however, that their house might be changed.

Mr. de Wilde next asked who was in charge of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs when Ieng Sary was absent. The witness's duty counsel interjected, noting that the question was already asked this question, asserting that the repeated question was now intended to incriminate his client. The President instructed duty counsel that he needed to consult with his client before speaking. The duty counsel sought permission to consult with his client. The question was repeated, and the witness did not respond to the question.

Moving on, Mr. de Wilde asked if big meetings were held when Ieng Sary was away, and Saloth Ban told him that only smaller meetings were held. The prosecutor wanted to know if cadres from the Standing Committee assisted when there was a major problem and Ieng Sary was away, and the witness said that there were not any major problems.

Saloth Ban was asked who headed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs when he was with Ieng Sary in



China, but he could not recall the answer. He was then asked who was in charge of the committee relating to the friends of DK but could not respond because he did not understand the question. Mr. de Wilde tried to clarify but eventually gave up in the interest of time.

The prosecutor next requested that the witness estimate the proportion of the staff in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who were from the peasant class. The witness responded that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not select their staff, rather Pang made the selection. But he did testify that the peasants group was the largest group.

Mr. de Wilde inquired whether the workers were all drawn from a pure class, and the witness told him he was correct. Saloth Ban explained that “pure” meant they were from the poor class. Mr. de Wilde asked whether there were persons whose class was not “clear-cut” or if only people from a pure class were recruited. The witness said he could not respond because the question was “confused.” He further commented that he accepted that everyone sent to him was pure.

The prosecutor referred the Court to two answers the witness had given to the Co-Investigating Judges in 2010, where Saloth Ban stated that people whose “biography were not clear-cut were set-aside” and those with “clear biographies” were recruited. The witness testified that he stands by this previous statement.

The President noted that it was time to adjourn. He asked the witness and his duty counsel to return tomorrow, Tuesday, April 24, to continue the testimony.