



Workshop on Responsibility to Protect Constituency Building in Cambodia

16-17 June 2010
Sunway Hotel
Phnom Penh

Workshop Report

Sarah Teitt
s.teitt@uq.edu.au

17 August 2010



Copyright © 2010

Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
Building 91, 54 Walcott Street
University of Queensland
St Lucia QLD 4072
Australia

Tel: +61 07 3346 6443
Fax: +61 07 3346 6445

Email: info@r2pasiapacific.org



Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Workshop Proceedings	6
3. Session One: The State of the R2P Debate and the Importance of R2P Constituency-Building in the Asia-Pacific	10
4. Session Two: R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia: Perspectives from Stakeholders	17
5. Session Three: Focus Group Discussions	21
6. Session Four: R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia: The Role of Stakeholders	26
7. Appendix I: Definition of R2P Crimes	32
8. Appendix II: Workshop Program	35
9. Appendix II: List of Participants	41



1. Executive Summary

The Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect in collaboration with the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace held a workshop from 16-17 June 2010 at the Sunway Hotel, Phnom Penh with participants from the media, government, civil society organisations, and academic institutions in Cambodia. It was the first workshop in a series of planned consultations to gather experts, practitioners and eminent members of the Cambodian policy and advocacy community to discuss the principle of the responsibility to protect (R2P), its relevance to the Cambodian current and historical context, and avenues for building a local and regional constituency in support of R2P in Cambodia and Southeast Asia, respectively.

The two-day workshop was organised into three plenary sessions and a break-out session for in-depth discussion. For the focus group discussions, participants were divided into three sector-based groups (academe/research organizations, government and civil society) to discuss the theme of the workshop: the prospects and challenges for building a constituency in support of the R2P principle in Cambodia. Participants were asked to give guidance on strategies for raising awareness on R2P, to outline their priorities and goals for promoting the principle, and to suggest practical avenues for carrying recommendations forward.

The following report is the primary output of the workshop. It offers an overview of the topics and themes covered, and summarises the specific recommendations for future engagement put forward by workshop participants. To highlight:

1. For participants from the **academe**, key recommendations are to:
 - a. Promote public awareness of R2P through education and research;
 - b. Adopt R2P in course curricula and research programs, particularly in relation to genocide and atrocity prevention and education and understanding the role of ASEAN as a regional organisation in implementing R2P.
 - c. Conduct academic exchanges and build research partnerships between academic institutions in the region to share views and build a knowledge base on genocide prevention and R2P.
2. For **government** participants, key recommendations are to:
 - a. Translate core documents and training materials into Khmer.
 - b. Conduct training seminars and awareness-raising activities to increase engagement on R2P and related issues in the government sector.
 - c. Support activities that promote a partnership between the government, CSOs and academe to create opportunities for open exchange on R2P.
 - d. Promote debate in the National Assembly among and within political parties on the importance and relevance of R2P.
3. For **civil society organisation** participants, key recommendations are to:
 - a. Conduct training seminars on measures to prevent mass atrocities.
 - b. Raise awareness of R2P among youth and develop youth-oriented R2P programs.

- c. Engage with organisations at the local level, particularly in capacity building; build networks to issue early warning in cases of imminent crimes, and develop monitoring/evaluation system of R2P implementation.
- d. Create a CSO network in support of R2P to lobby the government to be more responsive to R2P crimes and violations, which would first require locating an umbrella organisation (or organisations) that would be willing to take the lead on the issue.

It is worth noting that each sector stressed the importance of promoting awareness through education and emphasised that it is first necessary to translate key R2P documents and training materials into Khmer. This report offers an overview of the workshop panels and discussions in order to provide background information for future consultations. This document will be distributed to workshop participants. Following feedback, a plan of action will be issued to carry forward recommendations each sector proposed for building a constituency in support of R2P in Cambodia.



2. Workshop Proceedings

OPENING REMARKS

'I hope that the 21st century will be the century of cooperation and justice to all. I wish it is the century of the R2P. States, besides prioritizing national sovereignty, shall emphasise as well the responsibility to Protect.'

HRH Prince Samdech Norodom Sirivudh, Supreme Privy Counsellor to His Majesty the King of Cambodia



(L to R): Ms. Fiona Cochaud, HRH Prince Samdech Norodom Sirivudh and Dr. Noel Morada at the opening of the Workshop.

'It is very important for the Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect to host its first workshop in Cambodia in collaboration with the Cambodian Institute of Cooperation and Peace. Cambodia's past suffering makes it a natural leader in the region to promote R2P.'

Dr. Noel Morada,
Executive Director of
the Asia-Pacific Centre
for R2P

'Australia looks forward to working with Cambodia and member states to overcome the gaps in will, imagination and capacity to implement this principle to ensure that we prevent future mass atrocities to never again fail populations in need. Australia and Cambodia have got some unique perspectives to contribute to this debate. We must make sure that Cambodia's voice is heard and heard strongly as a leader on R2P.'

Ms. Fiona Cochaud, Deputy Director of Mission and First Secretary of the Australian Embassy in Cambodia.

HRH Prince Samdech Norodom Sirivudh, Supreme Privy Counselor to His Majesty the King of Cambodia; Dr. Noel Morada, Executive Director of the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect; and Ms. Fiona Cochaud, Deputy Head of Mission and First Secretary of the Australian Embassy in Cambodia delivered the opening remarks to the workshop.

Because the Responsibility to Protect is a relatively new concept to many workshop participants, the three speakers took the opportunity to provide a concise overview of the development, meaning and scope of the principle in their opening remarks. A summary of their remarks follows.

In his Millennium Report to the General Assembly, former United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan reflected on the failure of the international community to prevent mass slaughter of civilian populations in Rwanda and Bosnia, and challenged UN member states to cooperate more effectively to prevent and respond to mass atrocities. In response to this challenge, the Responsibility to Protect framework was developed.

The Responsibility to Protect is a principle that was adopted by consensus at the largest ever gathering of world leaders, the United Nations 2005 World Summit. In the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, heads of state and government agreed that each individual State has a responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, including the prevention of such crimes and their incitement. Under this agreement, the international community must assist states to exercise their responsibility to protect. The agreement also asserts that the international community is prepared to use diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to help protect populations. Should state authorities manifestly fail to protect populations from these four crimes, the international community declared that it is prepared to take timely and decisive collective action in conformity with the UN Charter to address the situation.

All three opening addresses to the workshop stressed that the World Summit endorsement of R2P is an expression of the international community's aspiration to build a 'triangle partnership' between individual states, regional organisations, and the United Nations, in collaboration with civil society organisations, to act collectively and coherently to protect populations from mass atrocities. They noted that it should be very clear from the World Summit Agreement that R2P does not mean the same thing as humanitarian intervention, nor does it provide a justification for unilateral military action. The R2P framework stresses the value of prevention and, if it fails, of early and flexible response tailored to the specific circumstances of each case.

The opening addresses also gave an overview of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon's January 2009 report entitled 'Implementing the Responsibility to Protect'. The SG report outlined a three-pillar approach to 'moving the R2P from words to deeds'. These three pillars are as follows:

Pillar 1: The responsibility of each state to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity;

Pillar 2: The responsibility of the international community to assist states to uphold their protection obligations;

Pillar 3: The responsibility of the international community to take timely and decisive action if a state manifestly fails to protect its populations from these four crimes.

The opening presentations noted that the ‘three pillars’ represent a narrow but deep approach to implementing the responsibility to protect. The three pillar framework is narrow because it limits the R2P to apply only to four crimes, but it is deep because efforts to address these very serious crimes should be considered before crisis erupts, and employ a wide array of prevention and protection instruments that are available to member states, the UN system and regional and sub regional organisations.

In her address, Ms. Cochaud noted that the first pillar is assumed and not controversial—there is limited room to contest that a state should protect its population from grave mass abuse. However, the other two pillars are less clear. What is the role of the international community to provide assistance under Pillar 2? How should the international community respond under Pillar 3 in a timely and decisive manner? How, for example, might it be explained to the people in Southeast Asia that ASEAN member states should help protect people in conflicts in other regions, to send humanitarian aid or to send troops, as a last resort? All three opening addresses noted it is important to raise awareness of R2P in Southeast in order to find answers to these challenging questions, and suggested that there are many reasons to believe that ASEAN should embrace the R2P.

In drawing out the connection between R2P and ASEAN principles, the opening addresses noted that R2P is sensitive to the concerns of ASEAN member states, which are very careful to protect and nurture their own sovereignty. Ms. Cochaud emphasised that the Secretary General’s report affirms that R2P is an ally of that process, as the purpose of R2P is to enhance responsible sovereignty not to undermine it. R2P is firmly anchored in well-established principles of international humanitarian law and builds on existing humanitarian, human rights and other obligations to protect populations. R2P is not a license for intervention, and actions in relation to R2P are to be undertaken in conformity with provisions, purposes and principles of UN Charter. As it does not impose any new legal obligations on states or widen the legal scope for interference in the domestic affairs of states, R2P is consistent with the norm of non-interference stipulated in the UN Charter and the ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation.

Recognising that it will take time and effort to integrate the concepts of R2P in regional policy dialogue, HRH Prince Sirivudh called on ASEAN to take a more assertive role in promoting discussion in order to reach a consensus on R2P, and to include R2P into the ASEAN Charter at the most appropriate time. He further called for international assistance to support capacity building in ASEAN and its member countries to meet R2P obligations through persuasion and partnership. ASEAN must help member states build the capacity to protect their populations, assist states under stress before a crisis breaks out, and respond in a timely manner to prevent situations from escalating down a path of mass atrocities.

Finally, HRH Prince Sirivudh, Dr. Morada and Ms. Cochaud each asserted that the responsibility to protect principle is meaningful to Cambodia because it has experienced one of the worst atrocities on earth: an estimated one-fifth of the Cambodian population perished as a result of the genocidal policy of the Khmer Rouge from 1975-1979. It has taken over three decades to address impunity and bring perpetrators to justice, and that process is still ongoing with the hybrid Khmer Rouge tribunal—the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia. Although judicial redress is an important part of R2P in regards to legal enforcement to end a culture of impunity, HRH Prince Sirivudh proposed that R2P is innovative and relevant because the principle goes beyond dealing with crimes of the past to looking toward preparing for the future to prevent genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.

Ms. Cochaud shared HRH's assessment that R2P is important, and noted Australia and Cambodia have played an important role in developing the concept. Gareth Evans, former Foreign Minister of Australia, was recently awarded the prestigious Roosevelt Freedom From Fear Award. Ms. Cochaud noted that Evans was in part recognised for his leadership in developing the United Nations peace plan for Cambodia, and also for developing the 'very simple but profound principle' that it is the responsibility of every state to protect its population from mass atrocities. In accepting his award, Evans specifically referenced his experiences in Cambodia that influenced his thinking in life. Of all the students Evans encountered in his travels throughout Asia as a student, it was his Cambodia friends whom he never saw again. The reason was very simple: none of them survived the Khmer Rouge regime. They were killed outright as middle class intellectuals or worked to death or starved in the field. This experience stayed with him for the rest of his life. This connection—between Australia and Cambodia—is an important starting point for partnering to prevent atrocities.

The opening address concluded by focusing on what the future holds for promoting and strengthening R2P in Cambodia and the region. Ms. Cochaud emphasized that Australia is very encouraging of Cambodia to take forward future General Assembly discussions of R2P. She noted that workshops such as this will go a great way toward advancing the international consensus on R2P and working together on how best to implement R2P. Dr. Morada noted that the success of many endeavours to promote R2P will ultimately depend upon the extent to which it is possible to develop consensus on R2P in Cambodia and in ASEAN. In this respect, Cambodia has many opportunities to ensure that the atrocities it experienced will not be the fate of populations residing in other ASEAN member states. When Cambodia assumes the chairmanship of ASEAN, there is an opportunity for Cambodia to propose for R2P measures to be adopted, such as creating a regional early warning capacity or strengthening ASEAN conflict prevention mechanisms.



3. Session One: The State of the R2P Debate and the Importance of R2P Constituency-Building in the Asia-Pacific

The two presentations in Session 1 of the workshop covered the role of the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (APC-R2P) and the Importance of building constituencies in Southeast in support of the R2P principle.

Dr. Morada, Executive Director of the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, noted that the APC-R2P aims to assist in building networks in the region to work together to implement R2P. The first stage of this process is to raise awareness among different sectors,



and to locate champions for R2P in each country in the region. Dr. Morada suggested that while it is important to have a UN consensus to uphold international law, it is even more important to have people at the local level believing and promoting R2P. It is essential for the norm to become contextualized and internalized in many of the countries in the region if it is to have an impact on policy choices.

(L to R): Sarah Teitt, Dr. Chheang Vannarith, Dr. Pranee Thiparat, Dr. Noel Morada and HE Son Chhay at Session Two of the workshop.

Dr. Pranee Thiparat, R2P Thailand Program Coordinator for the APC-R2P and lecturer at Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, gave an overview of Southeast Asian government positions on R2P. She noted that all governments of members of ASEAN *cautiously* support R2P. The Philippines and Indonesia are the most involved in discussions, and Vietnam, which has been deeply cautious of the principle, only recently began to engage in R2P debates with a focus on practical measures to implement the principle in line with the SG Report. Laos and Brunei are two members who rarely express direct support for R2P, and Thailand has remained unengaged in discussing the principle over the last five years. For Cambodia's part, the country's experience of genocide has helped its leader to recognize that a state needs to build the capacity to protect. Although the position on R2P varies from government to government, there is a general agreement that R2P should be understood only to apply to the four crimes, not on broader issues of human (in)security such as natural disaster or climate change; R2P should be carefully disassociated with any potential expansion of scope for interference in domestic affairs of states; international engagement to implement R2P should be predicated on cooperation and consent; and such engagement should proceed with regard

to relevant regional organisations. In Southeast Asia this means that R2P should be applied in a manner that is sensitive to the principle of non-interference. Dr. Pranee noted, however, that this does not mean sitting idly by when atrocities are unfolding, such as the Cambodian experience in the latter half of the 1970s.

The key to promote R2P in the region is to demonstrate to the governments and people of Southeast Asia how a commitment to R2P strengthens sovereignty and assists states in meeting core protection goals. While it is important to limit R2P to the four crimes, efforts must be made to fill gaps in understanding how implementing R2P relates to priorities of economic development and poverty alleviation. Dr. Pranee also stressed that it is important to identify stakeholders and core promoters of R2P in Southeast Asia. There is currently a very low level of awareness of the principle, which means that the first step is to introduce the principle through such sectors as the mass media and academic organisations. Dr. Pranee noted that efforts to raise awareness might include:

- Translating key documents and reports, and distributing these documents to different sectors.
- R2P advocates addressing members of parliament and government, particularly the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, for example, the House Foreign Relations committee. These are the people to convince of the merits of R2P.
- Introducing the principle to civil society organisations, particularly groups that already work on human rights issues.

The presentation concluded that the most productive approach to promotion is to incorporate R2P in existing practices, and to ensure that promotion is a partnership and ongoing collaboration rather than a single workshop or very short training session.

Session 1: Discussants

'We think now that what happened in the past that we are immune, but if we do not take our responsibility seriously to prevent them, these crimes will happen again.'

HE Son Chhay

After the presentations by Dr. Morada and Dr. Pranee, Dr. Chheang Vannarith, Executive Director of the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace, and HE Son Chhay, Member of the National Assembly, offered their remarks.

Dr. Chheang Vannarith provided an overview of R2P discussions at the regional level through the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) study group on R2P, which is a Track II mechanism to provide policy recommendations in the Asia Pacific, in particular to the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Dr. Chheang Vannarith noted that recent CSCAP meetings in Jakarta had resulted in the following points of consensus:

1. The nature and scope of R2P is set out in paragraphs 138-140 of the World Summit Outcome Document, and the primary responsibility to protect rests with each State;
2. R2P is consistent with existing international law and the UN Charter;
3. Regional arrangements have a role to play in implementing R2P;
4. The ARF should play a role in implementing R2P;
5. The ARF's role should include fostering dialogue between the United Nations and the Asia Pacific region and between the Asia Pacific region and other regions;

6. Given the mandate of the United Nations Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide (OSAPG), the Asia Pacific region should develop an early warning capacity to cooperate with the UN OSAPG office;
7. Regional arrangements should support capacity building in countries, in particular in peacebuilding and rule of law;
8. There should be enhanced cooperation between regional arrangements in the Asia Pacific and the United Nations Security Council in matters relating to international peace and security in the region and the responsibility to protect;
9. Regional arrangements are well placed to resolve local disputes as provided for in the UN Charter;
10. The primary responsibility to protect resides with the State, and the nature of this responsibility needs to be discussed further.

Dr. Chheang Vannarith reiterated that this is the Track II consensus on R2P in the region. He suggested that ASEAN is not yet comfortable in promoting R2P, but that it is in the stage of promoting dialogue to build confidence and trust. Because of this critical juncture, Dr. Chheang Vannarith stressed that it is very important to shape a clear Cambodian perspective on R2P.

In his role as discussant, HE Son Chhay remarked that it is very reasonable to suggest that Cambodia can play an active role in promoting R2P. Cambodia was the first (and only) country in Southeast Asia to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The immense suffering of Cambodian people under the Khmer Rouge means that there is no difficulty in seeing that there is a responsibility to prevent such atrocities. HE Son Chhay commented that the government should assume the role of promoting R2P within Cambodia and the ASEAN region. In terms of promoting the principle in ASEAN, it was noted that R2P should not be too difficult to absorb. Since 2003, ASEAN has worked to develop a framework for establishing an ASEAN Community by 2020, which was later ambitiously moved up to 2015. To reach this vision of a community, there must be progress in cooperating in three areas: (1) ASEAN Economic Community; (2) ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community; and (3) ASEAN Political-Security Community. Regarding the latter, action plans were put in place that emphasise shared security responsibility within the region, and the Political-Security Community (PSC) blueprint includes provisions for supporting democratic principles, respecting human rights and creating conditions conducive to upholding the rule of law in the ASEAN family of nations. If ASEAN leaders have already accepted a shared responsibility in building a Political-Security Community, then the organisation, HE Chhay suggested, is already halfway to implementing what is included under the R2P. When a country is able to seriously create institutions to deal with issue of human rights and to provide security to its own people in regards to implementing rule of law, the issue of preventing grave crimes is not such an alarming case anymore.

It was noted, however, that much work needs to be done to match practice with proposals. It is well known that in many cases atrocities are committed by armed groups associated with the State. Implementing the PSC in ASEAN member states will prove difficult because the deeper one looks, the more reform is needed to be taken in respective ASEAN countries. HE Son Chhay noted that the militaries in the region are quite powerful, and there is insufficient oversight to guarantee that state forces will not commit R2P crimes. Unless there is military reform to make armed forces more accountable to the people, it will be difficult to deliver on the vision of a PSC, let alone an action plan for implementing R2P.

HE Son Chhay asserted that the best way to move forward is to integrate R2P in existing paths set in ASEAN. It is important not to talk about R2P as a new concept that will be imposed on ASEAN leaders as part of their state obligations, but to highlight existing ASEAN agreements that stress similar ideas, in particular the responsibilities associated with sovereignty. Although some people might question why there is a need to promote a new concept like R2P when ASEAN and member states have already made similar commitments, it was stressed that existing agreements require more attention and resources. Embracing R2P at the state level would reinforce the aspirations of the PSC, suggest that Cambodia is serious about fighting very severe crimes, and demonstrate that the Southeast Asia region will not accept these crimes to happen on its territory.



Question and Answer Session 1: Plenary Participation

Following the presentations, the floor was open to questions from workshop participants. The following section summarises the questions and answers.

Q1: The first question asked for more clarity on the term ‘sovereignty as responsibility’.

In response, Ms. Sarah Teitt, Outreach Director at the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, noted that traditionally the term sovereignty has been associated with two principles: territorial integrity and the right to non-interference. This interpretation of sovereignty suggests that what happens within the territory of a country is primarily a concern of that country. Even when populations within a state are severely threatened due to the government’s inability or unwillingness to protect them, the sovereign state may still claim a right to non-interference. ‘Sovereignty as responsibility’ interprets the principle of sovereignty quite differently; it suggests that sovereignty is not a shield behind which widespread human rights abuses may occur with impunity. Instead, a sovereign state’s claim to non-interference relies on the governing authorities’ willingness and ability to uphold core protection obligations. Should authorities fail to protect their population from grave harm, they should welcome assistance from the international community, regional organisations and concerned states. The ‘responsibility to protect’ is based on this concept of ‘sovereignty as responsibility’ in which sovereignty is viewed less as a right to exercise absolute executive power in a given territory, and more as an obligation to govern

with respect to international human rights and humanitarian law. In this respect, R2P posits that in order to make a legitimate claim to the right to non-interference, governments must protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Q2: Another participant agreed that R2P is a 'very noble concept' that draws on basic principles of human rights, in particular the right to life. However, the participant questioned if R2P adds anything new to the Chapter VII provision of the UN Charter, which allows for the Security Council to intervene at its discretion when there is a threat to international peace and security. The participant likewise noted that the World Summit R2P agreement reaffirms that the Security Council is the final authority for deciding on appropriate responses to mass atrocities. However, in the past the Security Council has proven very incapable of responding in a timely and decisive manner to widespread or systematic attacks on populations. What, then, is the major innovation of R2P?

In response, Dr. Morada noted that the major contribution of R2P is the focus on prevention. While it is true that the UN Charter provides the mandate for the Security Council to respond to threats to international peace and security, it is sometimes deadlocked on these issues. In many cases, members agree that a humanitarian emergency exists, but disagree on appropriate responses, particularly when it comes to mandating enforcement measures such as sanctions or peace operations. This deadlock has proven very difficult to overcome, with some countries resisting even being added to the Security Council's formal agenda for fear of being singled out for human rights abuses. By emphasizing the importance of prevention, capacity building and assistance, the R2P framework stresses that the Security Council's attention to a situation is not merely to sound alarm bells to bring attention to a state's failure to protect, but to build a partnership for protecting populations. The R2P framework may therefore de-stigmatise Security Council attention being paid to situations at risk of escalating to mass atrocities. Rather than relying predominately on enforcement measures or viewing international attention as punitive or unwarranted meddling, Dr. Morada suggested that under R2P, states might be more willing to ask for assistance, such as the Philippines request for mediators in the peace negotiations between the government and groups that are questioning the legitimacy of the state. In extreme cases in which state authorities refuse assistance and mediation, however, it is recognized that the question of timely and decisive enforcement action continues to be a dilemma. This is not simply a matter of the decision to intervene militarily; if there is insufficient budget to deploy and maintain peace operations, inadequate human and logistic resources, or limited political will to support peace processes in a coherent and sustained manner, then timely and decisive response will be very difficult.

Q3: Much of the literature on mass atrocities reveals that these crimes are often committed or condoned by state authorities. R2P places a lot of responsibility on the state, emphasizing quite a bit of cooperation and consensus with the state. This seems to run counter to the very objective of ensuring that mass atrocities are prevented. Is this an inconsistency in conceptualising R2P?

In response, Dr. Morada acknowledged that States are often implicated in attacks constituting or leading to mass atrocities. However, rather than being a logical inconsistency, the emphasis R2P places on creating conditions for greater State responsibility and accountability is intended to directly address this issue. Dr. Morada highlighted the example of the November 2009 Maguindanao massacre in the Philippines in which political clans carried out extrajudicial killings of opposition party leaders and journalists. Dr. Morada noted that while some of the underlying causes for this massacre concern or even implicate the Philippine government, adequately responding to this situation likewise relied on State authorities being prepared to hold

perpetrators to account. The international commitment to R2P suggests that in these situations, if a state fails to respond to public outcry and address the situation, state authorities would face additional pressure from the international community and regional arrangements. R2P therefore limits the course of action that state authorities may reasonably take, and, it is hoped that in the long run, tips the balance in favour of state authorities governing with greater responsibility. Dr. Pranee echoed this statement, and emphasized that recognizing that states often commit atrocities makes it even more important to build cross-sector constituencies in support of R2P.

Q4: A participant from a Cambodian human rights organisation asked if there is anything under the R2P agreement that automatically requires the United Nations Security Council to respond to a crisis situation in which mass atrocities crimes are occurring or imminent?

In response, Ms. Teitt emphasized that R2P is a political agreement rather than a binding legal obligation. R2P rests on and strengthens past resolutions on the protection of civilians in armed conflict dating back to 1999 and 2000 in which the Security Council determined that deliberate attacks on civilians or the denial of humanitarian access could constitute threats to international peace and security. By interpreting deliberate attacks and denial of access as threats to international peace and security, grave suffering within a state's borders became the legitimate concern of the Security Council. Given this precedent, and the unanimous endorsement of R2P at the 2005 World Summit, how is it justifiable for members of the Security Council to continue to claim that conflicts which feature indiscriminate or deliberate attack on civilians are the internal concern of a sovereign state? The role of advocates of R2P is to remind UN member states and the Security Council of existing agreements that crimes that happen in a given state demand the attention of the Council. This is not legally binding the UNSC to an automatic response, but encouraging the members, in particular the Permanent 5, to act more responsibly and respond to situations that they have already agreed are within Security Council's mandated authority under the UN Charter. Ms. Teitt also stressed that the Council's decision to take enforcement measures against state authorities tends to occur when such action is requested by or firmly supported by neighbour states or regional arrangements. This suggests that the bottleneck in timely and decisive response is not just an issue concerning the veto power of the five permanent members, or the response of 15 members in the Council, but also deals with the positions of regional arrangements and neighbour states who bear a responsibility to encourage the UNSC to act responsibly in relation to these four crimes. The unfortunate reality is that individual States, regional organisations, and the United Nations consistently fail to meet existing obligations, and the responsibility to protect is meant to draw attention to better strategies to reinvigorate these commitments. The question should not be to introduce new duties or demand automatic responses, but to build the political will and institutional capacity to implement already existing obligations, such as those found in previous resolutions on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, international humanitarian and human rights law and the Genocide Convention.

Q5: R2P deals with a lot of human security and human empowerment issues. What is the relationship between R2P and human security in terms of healthcare, property rights, etc? What is the difference between the broader approach to human security and the narrow approach to R2P?

Dr. Morada noted that it is important to recall that the 2005 consensus limits the R2P to four crimes: genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Limiting the scope of R2P to cover these four crimes is considered the 'narrow approach' to implementation. However, Dr. Morada suggested that it may be important to link R2P to other frameworks in order to understand and address the

causes of atrocities that are related to, for example, shortfalls in human security, good governance, and security sector reform. Ms. Teitt remarked that it might be helpful to think of human security as an umbrella concept that covers both the freedom from fear and the freedom from want. R2P represents a very targeted area concerning the Freedom from Fear. It draws on the ethos of human security by emphasizing that the referent for security should be people, and that individuals and populations should be protected. However, R2P is distinct insofar as it relates to very extreme cases of freedom from fear, or in other words, R2P is concerned with policy options to enhance freedom from extreme fear that are marked by the four R2P crimes. Dr. Pranee gave an overview of the definition of the four R2P crimes to highlight that R2P is not dealing with routine or normal situations, but is trying to prevent very serious crimes (see Appendix 1 for definition of crimes). Although R2P and human security are linked and complementary, R2P is really concerned with addressing the most extreme human rights violations.

Q6: Another participant cautioned that Cambodia ‘has received a lot of terms’ in the past: human rights, social accountability, social responsibility and now R2P. Advocates should be careful when introducing new concepts in Cambodia because these concepts are very alien. The best way of explaining these concepts to stakeholders in Cambodia is to base outreach in familiar concepts and make sure the terms are properly translated. The term responsibility to protect translated in Khmer means ‘accept the right and wrong in protection’, but according to the opening addresses and Session 1 comments, the participant noted that it seems that the role of the state is not just to ‘accept the right or wrong’ of its action, but to carry through on an obligation. It may be better to translate R2P as ‘obligation’ rather than use the Khmer term ‘responsibility’ to ‘accept wrong or right’. Another participant echoed this concern, and stressed that there should be a greater effort to appropriately translate core R2P documents into Khmer.





4. Session Two: R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia: Perspectives from Stakeholders

'It is too late to save 2 million lives that died under the Khmer Rouge but it is not too late to save lives in atrocities around the world and Cambodia is a good example to learn from, to understand the why and how genocide and terrible crimes take place.'

Mr. Heang Path, Youth and Adolescent Development Specialist, UNICEF.

The second session of the workshop comprised of a panel of experts and practitioners who work in conflict management and education. Each member of the panel gave an overview of existing efforts to prevent R2P-related crimes in Cambodia, and offered suggestions for strengthening these initiatives, particularly in relation to R2P constituency building in Cambodia.

Mr. Heng Monychenda, Director of Buddhism for Development in Battambang Province, gave the first presentation which focussed on the role of civil society in preventing mass atrocities. The presentation began by cautioning that there is no guarantee that the history of mass atrocities in Cambodia will not happen again. Mr. Heng Monychenda emphasized that there is a responsibility to prevent this cycle from repeating itself, and highlighted three roles for civil society organisations in this regard: (1) engaging with local populations to hold state leaders accountable; (2) encouraging and fostering cultures of peace; and (3) providing early warning for potential atrocities. To summarise:

1. Civil society organisations should be receptive to entering into discussion on sovereignty as responsibility. Efforts should be made to raise awareness among local populations that leaders are elected by the people so must to respond to the concerns of the people, and to move leaders from the mind frame of 'I am the state' to the belief that 'the people are the state'. This transformation will be facilitated by civil society organisations networking within communities, interacting across communities, and working within and across states to ensure transparent policymaking that upholds the rule of law.
2. In terms of fostering cultures of peace, religion and religious organisations have an important role to play in preventing mass atrocities in Cambodia. In particular, the Buddhist principle 'do not kill' should be recognized and fostered as part of a human connection and political culture in Cambodia.
3. Regarding early warning, in many cases people at the local level can sound the earliest alarm for preventing mass atrocities. There should be training programs on prevention and early warning.

Mr. Heng Monychenda highlighted that many prevention frameworks adopt a top-down approach, whereas working with civil society organisations in Cambodia must start from a bottom-up engagement with local people.

Mr. Kok-Thay Eng, Deputy Director, Research/Education, Documentation Centre of Cambodia (DC-CAM) spoke next with a focus on genocide education in Cambodia. The presentation emphasised that if R2P is really concerned, as advocates suggest, with prevention and capacity building rather than intervention, then genocide and atrocities education is the best way to strengthen and implement the responsibility to protect principle. Mr. Kok-Thay Eng noted that DC-CAM approaches genocide education in two ways--through indirect and direct education. Indirect education is the process of gathering information about the experience of Cambodians under the Khmer Rouge from 1975-1979. From the end of the atrocities in the late 1970s until the early 1990s, there had been no considerable domestic effort to document what happened. Although international experts researched the period, local institutions were needed to engage better with local communities. DCCAM was founded to fill this gap by conducting interviews, recording victims' experiences, researching the Khmer Rouge prison system, and, among other things, analysing the role of women and children during the period.

DC-CAM records personal testimonies, and distributes its analysis free of charge to villages through a research magazine entitled 'Searching for the Truth'. Approximately 8000 editions of the magazine have been distributed per month in Khmer over the last 10 years. Given a relatively high level of illiteracy in the country, DC-CAM also runs a radio program to read the magazine over local radio stations. Mr. Kok-Thay Eng noted that these initiatives represent an indirect way to educate the Cambodian people about what happened in the country under the Khmer Rouge. In terms of direct genocide education, DC-CAM has developed two books on the history of Democratic Kampuchea to teach the history of atrocities as part of the approved Cambodian high school curriculum. One book provides a historical overview of the various practices and institutions of the Khmer Rouge, and the other is a teacher's guidebook to assist high school history teachers to develop teaching curriculum on genocide education within the context of the history of Democratic Kampuchea. The books are edited and approved by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport with the intent of being distributed widely to public schools throughout the country. As of the time of the workshop, approximately 300,000 copies had been distributed, with the aim of releasing a total of one million copies. In addition to distributing the books, DC-CAM, alongside international experts and Cambodian historians, has trained 24 instructors as 'train the trainers' to assist teachers to develop lesson plans using the DC-CAM history books. These 24 teacher trainers have conducted one-week chapter-by-chapter training programs for 184

teachers in all six educational zones. DCCAM is eventually hoping to train up to 3000 teachers in this schema, with a short-term goal of training 1500 teachers by 2011.



(L to R): Mr. Tep Punleou, Dr. Y. Ratana, Mr. Heang Path, Mr. Heng Monychenda, Dr. Noel Morada and Mr. Kok-Thay Eng in Session Two of the workshop.

Workshop on Responsibility to Protect Constituency Building in Cambodia

Overall, the main purpose of the indirect education program is to foster debate about what happened under the Khmer Rouge, to memorialize personal accounts so that lessons can be learned, and, it is hoped, to encourage forgiveness and reconciliation in order to prevent future atrocities. Recognizing that in many cases youth are mobilized to carry out mass atrocities, the direct education program is designed to educate young people about the history under the Khmer Rouge, and to actively involve them in prevention. This overview of genocide and atrocity education in Cambodia is meant to offer an example of ongoing efforts in Cambodia to systematically engage with local people and youth in understanding and preventing atrocities.

Mr. Heang Path, Youth & Adolescent Development Specialist, The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was the third panellist for Session 2. Mr. Heang Path relayed the personal account of his family under the Khmer Rouge, recalling that his brother, nephew and cousin were either part of the fighting or victims of the atrocities. Each of these men was in early adulthood at the time, and like many youth who were targeted by the Khmer Rouge, they were never afforded the opportunity to go to school. This introduction was intended to highlight the role youth have historically played in the onset and escalation of atrocities. Recognising this phenomenon, Mr. Heang Path noted that at present approximately one-third of the population are considered youth in Cambodia. The presentation passionately argued that the next generation of youth in Cambodia and the Southeast Asian region must be informed on how to prevent and respond to mass atrocities. A starting point for engaging with youth in atrocity prevention is to recognise very dynamic youth programs and organisations that represent 'pockets of excellence' around the country. Replicating and strengthening programs for engaging young people in peacebuilding is one of the best entry points for R2P promotion in Cambodia. Mr. Heang Path also suggested that efforts should be made to build capacity among youth to use communication technology for early warning.

Discussants: Session 2

The discussants for this session, Dr. Y Ratana, Director of Population Study Center, Royal University of Phnom Penh, Assistant to Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of National Defense and Mr. Tep Punleou, Associate Dean, Faculty of Law University of Cambodia, reiterated that it is important to recognize aspects of local culture and tradition, passed on from generation to generation, that privilege peace over conflict. These traditions should be recorded and taught, referred to in mass media, identified in education programs, and leveraged in diplomatic engagement. The discussants stressed a need for 'cultural diplomacy'—for ethnic, religious and political groups within Cambodia to explain their ideas and culture, so that difference can be better understood rather than perceived to be divisive. Noting that genocide is predicated on making distinctions between people, whether it be on racial lines or through in-group/out-group, or human/de-human categories, one discussant suggested that building cultural ties between groups may make these distinctions less salient. Discussants also noted that fully understanding how the four R2P crimes are best prevented is quite confusing, particularly as there seems to be limited consensus on the precise causes of the crimes. It was noted that the key message of the previous session centred on the importance of religion as a vehicle to promote the idea of R2P, that there are already efforts to develop material in the educational system regarding past atrocities which should be supported, and that it is necessary to understand that young people need to have a sense of history to ensure that atrocities will not happen again in the future.

Question and Answer Session 2: Plenary Participation

Following the discussants' contribution, the floor was opened once again to questions from workshop participants. The following is a synopsis of the discussions that ensued.

Q1: One participant asked whether the DC-CAM history book presented the Vietnamese action in Cambodia as an invasion or liberation/humanitarian intervention. The participant noted that ASEAN reacted to Vietnamese military action as an invasion, and therefore a violation of state sovereignty and a contravention of international law. However, if Cambodians accept the action as a humanitarian intervention then Cambodia should not have a problem with R2P at all, even in the case of military action.

The representative from DC-CAM noted that neither the term ‘invasion’ nor ‘liberation’ is used in the history book. Instead, the history is characterized by the term ‘military action’. The goal is to provide an historical account of the war rather than apply a title and therefore judgment to it. Participants agreed that this period in Cambodian history is still very controversial, so the aim should be to create room for a more open debate rather than determine the outcome of that debate in advance. It was noted that each year on January 7 Cambodia observes a ‘Victory Day Over Genocide’ national holiday to commemorate the day that Vietnam took military action that brought an end to the bloodshed of the Khmer Rouge. The celebration of that anniversary suggests that no matter what the action is labelled, Cambodia has accepted the role Vietnam played in halting atrocities. In response, the representative from DCCAM drew attention once again to the two education books that the Centre distributes, which include information about the state system, suggest why it is important, provide an overview of some of the dilemmas surrounding a state’s decision to deploy military force to another state, and ask students to debate the end of the Khmer Rouge in light of all these issues. Participants voiced appreciation for this approach, and suggested that the goal is not to find a definitive answer to whether the action was legitimate, but to provide background information, pose the question and allow students to seek their own answers on whether to consider Vietnam’s action as an invasion or liberation.

Although workshop participants did not want to speak for the whole of the population or to open a controversial debate, many noted that as a personal issue, most people do not think the Vietnamese military action should be considered an illegal operation under international law. One participant rather poignantly noted that the judgment is all a matter of perspective: from the perspective of victims, in death there is no concern about the preservation of the state system. ‘If it is the law that keeps outside states from protecting the victims,’ the participant stated, ‘then there is no use for that law anymore’. Another participant, filled with emotion, noted that at the height of the killing in 1978, thousands of people were dying each day. He questioned, ‘when people are being killed at alarming rates day by day, and the international community and the UN keep quiet, what are neighbouring states supposed to do? Any day spent debating about whether to intervene meant more blood spilt.’ Dr. Morada, the chair, closed the session by noting that the debate further emphasized the importance of understanding the domestic and regional context in order to promote R2P and prevent atrocities. From the perspective and sensitivities of the original members of ASEAN, Vietnam’s action was a violation of international law. Dr. Morada noted, however, that history is written by those who are part of it, and Cambodian should be given an opportunity to record the past in order to inform similar debates about upholding the R2P in the future.



5. Session Three: Focus Group Discussions

In the next session, participants were asked to divide into small groups to brainstorm on the theme of the workshop: R2P Constituency Building in Cambodia. Participants were divided into three sector-specific focus groups for discussion. These groups included: (1) representatives from the academe and think tanks, (2) government representatives, and (3) participants from civil society organizations (including the media). Following the discussions, a spokesperson from each group was asked to report to the plenary about the themes covered in the breakout sessions.

To facilitate discussion, each group was asked to reflect on the following questions:

R2P Awareness and Promotion

1. Have you or your organization participated in discussions about “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) principles prior to this workshop?
2. Based on the materials and opinions presented on R2P today, do you or your organization have an interest in knowing more about the responsibility to protect?
3. What aspects of R2P might your organization be interested in? Please specify (causes of mass atrocities, genocide prevention and education, the United Nations’ role, the role of regional arrangements, civil society engagement, etc).
4. Do you think that R2P principles are relevant in Cambodia and the larger Asia Pacific region? Why?
5. What do you think are the three priority areas in promoting R2P in the Cambodia?

Discussion for Future Engagement

1. Are there existing advocacy, academic or policy-oriented research programs, projects, or other activities that your organization is undertaking (or might plan to undertake in the near future) that are directly or may indirectly be related to advancing R2P? Please identify these programs, projects, or other activities
2. Would your organization be interested in building (further) your capabilities in doing the above activities related to R2P?
3. What kind of support (additional or supplementary) does your organization need in order to pursue or undertake further R2P-related activities?
4. Would you or your organization be interested in being part of country and regional R2P constituency building? Please specify the areas where your organization might make a contribution in R2P constituency building (e.g., research, advocacy work, training, etc.).
5. What do you think are three challenges to building a network of individuals and organizations engaged in promoting and implementing R2P in Cambodia and the region?

The following is an overview of the discussion of each of the three break-out groups.

Participants from **academic institutions and think tanks** relayed the following key points:

- To date, there is a very low level of awareness of R2P among academics in Cambodia, and the concept is quite new to most of them.
- The group asserted that R2P is very relevant to Cambodia and the region.
- Three priorities areas include: promoting cooperation among ASEAN member states and within ASEAN structures and institutions, particularly the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights; conducting cultural and educational exchanges among university departments in the Asia Pacific that focus on peace and genocide/atrocities studies; and conducting research to inform policy-oriented reform campaigns that are aimed at, for example, judicial reform, promoting the rule of law, and skills training for the media.
- It is important to promote public awareness through education; and there should be school programs to introduce R2P and related concepts to young people.
- There is an interest in engaging in future education and research on R2P, particularly in relation to genocide and atrocity prevention and education and understanding the role of ASEAN as a regional organisation in implementing R2P.
- Academics suggested that future projects might include: building research partnerships between academic institutions and including R2P in course curriculum.
- In order to carry through on programs, academics would require funding assistance and consultation on curriculum design and materials.
- Some of the challenges to sustain engagement on R2P include state resistance, the lack of public interest and competing priorities, and complication of the terminology of 'R2P', which some find difficult to understand. Overall, participants from the academe reflected that there would need to be additional funding to kick-start programs.



Dr. Pranee Thiparat with participants from academic institutions and think tanks.

Participants from the **government** relayed the following key points:

- Most government participants were not aware of R2P prior to the workshop.
- Many noted that the workshop was a very interesting exchange of ideas, but relayed that the government undertakes very limited activities that are directly or indirectly related to R2P.
- Participants expressed interest in training seminars and awareness-raising activities to increase engagement in the government sector on R2P.
- As many government employees deal only in Khmer, in order to engage in government debate on the issue core documents must first be translated into Khmer.
- Activities that promote a partnership between government, CSOs and the academe are welcome, and there should be efforts to create opportunities for open exchange.
- Participants from government suggested that a major challenge for promoting R2P is the low level of awareness. One option to address this is to develop a media program.
- There is a need to promote debate in the National Assembly among and within political parties on the importance and relevance of R2P.

- There should be assistance for briefing the National Security Council and for training the military—including, where possible, facilitating inter-agency meetings.
- Some of the challenges facing R2P promotion in Cambodia and the region are recognizing that state capabilities to prevent atrocities must be improved. In this regard, addressing corruption and upholding the rule of law are integral to ensuring the government's sustained engagement in implementing R2P.



Dr. Noel Morada and Dr. Chheang Vannarith with participants from government.

- Participants from the government sector relayed that there is a lot of openness to continue this engagement on R2P, and that the first steps should be: (1) improving awareness and knowledge; (2) creating partnerships across sectors; (3) introducing the concept not just at the national level but also at the local level.
- In terms of challenges, the participants from the government sector noted that it takes a lot of effort to convince actors to prioritise prevention. There must be an effort to link issues and promote frameworks that will help the state to improve resilience to mass atrocities so that officials do not wait for crimes to happen.

Participants from **civil society organisations and the media** relayed the following key points:

- Among the civil society organisations represented, only one person had previously heard about R2P when translating materials for DC-CAM.
- CSO representatives were interested in learning more about R2P, and noted that it was important to link R2P promotion with the history of atrocities in Cambodia.
- Participants were interested in education on preventive measures, civil society campaigns and judicial action to address impunity.
- As many CSOs represented are dedicated to engaging with youth, the participants were primarily concerned with raising awareness of R2P among youth and developing youth R2P programs.
- A suggestion for raising awareness among youth was to hold an essay contest among high school and/or university students on any of the following topics:
 - Why is R2P important to young people in Cambodia?
 - Tell your family history under the Khmer Rouge.
 - Why is the Khmer Rouge Tribunal important?



Outreach Director, Sarah Teitt, with civil society and media participants.

- Participants suggested that local organisations working with youth could help edit and collate the essays and stories to publish in a book that might be called, 'Young Voices: Overcoming and Preventing Atrocities in Cambodia'.
- There was a suggestion to link R2P to alternative dispute resolution programs, and to integrate R2P in the Buddhist community's radio programs, especially through storytelling in relation to the importance of prevention.
- CSO participants noted that translation of materials and clear explanation of concepts are necessary to carry forward any awareness-raising initiatives.
- CSO participants stressed the importance of grassroots engagement and reaching out to organisations at the local level, particularly in capacity building, networking to alert in cases of imminent crimes, and monitoring/evaluation of R2P implementation.

Workshop on Responsibility to Protect Constituency Building in Cambodia

- Participants suggested that CSOs could also lobby the state to agree to prioritize R2P, but the success of such an endeavour would require an umbrella organisation (or organisations) that would be willing to take the lead on the issue. One option would be to frame the issue less as CSO pressure on the state, and more on the importance of early warning and early response to impending crimes.
- CSO representatives highlighted the importance of building partnerships among different stakeholders, and noted that competing priorities of actors and sectors may pose a challenge to acting on a shared responsibility.
- CSO participants noted that one challenge, as evidenced by the gender balance of the workshop, is that very few women have an opportunity to pursue positions in government or participate in debate. There was some concern that greater efforts were needed to promote gender equality.
- Other key challenges included the need for institutional reform, overcoming conceptual complexity, and addressing gaps in capacity and funding. There is also a need to produce a training curriculum.

After a brief discussion between groups, the workshop organisers thanked the participants for their enthusiastic and constructive engagement, and brought the first day of the workshop to a close.



6. Session Four: R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia: The Role of Stakeholders

'We need to spread this idea of responsibility to protect. Before, when I was young, I heard someone talking about human rights. I knew I was human, but I had no idea that there were any rights that I had! Now I learn that States have a responsibility to protect!'

Civil Society Organisation Participant.

The second day of the workshop opened with a session on the role of stakeholders in promoting R2P in Cambodia and the region.

Mr. Neou Kassie, Outreach Coordinator of the Victims Unit of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, opened the session with a presentation about the importance of engaging local people to promote R2P in Cambodia. Mr. Kassie asserted that the timing is right to promote R2P, as there are established human rights programs and progress is being made in transitional justice through the ECCC trials. Offering recommendations learned from the experience of the Public Affairs section of the ECCC, it was noted that the Court was more effective when it became more relevant to local people through radio campaigns and outreach initiatives. Engaging local people created a demand side for the Court to proceed, and outreach attracted the interest of the Cambodian people, who were empowered to seek justice and to assert that their suffering must be acknowledged. Importantly, it brought to bear the importance of seeking and maintaining a historical record of people's pain so that they know it will be remembered. Mr. Neou Kassie asserted that this outreach would have been impossible if the court was not held in Cambodia. He noted that because the crimes happened in Cambodia and the victims reside in Cambodia, it is a welcome (and amazing) development in transitional justice for the hybrid court to be on Cambodian soil. It is also worth noting that while the International Criminal Court public gallery sits upward of 75 people, the Cambodian Court was designed to include 500 seats for the public to observe the trial. Its location and design, along with the creation of the victim support section reinforce the perception that the ECCC is a court that is meant to involve local people. The outreach aims to acknowledge people's suffering, remember their pain and establish a record of truth. This approach is meant to reaffirm that the court was not just established to seek justice but also to promote stability.

Insofar as the tribunal is perceived as a mechanism to involve Cambodian people in overcoming, learning from and moving beyond this dark moment in history, the ECCC is a role model court for other countries that have experienced mass atrocities. In terms of the lasting impact of the ECCC, ordinary Cambodians are able to be involved in judicial reform, and judges are working alongside international experts to understand international standards of justice and accountability. Local involvement reinforces a notion of judicial accountability, and judges can gain experience to take back to their respective courts and embark on a similar process of judicial reform throughout Cambodia. Mr. Neou Kassie offered this overview of some of the ways in which victims are encouraged to participate in the ECCC to emphasise the importance of engaging local people in the work of judicial redress and reform. He suggested that the lessons learned from the Outreach Office was to work within existing

institutions to promote understanding of new concepts, to translate materials, and to as far as possible engage the Royal government of Cambodia, which after all made a great deal of effort to improve the public perception of the court.



(L to R): Mr. Quentin Debetz, Professor Kong Phallack, Mr. Khieu Kola, Mr. Neou Kassie, Dr. Chheang Vannarith, Ms. Astrid Norén-Nilson, Mr. Yin Sopheap and Mr. Pou Sovachana at Session Four of the Workshop.

The second presentation by Mr. Khieu Kola, member of the Board of Directors of the Club of Cambodian Journalists, focused on the role of the media in preventing mass atrocities. The presentation emphasized that it is very important for local journalists to receive international training and support. For example, the United States Embassy has provided materials on responsible reporting to Cambodian journalists. While this is a move in the right direction, it was noted that training of journalists should be viewed as a continual commitment not just a one-time effort. An option for sustaining this commitment is to build a mentorship system, and to attempt to link workshops with ongoing practice and evaluation. It is likewise essential that the efforts to train a responsible media are backed by political will and legal framework to guarantee freedom of expression.

The third presentation, by Ms. Astrid Norén-Nilson, a Research Fellow at the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace, focused on the politics of R2P in relation to the norm of non-interference and the co-called 'ASEAN way'. The presentation encouraged participants to think of R2P on three political levels: the UN, region and state. While there is a lot of focus on issues surrounding state sovereignty and UN intervention, Ms. Norén-Nilson highlighted existing regional arrangements that may be in an excellent position to prevent or respond to conflicts in their own region. R2P should not rest solely in the UN as it is not the only body with the capacity or mandate to act.

The presentation briefly revisited issues raised in the previous day's sessions on the relationship between R2P, sovereignty and intervention. After offering a brief historical account of

sovereignty, with particular focus on the rise of popular sovereignty which asserts that the legitimacy of the state is created by the will or consent of the people, Ms. Norén-Nilson asserted that various interpretations of sovereignty have prevailed in different places in different times. With this in mind, she argued, sovereignty is inherently an elastic concept, and the conversations and activities that flow on from the workshop should attempt to understand sovereignty in a way that is most meaningful to this era.

The presentation characterised R2P as an attempt to create an international moral consensus 'to win hearts and minds' to make preventive decisions for action at an earlier stage. As the focus is on early and appropriate response, actors should not perceive such a new moral geography as a humanitarian intervention problem. Rather, the three-pillar approach to R2P is very respectful of the member states, circumscribed, and offers a more comprehensive view of the problem of preventing mass atrocities. As norm and value creation is central to this three-pillar approach, it is beneficial to look at existing regional and international agreements to understand the normative coherence between R2P and previous frameworks.

The presentation proceeded to analyse the founding and core documents of ASEAN. Ms. Norén-Nilson noted that the Bangkok Declaration and Treaty Amity and Cooperation in 1967 centred on two principles: non-interference and the principles of the United Nations. These latter principles include the respect for human rights, and there is a clear link between the prevention of atrocities and the protection against human rights violations in the extreme. Likewise, in the 13 meetings leading up to the adoption of the ASEAN Charter, there were proposals to weaken the norm of non-interference in internal affairs to more ably pursue the goals of establishing a Political and Security Community. Although these proposals were not adopted, the Charter does contain language about the shared commitment and collective responsibility of ASEAN members to enhance regional peace and security. The Charter provisions for a regional human rights body, and the subsequent establishment of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) is an indication that, however slow the progress, ASEAN aspires to act collectively to respond to pressing human security and human rights concerns in the region. It is worth examining the similarities between this language and the three-pillar approach to R2P, particularly in the attempt to build a community of shared values and norms. A starting point for entering into dialogue on this in the region could be the development of an early warning system for mass atrocities.

Mr. Yin Sopheap, the Cambodian Representative to a Regional Consultation on the Responsibility to Protect hosted by the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies and Internal and Cross-Border Conflicts Project, in Singapore, April 2010, spoke about current initiatives aimed at promoting R2P in the region. Mr. Yin Sopheap noted that he was both surprised and encouraged to see experts in the region discussing this important issue and working toward a 'roadmap' for implementation. He suggested that Cambodian scholars, practitioners and policymakers should learn more about R2P in order to enhance Cambodia's participation in this dialogue. The presentation concluded by asserting that although R2P is too late for preventing the atrocities of the Khmer Rouge, it is not too late for other cases, and Cambodian representatives should be active in maintaining that R2P is not just relevant to the past but also to current issues in the country and region.

In the following presentation, Professor Kong Phallack, Dean of Faculty of Law and Public Affairs, Pannāsāstra University of Cambodia raised questions surrounding the legal framework for protecting populations from mass atrocities. The presentation briefly touched on the importance of ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, but noted that this only covers war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. Although it was suggested that ethnic cleansing should have a legal definition, other participants noted that

ethnic cleansing is part of crimes against humanity and could be considered a constitutive act of genocide. The presentation posed questions about the relationship between domestic law specifically pertaining to mass atrocities and the prevention of such crimes. It was suggested that more research is needed to understand whether law has a preventive role.

Mr. Quentin Debetz, Research Fellow at the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace gave the next presentation in the Session. Like many other workshop participants, he cautioned that genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity are still a possibility in the region. When there is a failure in political will to curb extreme and divisive ideologies, individuals and groups can choose a path to slaughter civilians based on differences in religion, political opinion, ethnic origin or even nationality. In regards to Cambodian history, there can be no mistake that there is a responsibility to protect which countries must support.

The presentation noted that in the few decades since the killings of the Khmer Rouge, Cambodia has made giant steps from war to peace—from authoritarian rule to nascent democracy. The Royal Government of Cambodia has made efforts to contribute to a deeper understanding of the prevention of mass atrocities. The first contribution has been recognising the importance of genocide and mass atrocity education. The high school teaching curriculum that was noted in a previous session aims to bring awareness of the Democratic Kampuchea reign and the atrocities committed. Rather than just a static place in history, it seeks to gather the accounts of victims, and to understand the legacy of the Khmer Rouge on the lives of everyday Cambodians. This helps to ensure that the crimes are not forgotten, and one hopes, not repeated.



The government's second contribution has been the acceptance of the ECCC, which has provided Cambodian people with information about how and why the killings began and escalated. The Public Affairs division of the ECCC has explained the trial and the judicial process to the people through films and radio programs. In its hybrid nature, the court has stressed that crimes against humanity are the concern of the international community and that no state involved in such crimes can rest comfortably in the guarantee of total impunity, even if there may be a delay in holding perpetrators to account.

Mr. Debetz noted that the government of Cambodia should continue and advance its contribution to preventing mass atrocities. Both the government and civil society, through a watchdog role, have a responsibility to guarantee effective mechanisms for protection. Cambodia has a role to play at the regional level to persuade its ASEAN counterparts that mass atrocity prevention and early warning is a priority. Beyond the region, Cambodia has also played an important role in peacekeeping and mine clearance. All of these are good initiatives that should be strengthened and sustained. The political willingness to set up

prevention tools and enforce the R2P is a long struggle. But, Mr. Debetz noted, it is worth recalling the words of former Indian diplomat Vijay Lakshmi Pandit who said, 'The more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war'.

Session 4: Discussants

The discussants for this session highlighted the role that different sectors can play in preventing atrocities. There was a particular focus on the role of education in prevention. Mr. Pou Sovachana, Lecturer, Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia, made a presentation on the importance of ensuring that all Cambodian children have the opportunity to attend school. He reflected, 'Education is the seed of prevention before intervention'.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION 4: PLENARY PARTICIPATION

Following the contributions from panellists and discussants of Session 3, the floor was once again open to questions from all workshop participants. The following is a synopsis of the questions raised.

Q1: What is the implication of R2P on neighbouring states providing refuge to victims? Is there a responsibility of states to open their borders in response to populations escaping from mass atrocities?

In the discussions that followed, participants suggested that states that support R2P should demonstrate that they are taking seriously the commitment of international assistance in the case of mass atrocities by ensuring safe access to people fleeing from atrocities. It was suggested that regional organizations should help organise immediate assistance to countries absorbing refugees.

Q2: What is next for R2P promotion in Cambodia?

The session ended with questions regarding future engagement and proposals for carrying the momentum forward. Workshop participants asserted that the next steps should be very thoughtful and timely. One participant noted that Prime Minister Hun Sen endorsed R2P at the 2005 World Summit, yet this workshop was nearly five years after the fact. There was a general sense that more consistent engagement on the topic is needed. In terms of priorities, many participants agreed that the first step should be translating documents and training manuals, training the trainers sessions and awareness raising/capacity building programs, with particular outreach to the Ministries of the Interior and National Defense.

Pou Sovachana
presenting at the
Workshop.



CLOSING COMMENTS

In the final comments for the workshop, Ms. Sarah Teitt thanked workshop participants for their engaging debate and discussion over the course of the two-day workshop. She noted that it was encouraging to engage with eminent and dedicated people from across government and civil society sectors to take what HRH Prince Sirivudh characterised as a ‘timely and meaningful’ opportunity to discuss the relatively new topic of the responsibility to protect. The workshop sought to raise awareness of the principle and forge a deeper consensus on pathways to move forward on strategies to build capacity to prevent mass atrocities in Cambodia and the region. With this in mind, workshop participants had constructively debated the concept, and outlined some of the challenges and opportunities for building a local and regional constituency in support of R2P. Some key themes were repeated in each session: R2P is important to Cambodia and relevant to ASEAN, materials should be translated into local languages, there is a need for local champions to support R2P and to build a constituency dedicated to implementing the principle, efforts to raise awareness must be relevant and reflect the Cambodian context and build on existing practices and agreements, there should be outreach to young people and media organisations, and efforts should be made to support the establishment of an early warning system. Ms. Teitt concluded by noting that the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect is dedicated to building a R2P Program in Cambodia, and hoped that this workshop is the first stage in a continued engagement. She noted that the recommendations participants made for future engagement will be collated and circulated as a ‘Plan of Action’ for further consultation.



8. Appendix I: Definition of R2P Crimes

According to the unanimous consensus reached at the 2005 World Summit, the R2P relates to four specific crimes that are defined in international humanitarian law: genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The following definitions of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity are taken from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), and reflect a broad consensus about the necessary scale and extent of planning necessary to qualify as a crime that can be punished under one of the four labels. Although ethnic cleansing has no formal legal definition, the definition presented here is grounded in the explanation of the term developed by a UN Commission of Experts established pursuant to Security Council Resolution 780 (1992).

Genocide

Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, such as:

- a. Killing members of the group;
- b. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- c. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- d. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- e. Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

War Crimes

Because the responsibility to protect is primarily concerned with the responsibility of a state to protect its own citizens, the following definition of war crimes is limited to acts in armed conflicts. They do not apply to situations of internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence or other acts of a similar nature, but to protracted armed conflict between governmental authorities and organized armed groups or between such groups. To fall under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, these acts must be committed on a widespread or systematic basis. This provides a useful benchmark for guiding analysts and decision-makers: the R2P focuses on preventing the widespread or systematic commission of the following acts, and on protecting populations from them.

Any of the following acts in grave breach of the Geneva Conventions:

- a. Committing murder, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture;
- b. Committing outrages of personal dignity, including humiliating and degrading treatment;
- c. Taking hostages;
- d. Passing sentences and carrying out executions without fair trial and due recognition of judicial guarantees.

Any of the following acts as part of a non-international armed conflict:

- a. Intentionally directing attacks against civilians, humanitarian workers or peacekeepers;
- b. Intentionally directing attacks against facilities, transport and personnel using the distinctive emblems of the Geneva Convention in conformity with international law;
- c. Intentionally directing attacks against buildings dedicated to religion, art, science or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals or areas where sick and wounded are collected;
- d. Pillaging a town;
- e. Committing rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution or forced pregnancy or enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence also constituting a grave breach of the Geneva Conventions;
- f. Conscripting or enlisting child soldiers;
- g. Ordering the displacement of the civilian population for reasons related to the conflict;
- h. Killing or wounding treacherously a combatant adversary;
- i. Declaring that no quarter will be given;
- j. Subjecting persons in power of another party to the conflict to torture or mutilation;
- k. Destroying or seizing the property of an adversary unless it is an imperative demanded by the necessities of the conflict.

Crimes against Humanity

Crimes against humanity encompass any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack:

- a. Murder;
- b. Extermination;
- c. Enslavement;
- d. Deportation or forcible transfer of population;
- e. Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law;
- f. Torture;
- g. Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity;
- h. Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law,
- i. Enforced disappearance of persons;
- j. The crime of apartheid;
- k. Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.

For acts to be considered crimes against humanity they must be more than isolated or sporadic commissions of the above abuses. Rather, acts constitute crimes against humanity when they are part of an established pattern of cruelty. Again, it is useful to think in terms of the ICC's standard of 'widespread and systematic' as a benchmark for when the commission of the aforementioned acts constitute a crime against humanity. Although crimes against humanity overlap with genocide and war crimes, crimes against humanity differ from genocide in that they do not implicate the 'intent to destroy in whole or in part a group', and they differ from war crimes in that they may occur in times of peace as well as war. Although most episodes (around two-thirds by one analysis) of genocide and mass killing take place within a context

of armed conflict, the two are not synonymous. One study suggested that there was only a ten percent chance that armed conflict would escalate into mass killing.

Ethnic Cleansing

The phrase ethnic cleansing refers to the policy of a particular group to systematically displace or deport another group from a particular territory on the basis of religious, ethnic or national origin. Ethnic cleansing differs from genocide in that the intent of the perpetrator may not be to destroy in whole or in part a group, but to create an ethnically homogenous territory. Ethnic cleansing can be regarded as both a war crime and a crime against humanity, depending on the circumstances in which it is committed. In most cases, the systematic displacement of a group from its territory occurs during war, and thus can be regarded as ordering the displacement of the civilian population for reasons related to the conflict (see war crimes, above). It is a crime against humanity because it involves the 'deportation or forcible transfer of population' as well as the persecution against any identifiable group (see crimes against humanity, above). Moreover, it is normally accompanied by other crimes such as murder, torture, and rape.



9. Appendix II: Workshop Program

WORKSHOP ON R2P CONSTITUENCY BUILDING IN CAMBODIA

16-17 June 2010
Sunway Hotel
Phnom Penh

Program

Workshop Venue: Meeting Room Mekong II

DAY ONE
Wednesday, 16 June 2010

0830-0900 Registration of Participants

0900-0930 Opening Session

Welcome Remarks

HRH Prince Samdech Norodom Sirivudh
Supreme Privy Counselor to His Majesty the King of Cambodia
Former Deputy Prime Minister and Co-minister of the Interior
Founder and Chairman of the Board of Directors,
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace

Dr. Noel Morada
Executive Director
Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Ms. Fiona Cochaud
Deputy Head of Mission and First Secretary
Australian Embassy in Cambodia

0930-1200

SESSION ONE:

**The State of the R2P Debate and the Importance of R2P
Constituency-Building in the Asia Pacific**

Chair:

Ms. Sarah Teitt
Outreach Director
Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

0930-1000

Speakers:

‘The Role of the Asia Pacific Centre for R2P’
Dr. Noel Morada
Executive Director, Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to
Protect (APC-R2P)
Coordinator, R2P Philippines Program, APC-R2P
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

‘The Importance of R2P Constituency Building in Southeast Asia’
Dr. Pranee Thiparat
Department of International Relations
Faculty of Political Science
Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
Coordinator, R2PThailand Program, APC-R2P

1000-1015

COFFEE BREAK

1015-1045

Discussants:

Mr. Chheang Vannarith
Executive Director
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
Cambodian representative to the Council for Security Cooperation in
the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) study group on R2P

H.E. Son Chhay
Member of National Assembly

1045-1200

Open Discussion

1200-1300 LUNCH BREAK

1300-1430 SESSION TWO:

**R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia:
Perspectives from Stakeholders**

Chair:

Dr. Noel Morada
Executive Director, APC-R2P
Coordinator, R2P Philippines Program, APC-R2P
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Speakers:

1300-1400 ‘Civil Society and the Prevention of Mass Atrocities’

Mr. Heng Monychenda
Director
Buddhism for Development
Battambang Province

‘Genocide Education and Prevention in the Cambodian Context’

Mr. Kok-Thay Eng, PhD Candidate
Deputy Director, Research/Education
Documentation Centre of Cambodia

‘Youth and the Prevention of Mass Atrocities’

Mr. Path Heang
Youth & Adolescent Development Specialist
The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
The United Nations in Cambodia
International Advisory Board Member and Advisor on Cambodian
R2P Program, APC-R2P

1400-1430 Discussants:

Dr. Y Ratana
Director of Population Study Center,
Royal University of Phnom Penh
Assistant to Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of National Defense

Mr. Tep Punleou
Associate Dean, Faculty of Law
University of Cambodia

1430-1445 COFFEE BREAK

1445-1645 Break Out Session for Focus Group Discussions

Participants in the workshop will be divided into 2 or 3 breakout groups to enable them to brainstorm on the theme of the workshop. A spokesperson from each group will report to the plenary about the outcome of discussions their breakout sessions. A rapporteur will be assigned to each group.

1645-1715 Plenary Session: Report of Break Out Groups

1715-1730 Closing Remarks for Day 1 of the Workshop

Dr. Noel Morada
Executive Director, APC-R2P
Director, R2P Philippines Program, APC-R2P
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

DAY TWO
Thursday, 17 June 2010

Venue: Meeting Room Mekong II

0830-1200 SESSION THREE:*

**R2P Promotion and Constituency-Building in Cambodia:
The Role of Stakeholders**

Chair:

Mr. Chheang Vannarith
Executive Director
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace

0830-1000 Speakers:

‘Engaging Local Populations ’
Mr. Neou Kassie
Outreach Coordinator

* Panelists from Day 1 were added to this session due to scheduling conflicts; this program and the workshop report reflect these changes.

Victims Unit
Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia

‘The role of the Media in Prevention and Early Warning’
Mr. Khieu Kola
Board of Directors
Club of Cambodian Journalists

‘The Legal framework for Protection’
Professor Kong Phallack
Dean of Faculty of Law and Public Affairs,
Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia

‘The Politics of R2P: Cambodian and regional perspectives’
Ms. Astrid Norén-Nilson
PhD Candidate, Cambridge University
Research Fellow, CICP

‘Overview and Perceptions of Recent Regional Consultations on R2P’
Mr. Yin Sopheap
Cambodian Representative to Regional Consultation on the
Responsibility to Protect hosted by the S. Rajaratnam School of
International Studies, Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies and
Internal and Cross-Border Conflicts Project, Singapore, April 2010

‘Cambodian perspectives on R2P’
Mr. Quentin Debetz
Research Fellow
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace

1000-1015 COFFEE BREAK

1015-1100 Discussants:

‘Working for Cambodia's Future: Education is The Only Answer’
Mr. Pou Sovachana
Lecturer
Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia

1100-1200 Open Discussion

1200-1230 CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Sarah Teitt
Outreach Director
Asia Pacific Centre for Responsibility to Protect
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

1230-1400 LUNCH



10. Appendix III: List of Participants

Hosts/Organisers

Dr. Chheang Vannarith	Executive Director, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace; Cambodian Representative to the CSCAP Study Group on R2P
Ms. Neth Chantha	Deputy Executive Director, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
Dr. Noel Morada	Executive Director and Philippines Program Coordinator, Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
Ms. Sarah Teitt	Outreach Director, Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect

Speakers

HRH Prince Norodom Sirivudh	Supreme Privy Counsellor to His Majesty the King of Cambodia; Founder, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
Ms. Fiona Cochaud	Deputy Head of Mission and First Secretary, Australian Embassy in Cambodia
Dr. Pranee Thiparat	Lecturer, Chulalongkorn University (Thailand); Thailand Program Coordinator, Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
Mr. Son Chhay	Member of National Assembly
Mr. Heng Monychenda	Director, Buddhism for Development, Battambang Province
Mr. Kok-Thay Eng	Deputy Director, Research/Education, Documentation Centre of Cambodia (DC-CAM)
Mr. Heang Path	Youth & Adolescent Development Specialist, The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); International Advisory Board Member and Advisor on Cambodian R2P Program, Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
Dr. Y Ratana	Director of Population Study Center, Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP); Assistant to Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of National Defense
Mr. Tep Punleou	Associate Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Cambodia
Mr. Neou Kassie	Outreach Coordinator, Victims Unit, Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia
Mr. Khieu Kola	Board of Directors, Club of Cambodian Journalists

Prof. Kong Phallack	Dean of Faculty of Law and Public Affairs, Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia
Ms. Astrid Norén-Nilson	Research Fellow, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace; PhD Candidate, Cambridge University
Mr. Yin Sopheap	Cambodian Indigenous Youth Association;
Mr. Quentin Debetz	Research Fellow, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
Mr. Pou Sovachana	Lecturer, Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia

Plenary Participants

Mr. An Buntha	Ministry of Justice
Mr. Aun Sokneang	Human Right Organization for Transparency and Peace (HROTP) (NGO)
Mr. Ban Komphak	Official of National Assembly
Mr. Will Baxter	Phnom Penh Post
Mr. Chan Bunny	Permanent Secretary of IBMA, Royal Academy of Cambodia
Mr. Chea Chantha	Researcher, Royal Academy of Cambodia
Mr. Chhaing Huy	Office of the Council of Ministers
Mr. Chim Phorst	Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP)
Mr. Chin Chan	Ministry of Women's Affairs
Ms. Alice Foster	Cambodia Daily
Mr. Em Huy	Ministry of Agriculture Fishery and Forestry (MAFF)
Mr. Em Sokha	Partnership for Development in Kampuchea (Padek) (NGO)
Mr. General Heng Vichoth	Deputy of Education, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport
Mr. Han Chenda	Cambodia Media and Research for Development (CMRD) (company)
Mr. Hel Mory	Ministry of Women's Affairs
Mr. Hem Sinoch	Social Worker
Ms. Kang Sarita	Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia
Mr. Kay Ketninn	National Assembly
Mr. Keo Phirum	Chief Cabinet Sam Rainsy Party
Mr. Keo Rathana	Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia
Mr. Keo Soklakhena	Ministry of Information
Mr. KhanYean	Ministry of Interior
Mr. Koem Oeurn	Ministry of Education
Mr. Kong Sam Onn	Cambodian Center for Human Rights
Mr. Greg Lavender	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Ms. Riona McCormack	UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Ms. Meas Saim	ADHOC, The Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association
Mr. Meas Sokchea	Phnom Penh Post
Mr. Mey Soklim	Radio FM 102

Mr. Ngyen Chi Dung	Embassy of Vietnam
Mr. Nim Sitha	Ministry of Planning
Mr. Nop Rithy	Ministry of Planning
Mr. Ouk Chandaravuth	AM 918, FM 105.75
Mr. Pen Sangha	Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia
Mr. Pou Darany	Ministry of Education
Mr. Prak Rosa	Ministry of Interior
Mr. Prak Socheat	Council of Ministers (CM)
Mr. Ren Sopheap	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport
Mr. Binike Ro	Australian Embassy
Mr. Ros Hoeun	Trainer, Youth Resource Development Program (YRDP)
Ms. Say Seyheang	Assistant to Pou Sovachana, Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia
Ms. Sayana Sev	Documentation Centre of Cambodia (DC-CAM)
Ms. Nikki Sayres	The Asia Foundation
Mr. Sengkeo Mithong	Lao Embassy
Mr. Sok Kheng	Ministry of Justice
Mr. Sok Thea	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Tep Punleou	University of Cambodia
Mr. Tum Sophal	Ministry of National Defense
Mr. Vann Piseth	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Terry Wawn	Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia



The Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect is an Associate of the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. The Centre's mission is to advance the Responsibility to Protect principle within the Asia-Pacific Region and worldwide, and support the building of capacity to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Patrons

Lloyd Axworthy

*President, University of Winnipeg,
Former Foreign Minister of Canada*

John Dauth

*High Commissioner of Australia in New
Zealand*

Gareth Evans

President of the International Crisis Group

Colin Keating

Executive Director, Security Council Report

Edward Luck

*Special Adviser to the United Nations
Secretary-General*

Fidel Valdez Ramos

Former President of the Philippines

H.R.H Samdech Norodom Sirivudh

*Supreme Privy Counsellor to His Majesty the
King of Cambodia
Former Deputy Prime Minister and Co-
minister of Interior*

Vitit Muntarbhorn

*Professor of Law, Chulalongkorn University,
Thailand; Special Rapporteur on Human
Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of
Korea*

Kyudok Hong

*Dean, College of Social Science
Sookmyung Women's University
Korea*

Dewi Fortuna Anwar

*Former Assistant to the Vice President
for Global Affairs*

Lauro Liboon Baja Jr.

*Former Philippines Permanent Representative
to the United Nations*

Tatsuro Kunugi

Former UN Assistant Secretary General

Ramesh Thakur

*Distinguished Fellow, Waterloo University,
Canada*



International Advisory Board

Alistair Gee (Chair)
Amitav Acharya
Miki Honda
Shin-wha Lee
Liu Tiewa
Path Heang
Muhadi Sugiono

M. C. Abad Jr.
Mely Caballero-Anthony
Paul Evans
K. S. Balakrishnan
Rizal Sukma
Pranee Thiparat

The International Advisory Board also includes Institutional Members:

Oxfam Australia
Austcare/Actionaid
Pacific Islands Forum

Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, c/o School of Political Science & International Studies, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD4072, Australia.
Tel: +61 7 3346 6443. Email: info@r2pasiapacific.org

The contents and conclusions of this Report are the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Centre, its Patrons or members of its International Advisory Board.