

មជ្ឈមណ្ឌលឯកសារកម្ពុជា

A Meeting of Genocide Scholars: A Report on the 2007 Biennial IAGS Conference¹

By: Dacil Q. Keo²
July 23, 2007

Below the snowy peaks of the Bjelašnica Mountain Range and beneath the crimson brick homes and fruit-bearing arboreal trees that decorate verdant hills, lies Sarajevo, the site of a genocide conference. A taxi ride from Sarajevo's international airport to the conference venue reveals both natural beauty and a country rebuilding itself. At times, scenic views of grand conifers and colorful gardens can be deceptive, but there is no mistake why the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) chose the country of Bosnia-Herzegovina as the 2007 location for international genocide discourse. In the 1990s, former president of former Yugoslavia Slobodan Milosevic's failed plan to create a "Greater-Serbia" after a number of secessions resulted in numerous mass killings across the Balkans and undeniably, genocide. Bosnia-Herzegovina was a part of the former Yugoslavia until 1990. The country has three main ethnic groups: Bosnian Muslims, Serbs (32%) and Croats. Bosnia declared independence from Yugoslavia in 1992, which the Serb population opposed. War broke out and ethnic cleansing occurred. It was carried out by Bosnian Serbs against non-Serb Bosnians. As a result approximately 200,000 people were systematically killed in the conflict. The most notorious killings occurred in the United Nations "safe haven" of Srebrenica where thousands were murdered by the Serb military in July 1995. Over a decade later and mass graves are still being discovered in parts of the country making some Bosnians feel that a "silent genocide" is in progress.

In Africa and Asia genocide also took its toll most notably in Rwanda and Cambodia. Both countries are presently seeking justice by different models; Rwanda is employing three judicial processes at the international, national, and local level while Cambodia currently is addressing legal justice through the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC), a mixed international and national tribunal. While legal systems seek justice for what occurred in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Cambodia, genocide is presently taking place in Darfur, Sudan. Appropriately and somewhat ironically, the title of this year's week-long IAGS conference is "Preventing Genocide Before it Occurs." In September 2004, Former US Secretary of State Colin Powell proclaimed that the mass rapes and killings in Darfur are tantamount to genocide. Several years later in August 2007, the UN announced that it would send UN peacekeeping forces to Darfur. By that time, an estimated 200,000 people had died and two million more have been displaced since 2003. The meeting of genocide scholars in Sarajevo aims to address this issue and many others. Through discussions on Darfur, past genocides, the role of the international community and the UN, concepts and theories, legal systems of justice, and personal testimonies, the IAGS conference is a formative step in raising awareness on genocide and developing the promising scholarship on genocide and related areas.

The conference was held from July 9-13th in the southern district of Ilidza. It was hosted by the Institute for the Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law of the

¹This report does not intend to be a comprehensive review of the conference. The views expressed are solely those of the author's and not IAGS's.

² I would like to thank Adam Keker and Amanda Pike for their generous donation to DC-Cam which allowed me to participate in the conference in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. I would also like to thank Kok-thay Eng, the Director of the Research at DC-Cam. He wrote complete summaries of his panel presentations for me, which I have used in whole (without any changes) in this report.

University of Sarajevo and dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Eric Markusen in the spirit of commitment for the study of how genocide was perpetrated by peoples who were previously or later victims.

In the peculiar setting of the Hollywood Hotel where framed posters of the Rat Pack and Tom Cruise abound, over 300 genocide scholars, including seasoned professors and rising scholars, participate in approximately 12 hours a day of panel presentations, speeches, movies, excursions, and even breakfast conversations all related to the matter of mass violence. Participants in the conference come from diverse backgrounds thereby creating both interdisciplinary and interesting panels. The fields of theatre, art, and film were not left behind. The conference presented many opportunities for participants of all levels. It was a chance for the unknown but ambitious undergraduate student to see and possibly meet renowned scholars like Frank Chalk and Israel Charny. The conference had given a face and voice to the forefathers of genocide scholarship, the majority of whom are rather amiable and humble. It also provided IAGS members a forum to address association business affairs and encourage more active participation from the students. And most noticeably, it brought together a community of learners, teachers, and researchers dedicated to analyzing and understanding some of the most horrific crimes of the twentieth century with the sincere hope of ending them.

In a long hallway lined with doors of meeting rooms named after key figures in genocide studies such the Lemkin Room (named after passionate activist Raphael Lemkin who coined the term *genocide* even before the notorious genocide of the Jews and other minority groups during World War II), participants selectively chose a panel of interest. The 10 minutes allotted per presenter had some rushing through their conclusions and others only highlighting the highlights of their research papers. A short Q&A session granted just enough time for several questions to be asked and answered. Although there was intellectual exchange present during the sessions, time limitations curbed the possibility for extended dialogue during the presentations. These dialogues were most likely continued after the session over Bosnian coffee or beer. In total, six sessions convened on four of the five days translating into 120 presentations and speeches if one attended all six sessions per day with an average of 5 presenters per session. This does not include films screened after dinner each night. Amidst the all the activities, the information absorption, and the self-introductions, several moments stood out for the author for different reasons, but mostly because of their emotional intensity.

Personal testimonies of torture and survival are inherently fused with emotions, especially when they come from the young. On Monday night at the Markusen room, eight brave Bosnian students disclosed their horrific experiences during the genocide to a full audience. The students spoke of how they felt betrayed by the UN Dutch forces who they believed would protect them but instead allowed the massacre of their family, neighbors, and countrymen. They also talked about their hopes of discovering the bones of loved ones so that proper funeral ceremonies can finally be given. During the presentations, many conference participants both young and old were extremely moved by the students' stories. Lisabeth Meyers, an incoming graduate student in the London School of Economics and Political Science, remembers vividly a presentation in which one speaker "described how his mother, overcome by grief, tried to take her own life and his" and later "unable to convince her son to give up, she threw herself into a river." This and other disturbing testimonies from the eight students remind us of the difficulties that the United Nations and other international bodies have had in preventing and stopping genocide, and ultimately in saving thousands, if not

millions of lives. The people of Bosnia have not forgotten the failures of the UN in Srebrenica and other places. The wounds of genocide are still fresh in Bosnia because mass graves are still being discovered in parts of the country.

On the following night, when honored speaker Carla Del Ponte arrived to receive an award, it appeared that some had understandably channeled their grave disappointments towards the present work of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY). Upon the three foot raised stage sat senior IAGS officials along with Chief Prosecutor Carla Del Ponte and the lead attorney at the Office of Prosecution, Mr. Norman Farrell. Mr. Farrell began first with an explanation of the duties and difficulties associated with the work of his office including the complexities involved in proving a legal case of genocide. Prosecutor Del Ponte arrived later and also spoke. Afterward, the moment of questioning came. Many hands rose in the air. Some questions Prosecutor Del Ponte answered herself and others she deferred to Mr. Farrell who answered them very calmly and systematically. Some inquired into the legal and factual aspects of the cases such as proving “intent,” rape as “an element of genocide,” and the matter of mental and bodily harm. Others asked about the details of those arrested or why others have not been arrested. And some questioned the handling of the cases and evidences by the tribunal. In a question concerning a piece of evidence, one woman asked the Chief Prosecutor, “Do you regret keeping the key Serbian documents secret?” and added that she wanted the prosecutor to answer “not like a chief prosecutor but like a human being.” Another asked Del Ponte, “I’d like to know why you haven’t done your job properly.” This was in reference to certain top leaders of the Serb military not being indicted. At the end of the session, Carla Del Ponte was presented with an award for her “outstanding contributions to the development of an international legal system to end impunity for the crime of genocide.”

Arguably the most emotionally intense day was Wednesday when conference members visited a mass grave and attended a funeral ceremony for 465 victims whose bodies were recently exhumed in Potocari, a suburb of Srebrenica located about a 3-hour bus ride from Sarajevo. The long ride from Sarajevo to Potocari, like the short one from the airport to the conference venue, revealed stunning vistas. The road along the way was lined with fertile apple trees, tall cedars, and green hills. And if one paid close attention, other sceneries included smoke rising from canopies,



A scenic view along the 3-hour bus ride from Sarajevo to Potocari.

brick balconies adorned with blossoming flower pots, gardens of flowers and corn, and even Chinese shops decorated with traditional red lanterns. Against this backdrop of color and natural beauty, the bus driver commented periodically along the 3-hour ride upon the atrocities that took place in an area the bus was about to enter or had just passed. For example, he would begin with, “Ladies and gentlemen” and explain through a translator that in a certain town, approximately 100 Bosnians were killed in their homes by the Serb Army; as one looked out the window, only lush green hills and bright flower gardens were visible.

Upon arrival at the mass grave, the conference members were introduced to two important Bosnians deeply involved with the mass grave exhumation. The first is a gentleman who had dedicated his life to locating and excavating the graves, with or without support from the local government. And the second is a prosecutor in charge of building a case for victims of the Srebrenica genocide. As the crowd gathered around the large excavated earth, the two explained their work and answered questions.



A recently exhumed mass grave in Potocari, Bosnia.

The mass grave was rectangular in shape and measured approximately 5 meters by 15 meters. Noticeably buried partially in the dirt were tattered red, black, and blue clothing, bones, and skulls. The area was in some ways, accidentally discovered. No one in the area had suspected a mass grave was there because grass and small trees grew above the soil. Local children even played soccer there. One woman who lived down the hill noticed something strange about the hill however: it was quite leveled. This was unusual. A team was sent in to examine the area and a mass grave was discovered.



At the memorial cemetery in Potocari, 465 coffins dressed in green cloth wait to be buried.

Another strange aspect of the mass graves in Potocari is that the entire remains of a victim are not always found in the same mass grave. The possibility that parts of a body were located in two or three different places is not unlikely. The explanation given for this is that some perpetrators had returned to the mass grave site with a bulldozer with the intent to destroy and relocate parts of victims' remains. By doing so they believed that it would be harder for the authorities and the survivors to build a case against them. The devastating result however, is that some family members of a victim must wait weeks or even months to collect all the remains of the loved one. This not only is emotionally devastating to the family, but also creates practical complications such as whether to bury the remains discovered or wait to until all the bones have been found. This is what the local gentleman who has dedicated his life to uncovering mass graves calls a "silent genocide."

That afternoon a ceremony was held for 465 victims of the Srebrenica massacre at the Potocari memorial cemetery. The clouds and cool breeze from the morning had not

disappeared, contributing to the solemnity of that day. The memorial cemetery was created in 2000 and currently holds the remains of 2,500 of the estimated 8,000-9,000 Bosnian Muslims that were killed by Serb forces in 1995. Each year, the bodies of recently discovered victims are buried here. This year, approximately 30,000 people gathered to take part in the mass burial. On one end of the field, 465 coffins dressed in green cloth lay side by side. On the other end of the field, 465 tombstones and freshly dug graves wait to receive the coffins. In the center of the field, large marble arcs positioned in a semi-circle are engraved with victims' names. One by one, each name was called out. As a name was called out, the respective coffin was lifted off the ground where it was transported to the other end of the field by a sea of supporting hands underneath. There at its proper gravestone, the coffin was gently lowered into the ground as several men began to cover it with soil. Burying the coffins was a group effort; when one man got tired another would step in. Even a boy of approximately 13 years took part in burying the victims. Gathered around the tombstones were family members who mourned and wept.



Local Bosnians work together to transport the coffins from one end of the field to the other where freshly dug graves, tombstones, and family members wait for proper burial.

The cries of one woman in particular were piercing and unsettling; it seemed that she lost herself in her moment of grief and became physically weak. Others in the crowd quickly escorted her to the side. Sitting in a cloth fold-out chair, the elderly lady wiped her tears as several people around her tried to console her.

After all the names were read, there was a momentary pause followed by the stirring voice of a man singing *a cappella*. The remains of 465 victims were buried that day in the memorial



A woman kneels down as the remains of her loved one is being gently lowered into the ground.

cemetery; thousands more are still waiting to be discovered and buried.



In the center of the field, large marble arcs arranged in a semi-circle are engraved with victims' names. Some are blank, allowing room for future names to be added.

While burying a loved one may help to relieve some of the emotional and physiological agony of genocide, much more is needed to help victims achieve a sense of closure and perhaps, even justice. The topic of reconciliation and justice was prominent among some of the presenters. Mutangana Jean Bosco, a prosecutor for the National Jurisdiction, gave a presentation titled, "Criminal Justice in Post-Genocide Rwanda: Case Study of *Gacaca* Jurisdictions." Mr. Bosco talked about how, given the large scale of perpetrators and the jurisdictional and resource limitations of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the National Genocide Trials, the *Gacaca*

judicial process has been able to administer justice at the local level. According to the presenter, the *Gacaca* process is based on the Rwandan tradition of resolving disputes between community members. Its structure, which presenter Shivon Byamukama also described, when applied to genocide cases involves the community investigating the nature of a crime and then having an elected *Inyangamugayo* ("persons of great integrity") try the alleged perpetrator. The sentences various according to whether the person confesses and the severity of the crime committed. The two presenters pointed out the advantages of utilizing such a system in Rwanda.

One audience member asked if the *Gacaca* process could be applied to other cases of genocide in the world; Mr. Bosco explained quite assertively, that it could. His answer received a round of applause. Arguments of course, can be made for the potential inadaptability of this system for the Bosnian and Cambodian cases of genocide if we were to carefully examine the differences in traditional systems of problem-solving within these countries, the physical location of victims and perpetrators, the feelings and opinions of victims towards perpetrators and vice-versa, the current progress of the respective international judicial processes (the ICTY and the ECCC), the willingness of the perpetrator to participate in this process, concepts of local justice, and the facts of the genocides themselves, among many other considerations.

In the context of Cambodia, justice for genocidal crimes is a complex issue involving influences ranging from international and national politics, the extended lapse of time since the crimes were committed, a "culture of impunity" and a "culture of silence," and survivors' understanding (or lack thereof) of why the genocide occurred. Nonetheless, it appears that the majority of survivors in Cambodia are optimistic, albeit cautiously optimistic, about the ECCC (also known as the Khmer Rouge tribunal). The author presented on the Local Justice I panel (there was also a Local Justice II panel) on Cambodian perspectives of justice in regards to the Khmer Rouge tribunal.

I first began by briefing the stages of judicial structures in Cambodia starting with the Civil Code adopted during French colonization, then Democratic Kampuchea's destruction of courts and basic freedoms, and ending with modern-day weak and corrupt judicial institutions in Cambodia. Given such upheavals and inconsistencies in judicial structures in a span of fifty years, it has been particularly difficult for Cambodians to comprehend and express what legal justice in terms of genocidal crimes means to them. This is evident by the massive efforts on the part of international and local NGOs in Cambodia to explain the Khmer Rouge tribunal to them. This also produces a distinguishing feature of local justice in Cambodia: the active involvement of the NGO community in truth-seeking and legal justice education. Organizations dealing with human rights or related areas such as democracy, have collaborated with the Khmer Rouge tribunal in order foster understanding among Cambodian villagers about the tribunal processes and its developments. They educate the local population through forums, radio and videos, visits to the courtroom, presentations by tribunal officials, and workshops. They encourage the average Cambodian villager to speak up and express their viewpoints or concerns in relation to the ECCC. Having worked at the Documentation Center of Cambodia (DC-Cam) for a period of nine months, my presentation focused mainly on the outreach efforts of DC-Cam and the insights it revealed about Cambodians' perspectives of justice in regards to the present Khmer Rouge tribunal.

DC-Cam is one of the leading organizations in Cambodia focused on informing and educating the public about Democratic Kampuchea and the ECCC. In 2006, the Center implemented a new approach of outreach in Cambodia, the "ECCC Tour," in which instead of going to the villages to educate, the Center brought thousands of local villagers to Phnom Penh to see for their own eyes the tribunal courtroom and genocide commemoration sites such as the Tuol Sleng Genocide Museum and the Choeung Ek "Killing Fields" Genocide Memorial Center. It was through the dozens of interviews conducted at these sites from February 2006 to April 2007, the ECCC Tour surveys collected in January 2007, and the questions and concerns expressed during the meetings with ECCC officials, that I have categorized the perspectives of Cambodians into four groups. Before I explained what these perspectives are, I first mentioned one aspect of the survey responses. Many respondents did not provide an answer to the question which asks them to explain what justice in terms of the crimes of the Khmer Rouge regime meant to them. This might be the result of a number of things. Perhaps they did not understand the question, although none of them wrote down as such. Another reason could be the difficulty that many Cambodians have in expressing and describing their thoughts when it comes to abstract concepts. And the third is perhaps because they feel that no kind of justice will ever suffice for the loss of loved ones and thus, were reticent in their response. With this in mind, I grouped the sentiments towards the tribunal by Cambodians in the order from the most pervasive perspective to the least. It should be noted that some Cambodians may hold more than one perspective and as time goes on, they may change their perspective as well.

I believe that the majority of Cambodians are cautiously optimistic about the tribunal. This cautious optimism is the result of the complicated history of Cambodia during and after the genocide as summarized hereafter. The international community and the UN were unresponsive to genocide while it was happening in Cambodia, partially due to limited information about Cambodia at that time. After genocide did occur, Cambodia was sanctioned and embargoed by the international community due to its friendly relations with and its dependency on the Vietnamese communist government. To make matters worse, the Cambodian seat at the UN General Assembly was represented by the genocidal Khmer Rouge faction. In 1992 and 1993 when the international community finally stepped in, in the

form of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), Cambodians were hopeful that political stability and international support had finally arrived. After nearly a US\$2 billion investment resulting in the successful national elections of May 1993 (there was a 90% voter turnout), the UN left the country on its own to deal with the aftermath of two rival parties joined nominally by a rare and disastrous co-prime ministership. In addition, the issue of the Khmers Rouges was not resolved. Four years later, the co-prime ministership ended with a coup which left incumbent Hun Sen the sole leader of Cambodia. During the coup, some in Cambodia had feared a return to the Khmer Rouge years; this is how scared some people were. And lastly, during the long 8-9 year dialogue between the UN and the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) Khmer Rouge Task Force, many including international observers, had believed that justice for Khmer Rouge victims would never be realized due to strong disagreements between the two sides which had at one point, motivated the UN to pull out of the talks. With all of this in the back of their minds, many Cambodians are nonetheless still hopeful of the joint RGC-UN tribunal. The bottom line is that they want the Khmers Rouges to be punished for the atrocities they committed.

The second group desires simply to know the “truth” about Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979) and believes that the tribunal will reveal this truth. They want to know who the Khmers Rouges were, why they killed their own people, why they inflicted great suffering upon the populace by starvation and torture, which foreign countries supported the Khmer Rouge, why their loved ones were killed, what was the goal of the Khmers Rouges, and many other questions relating to the government of Democratic Kampuchea. Simply knowing the facts of what happened and seeing the Khmer Rouges held accountable will greatly satisfy them.

The third group are those that are unsatisfied with the ECCC prosecuting only “senior Khmer Rouge leaders and those most responsible” as stated in the Khmer Rouge law; they want low-level and mid-level former Khmer Rouge leaders and cadres held accountable in the court of law as well. This is understandable considering that perpetrators who carried out the crimes were among this stratum of leadership and not from the top political echelon. This does not mean however, that Cambodians who are satisfied with only top leaders being prosecuted by the tribunal have forgiven low-level Khmer Rouge cadres or would not support other measures of holding them accountable. Not everyone accepts the defense of “following orders” or “I would have been killed myself.” Their support of the tribunal’s limited jurisdiction can be explained by their understanding of the complications and costs associated with trying to prosecute thousands of former Khmers Rouges and the need for national social stability (explanations that the tribunal itself has given for their limited jurisdiction).

The final group employs Buddhist understandings of *karma* and can be divided into two sub-groups: those that feel that the tribunal, in a sense, is *karma* being enacted upon the perpetrators and those who see the tribunal as unnecessary because the cycle of *karma* will catch up with the perpetrators either in this lifetime or in the next life.

Kok-thay Eng, Director of Research at DC-Cam and a PhD student at Rutgers University, presented on a similar topic with similar conclusions of Cambodian perspectives on another panel. Based on interviews with top Buddhist monks on justice and reconciliation by DC-Cam in 2003, Mr. Eng contributes another sub-perspective to the fourth group. He explains that monks believe, whether or not former senior Khmer Rouge leaders or lower Khmer Rouge personnel are brought to justice now, they are suffering from their bad deeds. One of the aspects of punishment they are enduring is being considered in Cambodian society as

murderers. This is heavy punishment because in this society "face" is very important for a person's future career and success. Villagers would most certainly avoid making business with them and keep them outside the social circle. Mr. Eng analysis on Cambodians' perspectives also includes the matter of economic compensation, stating that "some Cambodians believe that although prosecutions of Khmer Rouge leaders might bring some degree of justice to the victims, in general they would personally gain little in terms of family economic conditions."

Mr. Eng also presented his personal view of what justice should be for the Cambodian genocide. Holding the view that the various understandings of what justice is in Cambodia are influenced by the extent to which the people understand their genocide history, he builds his view of genocide justice through his understanding of genocide in general and Cambodian genocide in particular. His knowledge of Cambodian genocide has been built through working and immersing in DC-Cam archives reading forced confessions and other Khmer Rouge documents. He mentioned that justice for genocide is not easily obtained and once genocide happens one should not expect that much can be recovered from the loss. The best way to bring justice after genocide is to prevent it from happening or spreading in the first place.

On the same panel as Mr. Eng, Helen Jarvis (Chief of Public Affairs at the ECCC) presented as well on the Khmer Rouge tribunal itself, detailing the dialogue that led to the establishment of the tribunal. Her presentation centered on the challenges to the formation of the tribunal from both the international and national side. Newly elected President of IAGS, Gregory Stanton, discussed his personal and professional activism which led to the creation of the Cambodian Genocide Program at Yale University. The Cambodian field office of this program led by Mr. Youk Chhang soon after became an independent organization called the Documentation Center of Cambodia in 1997. The Center is now the largest repository of Khmer Rouge documents in the world and a major contributor of Khmer Rouge related documents to the ECCC. Gregory Stanton emphasized that he strongly believes in "planting institutions," as evident in his passionate campaigning in the 1980s and 1990s. DC-Cam Director Mr. Chhang calls Gregory Stanton one of the "founding fathers" of his organization. In a sense, President Stanton's vision had come full circle; and indeed it was quite heartening to see a "founding father" of Cambodia's prominent genocide center shake hands with an intelligent and promising young scholar of this center, Mr. Eng.



DC-Cam Research Director, Kok-thay, meets a "founding father" of DC-Cam and newly elected IAGS president, Gregory Stanton.

Kok-thay Eng presented on two other panels at the conference. In the panel on internationalizing the IAGS he proposed the need for the establishment of a genocide research center for the region of Southeast Asia by transforming DC-Cam into an international NGO. DC-Cam has been active in Cambodia for the past ten years. It has

evoked within the Cambodian community a revival of interest on the Khmer Rouge genocide which had been forgotten for more than ten years. With the publication of a new book on the Cambodian genocide for high school education, DC-Cam has become a major genocide education center for Cambodia. Its magazine, *Searching for the Truth*, which began since 2000 reaches to every corner of Cambodia and plays a very important part in genocide education and truth seeking process. Based on this experience, DC-Cam seeks to transform itself into a body for genocide education not only in Cambodia, but also in the region as well. Education will be one element of the new, wider center, but genocide research and monitoring in general for the region will be another important aspect.

The same paper also focuses on theoretical foundations for the establishment of the new center. Like other regions of the world, Southeast Asia is under constant threat of genocide. Southeast Asia is a multi-ethnic region. Archipelagic countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and others are particularly vulnerable because they contain many different cultures that used to be far apart. Today under the force of globalization, economic and social integration of the region, these different groups come together. There is a great potential for clashes. Furthermore, evolution and dissolution of groups are ongoing phenomenon in other countries. The indigenous ethnic groups in northeastern part of Cambodia, central Vietnam and southern Laos are under serious threat of being integrated into the larger regional community. A study and understanding of this phenomenon is vital in preventing future conflicts which might spiral down to genocide.

In the panel on Genocide and the UN Convention, Mr. Eng presented on conceptual dimensions of the term genocide. He highlights several standard critiques of the United Nations definition of the word genocide, including its inclusiveness and exclusiveness, intent requirement and protected groups. The paper emphasizes the most prominent aspect of genocide as "the killing of members of a people because of who they are." This manner of killing has the potential to proliferate from small-scale killing to large-scale killing of members of the victims group. A member of the audience believe that mass killing during the Bosnian conflict was a genocide-in-attempt, rather than small-scale genocide, because only a small number of members of the victims group were killed. My concept of genocide does not consider number as an important factor. The killing of a several thousand victims and the murder of two millions people are not different and they are equally heinous. In fact the two forms of killing are the same because the first case most certainly spread to the second case if it is not stopped. In this paper's definition of genocide, intervention should take place at the early stage of small scale killing because that is also genocide.

The conference came full circle with a performance on the life of Raphael Lemkin by Robert Skloot, a professor at the University of Wisconsin Madison, titled "If the Whole Body Dies: Raphael Lemkin and the Treaty Against Genocide." Raphael Lemkin was the man who created the term *genocide* and through zealous activism, brought about the UN Genocide Convention of 1948. The reading by Professor Skloot and other selected members of the conference was moving and powerful. It revealed the life of a man who was passionate, obsessed, and struggled deeply for a personal and international cause until his final days. The unfortunate reality is however that genocide occurred many times after Mr. Lemkin's death; the most pressing humanitarian issue today is the ongoing genocide in Darfur. Thus there are yet to be clear answers to "Preventing Genocide before it Occurs," the title of the conference. Some believe in the idea of "planting institutions," others in organizations and mechanisms which can override state sovereignty if needed, and others in a permanent international criminal court. During the presentations by older Bosnian survivors on Thursday night, one

gentleman in the audience stood up and graciously commended the witnesses for speaking out against the atrocities and praised them as the key to ending genocide in the future. Some in the audience applauded enthusiastically in agreement with his comments. Right after, another man stood up and said that witnesses speaking out in fact cannot prevent or stop genocide; rather it depends on political leaders. In the case of Darfur, political leaders of the UN have finally agreed to take action by sending as many as 26,000 UN peacekeeping soldiers and soldiers from the African Union to the area. These soldiers are armed and have the authority to defend themselves and protect the refugees and humanitarian workers there. The world now waits for the Sudanese government and the Arab militia who are committing the violence (and supported by the Sudanese government) to react to the UN's landmark move. As the dramatic events unfold, Darfur will become a major test in the international community's commitment and ability to end genocide.