



## **The “Reluctant” Witness: Examination of Long Norin Continues**

**By Christine Evans, Clinical Fellow, Center for International Human Rights, Northwestern University School of Law (JD and LLM)**

The trial of former Khmer Rouge leaders Nuon Chea, Khieu Samphan, and Ieng Sary continued today with the entire time devoted to the examination of former foreign ministry official Long Norin. Although the proceedings overall advanced more smoothly than they had on the previous day, the continued examination of the witness Long Norin progressed extremely slowly, characterized by the frequent need to repeat questions to prompt a response from the witness. By the time court was adjourned at 4 p.m., everyone in the courtroom – and many in the public gallery – appeared worn out from the day’s efforts and not eager to return to the courtroom on Friday.

### ***Long Norin’s Biography Presented***

The Trial Chamber convened the proceedings fifteen minutes late again today due to difficulties with the remote video link to Mr. Norin. President Nil Nonn informed the parties that the entire day would be used to continue the examination of the witness. He then informed the Witness and Export Support Unit (WESU) of the ECCC that witness TCW542, who had been standing by in case Mr. Norin’s testimony would be completed early, was excused and may now be returned to his home. The court stated that the court would most likely not hear this witness until early next year.

President Nonn then passed the floor to the international deputy co-prosecutor to continue with the presentation of the document to which the prosecution had referred at the end of Wednesday’s proceedings, requesting that the code of the document be stated precisely before it is projected on the screen.

The co-prosecutor then informed the court that the document that he would be presenting to the witness and to the court is a new document that was recently discovered and identified by the prosecution and, for that reason, it had not been placed in the case. After providing the assigned document numbers for each of the Khmer and English and French versions, he stated that he had been informed that the documents would be available on the shared documents drive for all the parties and the Trial Chamber. Knowing, however, that the drive does not always work well, the prosecution had brought hard copies in all three languages for the other parties.

After this introduction by the co-prosecutor, President Nonn instructed the court official to project the document on the screen so that the court and the witness would be able to see it. As only the Khmer version would be projected so that the witness would be able to see and read the document, Khieu Samphan's international lawyer and then the judges requested copies of the document in all three languages.

Son Arun, counsel for Nuon Chea, then requested that hard copies of all versions of the documents be provided to all of the parties; the president agreed and informed the parties that this practice should be followed in the future for whenever such documents are presented in court. Overall, the process of ensuring that all parties had copies of the documents took nearly ten minutes, prompting Ieng Sary's lawyer Michael Karnavas, ever the watchdog of the court's schedule, to suggest that this distribution be completed before the proceedings start. President Nonn agreed again and advised the parties also to make the advance circulation of the documents part of their standard practice in such cases.

The co-prosecutor responded, a bit defensively, that he had spoken directly with a member of Ieng Sary's legal team after the proceedings yesterday and given him the document numbers as well as his email address if he was unable to access the documents on the shared drive. He stated that he wished to make clear for the record that efforts had been made by the prosecution to ensure that the defense had these documents in advance of its production in court. Moving on from this topic, he then requested that he be allowed to sit during the questioning so that he may see the witness on the computer monitor on his table, which the court allowed.

Turning to the camera, the co-prosecutor greeted the witness and requested that the court official project the document on the screen. Asked whether he recognized the handwriting, Long Norin stated that this was indeed his writing. The WESU representative, again seated next to Mr. Norin, then informed the court that they were unable to see the entire page of the document and asked the court to zoom out. The witness then read the title of the document as "The Biography of Comrade Rit." Mr. Norin stated that this was the biography that he prepared "at a later date" and acknowledged that "Rit" was his revolutionary name during the period of Democratic Kampuchea. Although he was unable to recall the exact date when he wrote the biography, Mr. Norin did confirm that he prepared this biography between April 1975 and 1979.

Khieu Samphan's international lawyer then interrupted the questioning, stating that the witness's verification of the two front pages in and of itself cannot serve as an authentication of the entire document. Noting that the words appear almost illegible to him on the screen (though they were projected in Khmer and not in French), he requested that the witness be shown the entire document before they proceed.

President Nonn inquired whether Mr. Norin was able to see the document clearly, and Mr. Norin stated that he needed his glasses to see it completely. After the WESU representative put one pair of glasses on the witness, Mr. Norin requested he instead retrieve the glasses in his pocket in the other room. After a slight delay, the glasses were finally retrieved; however, the WESU representative stated that he and Mr. Norin were still unable to see the document clearly. The co-prosecutor informed the court that, as they would not be focusing on the entire document, it might be clearer if they zoom into the specific part that they would like Mr. Norin would read.

As Nuon Chea's counsel had objected to the admissibility of the document, President Nonn informed the prosecution, the witness must clearly identify that this is indeed his handwriting and the biography he completed. The co-prosecutor then suggested that they show each page to the witness and have him verify the handwriting before they go to the specific portions. He then asked the witness to look closely at each page as the court official scrolled slowly through them. After this was completed, the witness stated that the contents he had seen on the screen were in his handwriting.

After validating that the document was indeed written by Mr. Norin, the co-prosecutor asked him to verify that the Tach Chea he mentioned in this document was the same person with whom he had studied, as he stated in Wednesday's examination. Mr. Norin confirmed that this was indeed the same Tach Chea. The co-prosecutor then asked whether this Tach Chea also held the position of deputy education minister in the Lon Nol government. Mr. Norin stated that, during the Lon Nol period, Tach Chea had contact with the government, but he did not specify Mr. Chea's role. In response to a question on the subject, he also stated that he was not sure if Mr. Chea was taken hostage by students in 1974 and shot along with the education minister. "It has been a very long time," he said.

The co-prosecutor focused on one particular phrase in the document, in which Mr. Norin had written "the contemptible Tach Chea." When asked why he referred to Mr. Chea as "contemptible," the witness asserted that he meant "contemptible" in "a friendly way." Mr. Norin then explained that he was asked to write this biography in detail and describe his connection to Tach Chea specifically because he had been accused of being a CIA agent. "I knew that Tach Chea was a CIA agent, because he had contacts with embassies that are known to have tendencies toward the CIA," Mr. Norin stated, but then said that he himself only had contact with embassies that were from socialist countries and therefore, presumably, had no connection to the CIA. While he did not understand the real motive behind completing biographies, Mr. Norin said, he believed that it was because people wanted to know if he was affiliated with "certain organizations." He was told to be honest in writing the biography, which he tried to be, but he did not know what would be done with it after he completed it.

The witness then requested to go to the bathroom, and the court waited for him to return.

Returning to the biography, the co-prosecutor moved on to another page, but Mr. Norin stated that the letters and the screen are not clear enough. After the court zoomed into the page more closely, the right side of the page was blocked, so, after having Mr. Norin confirm again that this is his handwriting, the co-prosecutor read the portion into the record himself. "During my study, my life contact was very dark," the co-prosecutor read, "I was in contact with the people who later betrayed the country or conspired with the traitor." Mr. Norin had also written in the biography that his "living was not very clean," in that he used money and "did business" to get ahead. He also wrote that his "sexual morality was not clean, but "thanks to Angkar, I have strived to be better...."

When the co-prosecutor inquired as to why he wrote these sentences into the biography, the witness stated that he wanted to show the party that "I did not have anything to hide from

Angkar.” He wanted to be honest with the party and to show that “[o]nce I joined the revolution, I refashioned myself.”

Asked why he needed to explain to the party about his sexual morality, Mr. Norin’s answer was non-responsive to the question, stating instead that, during his student years, he and his friends divided into two groups: the leftists and the liberals. “We would try to convince each other to join our groups,” he said, noting that those who did not join were then considered “traitors.” He continued that those who considered themselves part of the leftist group saw themselves as clean and the others as unclean. When asked what happened to people who were considered unclean or traitors, he stated that nothing noticeable happened to them “at that time,” though it was unclear to which time period he was referring – his time as a student or during the period of Democratic Kampuchea.

The co-prosecutor then asked Mr. Norin about specific people he mentioned in his biography. First, with regard to a man named Sarin Chak, the witness stated that Mr. Chak had been the foreign minister for the Royal Government of National Union of Kampuchea (GRUNK).

Khieu Samphan’s lawyer interrupted the questioning again to inform the court that, on the documents he had been given, the document identification numbers were not printed, and therefore he was unable to follow along. Judge Lavergne then explained for the lawyer where to find the numbers on each page of the document.

After this interruption, nothing happened for approximately five minutes in the courtroom. It soon became clear that Mr. Norin had left during the interruption to take a bathroom break.

When Mr. Norin had returned, the co-prosecutor turned to another name listed in the biography, Tap Som An. Mr. Norin stated that Tap Som An had been a member of the diplomatic corps perhaps in Africa, and Mr. Som An had worked with Sarin Chak in Beijing for a time. In 1976 Mr. Som An returned to Cambodia, the witness stated, but Mr. Norin did not think that he had worked at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under Ieng Sary. The co-prosecutor then informed Mr. Norin that Mr. Som An was listed on a detainee list for S-21 prison and that, in fact, many of the people mentioned in his biography had ended up at S-21.

Regarding yet another person listed in his biography, Mr. Norin stated that a Mr. Van Piny had been a member of the diplomatic agency deployed to Egypt. But Mr. Norin could not recall if Mr. Piny was in Egypt during 1976 or 1977. He explained that he had given Mr. Piny’s name in his biography because he had been asked to list others who had worked with him in Beijing during the GRUNK period. When asked who had told him to give these names, Mr. Norin seemed hesitant to answer, and then eventually stated that no one at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs asked him to give this information.

### ***The Prosecution Attempts to Impeach the Witness***

Given the witness’s hesitancy in answering this question and his slow responses throughout the morning, the co-prosecutor then stated that it appeared that the witness is a bit reluctant to testify

against his former boss, Ieng Sary. Mr. Norin denied that he had any reluctance in answering the prosecution's questions. "If I could recall it, I would tell all that I can remember," he insisted.

Stating that he was now going to explore Mr. Norin's relationship with Ieng Sary, the co-prosecutor asked the witness if he has known Mr. Sary for almost forty years. Mr. Norin confirmed that this is correct and that he had known the accused since Mr. Sary was a special envoy under the GRUNK administration in Beijing. He also confirmed that Mr. Sary was the minister of foreign affairs while Mr. Norin worked there. He denied, however, having any contact with Mr. Sary after 1979.

The court then took the morning break.

Upon returning from the recess, the president reported that the Trial Chamber had sent an electronic copy of the biography to the WESU representatives with Mr. Norin so that the witness may review the document in hard copy. The WESU representative informed the court that another colleague had been sent to the copy shop to print out the document and that the court would be informed when he had returned. The court therefore returned the floor to the prosecution for further questioning of the witness.

The co-prosecutor then asked Mr. Norin to confirm that he had claimed before the break to have no contact with Ieng Sary since 1979, to which Mr. Norin replied that this is correct. The co-prosecutor requested Mr. Norin to explain to the court what the Democratic National United Movement (DNUM) was. Mr. Norin responded that DNUM was "a political movement," in which the members "tried their best to make sure the country was united and therefore very strong" He stated, however, that this movement did not have meetings. He stated that he had been the secretary general of the movement since it was established and that "another person" chaired DNUM. Under further examination by the co-prosecutor, Mr. Norin admitted that Ieng Sary was the president of this movement. He acknowledged that DNUM was established in 1994 after Mr. Sary split from the other Khmer Rouge leaders and that "theoretically" the movement still exists today but that "practically" it does not. The co-prosecutor then asked if "theoretically" Mr. Sary was still the president. In response, Mr. Norin again stated that DNUM has never had any actual meetings. When asked if he had communications with Mr. Sary about the organization, the witness stated that he had no contact with Mr. Sary ever about the organization. He said he has no idea where Ieng Sary even is.

The WESU representative who had been sent to the copy shop then returned with the hard copy of the biography, stopping the examination for a moment. After Mr. Norin had been handed the document, President Nonn explained what it was and instructed the WESU representative to assist the witness to find the appropriate parts whenever the lawyers referred to the document during the examination.

Picking up where he had left off in the questioning, the co-prosecutor then asked the witness how he became secretary general of DNUM. Mr. Norin again merely stated that Ieng Sary had been the chair of the organization, but that they had not had meetings.

Sounding a bit exasperated, the co-prosecutor then moved on from the subject of DNUM and began to ask the witness if he knew of another group named the Malai Market and Trade Office Company.

Disrupting the examination, Mr. Karnavas raised an objection to this line of questioning, asking the co-prosecutor to specify the particular paragraph of the Closing Order to which this information is relevant. The co-prosecutor stated that he would think the relevance is “fairly obvious” as it goes to establishing the credibility of the witness. Mr. Karnavas asserted that it was not fairly obvious to him, and, in response, President Nonn instructed the co-prosecutor to make clear to what portion of the Closing Order these questions apply.

With a clicking pen punctuating his response, the co-prosecutor explained that he was delving into these matters because the witness has repeatedly appeared reluctant to testify, especially with regard to anything related to Ieng Sary. These questions, he asserted, are meant to expose that Mr. Norin and Mr. Sary currently or in the recent past have been part of the same entities, and, therefore, Mr. Norin may have a reason to protect Ieng Sary.

In response, Mr. Karnavas stated that, if the witness had truly been reluctant to testify, then he could have refused to testify at all. Instead, he argued, the witness has answered every question posed to him, despite his ill health and the difficulties created by the remote participation. He accused the co-prosecutor of “characterizing” the witness. If the co-prosecutor’s intention is to show bias by the witness, then he needs to impeach him properly using his prior statements, Mr. Karnavas maintained, rather than straying into other irrelevant matters.

Agreeing with Mr. Karnavas, the court sustained the objection and ended the questioning of the witness on this subject.

Declaring that he will “take up Mr. Karnavas’s offer,” presumably meaning he will impeach the witness, the co-prosecutor then asked Mr. Norin if he remembered being interviewed by someone from the Office of the Co-Investigating Judges (OCIJ) in 2007. The witness replied that he did not remember this interview. The co-prosecutor then asked if he remembered being shown a copy of a statement from this 2007 interview before he started testifying yesterday; Mr. Norin responded that “perhaps he was interviewed,” but he did not take notice if they were co-investigators from the court. He also claimed he was not shown a copy of the statement from this interview. When asked if he was truthful when he completed the interview, Mr. Norin stated that he did respond to the questions honestly.

The co-prosecutor then asked if there was a copy of this statement to show the witness. The WESU representative with Mr. Norin reported that he had shown and read a copy of the statement to the witness but, as he had been told to return it to the court, it was not there with him. After further questions, Mr. Norin did affirm that he had read the document, but he did not remember what he actually said during the interview. The co-prosecutor had the signature page of the statement put onto the screen to show that the witness had signed and put his thumbprint on the document. Mr. Norin confirmed that it was indeed his signature and thumbprint.

After reading a portion of the statement out loud, the co-prosecutor then asked Mr. Norin if it is true that, in 1977, the witness was aware of the arrest of two people mentioned. Mr. Norin confirmed that he was aware of these arrests. The co-prosecutor then requested the witness explain why he had claimed on Wednesday that he was not aware of any arrests at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Norin responded, “Only after people disappeared, did I know that people were arrested.”

Mr. Karnavas objected again, insisting that the entire paragraph be read to give the context, because the paragraph makes clear that Mr. Norin was not at the meeting where the arrests were announced and that he was only told afterward about the arrests. The co-prosecutor argued that he should be allowed to go through the paragraph part by part, as was his plan. The court overruled the objection, stating that the defense can question Mr. Norin further on this issue when it is their turn to examine the witness.

Resuming his questioning on this matter, the co-prosecutor then asked what Mr. Norin thought happened to people who disappeared from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He responded that at first he thought they had gone to study, but later he realized that they were arrested. The witness recounted that eventually he realized that even people who “went to study in socialist countries” were being arrested. “Then everyone got fearful when we talked about people going to study,” he recalled.

Moving on to another topic, the co-prosecutor asked Mr. Norin whether he had participated in meetings where Ieng Sary provided political training to foreign affairs cadres. The witness responded that, in general, the sessions at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were lead by Ieng Sary, and he would talk about “the party lines.” Mr. Norin maintained that Mr. Sary did not talk about the arrests of people during these meetings, but that he did discuss the CIA and the KGB and “everyone trembled when he talked about that.” The co-prosecutor then read a portion of Mr. Norin’s previous statement, in which he said that Mr. Sary had informed him and other MFA staff that certain persons had been arrested. Rather than responding, the witness requested leave to go to the bathroom.

Upon his return, the co-prosecutor read the relevant portion of the statement again. Mr. Norin stated that he does not now recall Mr. Sary making those statements but that he was honest when he completed the previous interview.

Returning to Mr. Norin’s biography, the co-prosecutor asked to whom the witness gave his biography when he had completed it. Mr. Norin replied that he gave it to the chief of his group but that he did not know what happened to his biography after this point.

The court then recessed for the lunch break.

### ***Procedural Matters Start the Afternoon***

Before returning the floor to the co-prosecutor, President Nonn reported to the parties, public and the ECCC staff that the court will continue the hearing of the witness Long Norin through tomorrow. He then asked the parties to indicate the amount of time they would need to complete

their examinations of the witness. The international co-prosecutor informed the court that he had fifteen minutes and his national colleague thirty minutes of questions. The civil party lawyers indicated that they would need to take about an hour for their questions. Since the testimony of this witness was related mostly to Ieng Sary's case, the president asked if Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan's team would need to question the witness. Nuon Chea's team said they would need at least an hour. Khieu Samphan's counsel stated that, since the prosecution and civil parties had not yet completed their examination of Mr. Norin, he was unable at this time to determine whether they would have any questions, but, either way, he expected they would need no more than thirty minutes.

Ieng Sary's lawyer, Ang Udom, then raised a couple concerns regarding the document that had been presented by the co-prosecutors in the morning, stating that the prosecutor had not referred to the exact identification number of each page that he referred to. He also raised a concern that the witness apparently could not see the entire courtroom or hear everything that is happening during the proceedings.

With regard to the first point, President Nonn reminded all parties that the exact page number in each language needed to be communicated for all documents. Concerning the video link, the president admitted that the Trial Chamber has not had much experience with remote participation. The real issue, he stated, is whether or not the witness hears what is being asked, and so far there has not been a significant issue with regard to his ability to hear and understand the questions put to him.

After the proceedings were returned to him and in response to the request by Ieng Sary's team, the co-prosecutor then took the time to repeat the document identification numbers for Mr. Norin's biography for all three languages. President Nonn then reminded all the parties to be careful to refer to the identification numbers in all three of the court's languages when presenting from a document.

### ***Impeachment Attempts Continue***

Resuming the questioning of the witness, the co-prosecutor again inquired whether Mr. Norin remembered times when people outside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs came to arrest people within the ministry. Mr. Norin stated that, "as a combatant," he would not have been involved in this issue and that anyone seeking to arrest a person in the ministry would have gone to the particular section chief. The co-prosecutor then read from Mr. Norin's previous statement, in which he said that officers from S-21 prison came directly into the MFA to arrest people. Mr. Norin replied that he only learned of this information after people had been arrested.

The co-prosecutor then asked how many languages Mr. Norin speaks. He replied that he speaks Khmer, French, some English, and Czech. He then asked if his grasp of English was good enough to understand the questions being posed without translation. Mr. Norin said he could understand if it was not too difficult. Mr. Norin then reported that he had obtained degrees from universities but that they are no longer with him because "the termites already ruined them," prompting chuckles from a number of observers.



When asked if he knew if Ieng Sary had the power to order or stop arrests, Mr. Norin replied that, when Mr. Sary was away from the MFA, traveling to other countries, he would leave a message ordering that people not be arrested in his absence. The witness stated that he learned this information from cadres in his section. When Ieng Sary traveled abroad, an acting head was put in place, he said. At times, Khieu Samphan would serve as the acting head, and sometimes, it would be Vorn Vet. They did not make any decisions for the ministry, Mr. Norin claimed, but they would greet and meet with visitors to the MFA.

When asked about the term “democratic centralism,” Mr. Norin explained that this meant that “everything was managed by the party.” He reported that he attended the Party Congresses at times, because he was required along with all staff of the MFA to be there. These Party Congresses were held at the Olympic Stadium in Phnom Penh once a year; Pol Pot would chair the Congress, and those from the Party Center organized it. The witness recounted that all party cadres were expected to be there as matters of party policy and the political line were discussed there. When questions were raised at the Congress, the only people allowed to answer were the senior leaders, such as those on the Standing Committee or the Central Committee. Mr. Norin reported that Nuon Chea was present at these Congresses, and he could be seen sitting on the stage in the portion reserved for dignitaries. The witness could not recall whether Khieu Samphan or Ieng Sary was ever present, but he stated, “If you were a party member, you were expected to be there.” The “political line regarding the enemy” was a common issue that was discussed at these Congresses, Mr. Norin recounted.

### ***Reference to S-21 Confessions Provokes Defense Response***

To close his part of the prosecution’s examination of the witness, the international deputy co-prosecutor then informed the court that the prosecution had identified three different S-21 confessions that implicated Mr. Norin and read the document numbers for the record. Judge Lavergne then asked the co-prosecutor to verify the reason why these documents were mentioned and to specify whether these confessions had been obtained under torture. The co-prosecutor stated that the documents were only being identified for the record as they relate to Mr. Norin and that they were not being offered into evidence at this time. He also stated, in relation to the question about torture, that the prosecution was not offering these confessions for the truth of any information contained in them but rather to help explain how confessions such as these were used within the Khmer Rouge regime.

Mr. Karnavas then objected to the use of the court proceeding for this purpose, stating that he believed that these confessions are irrelevant to the matter at hand and that the prosecution appeared to be using them as “provocation.” He stated that there was no reason to “make a record” of these documents. The co-prosecutor responded that the relevance is obvious, given that these confessions implicate Mr. Norin, who is currently giving testimony, and “this is clearly part of this story.”

Rejecting the co-prosecutor’s argument, Michael Karnavas maintained that the prosecution was attempting to argue for the admission of torture-tainted evidence, to which the defense has consistently objected, and he again asserted that the prosecution’s timing in presenting these documents is highly inappropriate.

President Nonn stated that the court had noted the defense counsel's objection, and then he passed the floor to the national deputy co-prosecutor to continue the questioning of the witness.

### *The Witness Opens Up*

The national deputy co-prosecutor examined the witness for approximately twenty minutes on a number of topics. During this questioning, Mr. Norin seemed to be less hesitant in his answers, indicating that his apparent reluctance to answer the international co-prosecutor's questions may have had more to do with the language barrier than any effort to protect Ieng Sary. For some questions, however, Mr. Norin's answers continued to be fairly nonresponsive to what was actually asked by the co-prosecutor, so the witness's motivations, if any, in his answers remained unclear.

Turning back to the functioning and structure of the MFA, the national deputy co-prosecutor began by asking the witness to explain Ieng Sary's role at the MFA. Mr. Norin reported that Mr. Sary was the chief at the MFA, but that he could not say whether anyone was higher than Mr. Sary, though "it could be Pol Post or the Standing Committee."

The deputy co-prosecutor then asked about a few other staff members at the MFA, including the secretary general and the leader of the secretariat. Mr. Norin recalled that, upon returning from other countries, diplomats would come to work at the MFA, but it did not appear to the witness that they were forced to work there. Mr. Norin then informed the court that his knowledge on these matters was limited, as his role was only as a typist at the MFA and that occasionally he prepared houses to receive guests.

In response to a question about the senior leaders of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, Mr. Norin explained that, to become a member of the Standing Committee, a person would need to be a member of the Central Committee first. Pol Pot, Nuon Chea, Ieng Sary and "perhaps others" were members of the Standing Committee. The witness stated that he did not know where or how often the Standing Committee met or what was discussed at those meetings because he was a "combatant" and not present at the meetings.

The co-prosecutor then asked a number of questions about the *Revolutionary Flag* magazine. Mr. Norin denied that he had ever heard of this magazine, and, after asking him about it in a number of ways and getting the same response, the co-prosecutor moved on to another subject.

When asked how the political lines of the party were developed, Mr. Norin replied, "I just followed what I was told," stating that he did not know who created them and if the policies were implemented correctly. Those charged with implementing the political line were human, he stated, so therefore mistakes could have been made. "I loved my country, and that is why I joined the party," he continued, "There was no other party, there was only one party back then. I asked to join the party, and Mr. Ieng Sary accepted me to join the party."

The court then adjourned for the afternoon break.

After returning from the afternoon break, the president informed the deputy co-prosecutor that he had fifteen more minutes in which to complete the prosecution's questioning of this witness.

Returning to the issue of Communist Party magazines, the deputy co-prosecutor asked if Mr. Norin recalled whether there was a youth magazine. The witness confirmed that there had been a party magazine meant for the youth, with articles about the party and the political line. But he did not know to whom it was distributed. He believed that copies might have gone to the various ministries.

The national deputy co-prosecutor completed his examination of Mr. Norin by inquiring whether the witness had been aware of the resignation of King Sihanouk in 1976. At the time the king resigned, Mr. Norin recounted, he was actually at the palace, and he remembered that "those uncles" had begged him not to resign. Prior to the King's resignation, Mr. Norin would sometimes accompany King Sihanouk and Ieng Sary when they would travel to other countries together.

### ***The Civil Parties Examine the Witness, with Technical Difficulties***

The court then passed the questioning of the witness to the civil party lawyers, asking them to avoid repetitive or irrelevant questions. The first civil party lawyer focused many of his questions on Mr. Norin's time in Czechoslovakia, his part in the GRUNK administration in Beijing, the radio station in Hanoi, and his work at B20 and Preah Vihear, all of which had been covered fairly extensively by the international deputy co-prosecutor during Wednesday's proceedings. Although the questions were not completely repetitive of what had been asked by the co-prosecutors, Mr. Norin's answers to them did not add much new information to the record.

Regarding his time in Hanoi, Mr. Norin stated that the radio station where he had worked broadcasted news and information about the need for "national solidarity to fight against the American imperialists." He also reported that he had met Ieng Sary there when Mr. Sary, as a special envoy for the resistance movement, came to present papers and to give talks. But the witness could not remember what Mr. Sary came to discuss or talk about there.

Turning to his work at B20, Mr. Norin reiterated that he was tasked with "growing plants." He had been told that the produce was for the people at B20 and "sometimes for the Central Committee." There were also youth from a nearby base who would come to B20 before they were sent to B15 or other offices, and these youth would assist with the labor there. Mr. Norin recounted that the workers at B20 attended regular "self-criticism sessions," where they "would criticize each other and criticize themselves." The witness also stated that Ieng Sary would drop by B20 when he would travel through the area.

In response to questions about his work in Preah Vihear, Mr. Norin repeated that he and others had met Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan before they were sent to the province. "We were instructed to go there to meet people to understand their needs," the witness said of this meeting, "We were trying to see what people would need once the country was liberated." Mr. Norin recalled that he stayed in Preah Vihear for about a year, working with people and learning from them that they needed salt and medicine. He stated that he had to report these findings to the

“upper echelons,” and the senior leaders then arranged for rice and the things that people needed to be delivered to them.

After completing his statements on Preah Vihear and before the civil party lawyer could ask another question, the video feed was cut, prompting much scrambling by court officials within the courtroom. President Nonn informed the parties that there had been a “technical glitch.” A few minutes later, a loud ringing came through the sound system, and, although it sounded as if there was an answer on the other side, the link was not immediately reestablished. After a total of five minutes, Mr. Norin and the WESU representative finally appeared again.

Having completed his questions, the national civil party lawyer passed the floor to his international colleague, who focused most of her questions on details of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, also known as B1.

Attempting to clarify Ieng Sary’s position at the ministry, the lawyer asked Mr. Norin whether anyone at B1 was allowed to give orders without Mr. Sary’s approval. Mr. Norin asserted that he had no knowledge about this matter, as he was not one of the “senior people.” When asked about the unit chairman’s relationship to Ieng Sary, Mr. Norin at first claimed that he did not know whether Ieng Sary was his superior. After this question was asked again in a couple different ways, the witness finally answered that “Ieng Sary was the chairman of everyone at B1,” and was the supervisor of the unit chairman and of Mr. Norin. He then acknowledged that his unit chairman had indeed been ordered by Ieng Sary to have Mr. Norin complete his own biography.

Reading from the witness’s 2007 interview, the co-prosecutor then raised the issue of intellectuals living abroad being instructed by Ieng Sary to return to Cambodia. While he could not remember Mr. Sary’s exact words, Mr. Norin did state that Ieng Sary had contacted intellectuals such as Mr. Norin to tell them to return to Cambodia because it was now independent and that they were needed to assist in building up the country. Those who heeded the call of Mr. Sary “returned because they were nationalists,” the witness asserted. But then he admitted that some of these intellectuals had disappeared after they came back to Cambodia. When the lawyer asked whether returnees, including those who had disappeared, were required to write their biographies, the screen froze, and the video feed to Mr. Norin was again lost.

While court officials attempted to reestablish the link to the witness, the international civil party lawyer requested that the court grant her ten additional minutes to finish her questioning tomorrow, due to the technical difficulties. The Chamber granted the civil parties’ request.

Acknowledging that the video feed would not be reestablished today as the electricity had been cut off in Long Norin’s location, President Nonn adjourned the proceedings for the day. The trial will resume on Friday with the continued examination of Mr. Norin.