

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
PRESS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE

PRESS CLIPPINGS

Enclosed are clippings of the latest local and international press on the Special Court and related issues obtained by the Press and Public Affairs Office as of:

Tuesday, March 15, 2005

The press clips are produced Monday to Friday.
If you are aware of omissions or have any comments or suggestions please contact
Mariama S. Yilla
Ext 7217 / 7216
MOBILE: 232 76 767502

Kamajors murdered civilians, drank their blood

...Special Court witness testifies

By Abu Whyte Fofanah

Mr. Thomas, a former Local Court treasury Clerk at Moyamba was reported to have been shot dead by Kamajors at Shenge Park.

Testifying at the Special Court on the 7 February 2005, TFT 2-165 said he was in Moyamba Town

when the AFRC took power from the SLPP government in 1997.

The witness said the rebels entered Moyamba Town and his family, other civilians and the Kamajors fled into the bush for safety. The witness said he later heard

that the Kamajors had re-grouped at Chainue village. 'The rebels spent eight days in the township after which I decided to visit the Town, but he said the town was deserted and some houses including his father's were burnt down. "I was afraid so I decided to get back to the bush", the witness stated.

TFT-2 -165 said when they returned from the bush, civilians like Karpur, Abdul Batam, T.K. Mamood were arrested by the Kamajors accused of disarming Kamajors within the Township. The witness said they were later freed.

Kamajors

contd

'The Kamajors later arrested Mr. Thomas accused him of being a collaborator. They said Mr. Thomas was collecting information from Moyamba to Camp Charlie at Mile 91 in Tonkolili district'.

The 43-year-old Teacher said Mr. Thomas was taken to the Shenge Park opposite the Local Court Barry in jubilation. 'The Kamajors later spoke in low tones. "Later I heard them saying, go, go, you're now a free man. Within few seconds I heard gun shots and Mr. Thomas fell on the ground.

Whilst they were dancing, one of the Kamajors went and cut off Mr. Thomas's head, they drank his blood and they took his head with jubilation within the Township', the witness stated.

TFT-2-165 says Mr. Thomas's body was later dragged to Langowah Street in Moyamba. 'I was so frightened that I decided to quit the scene for the main time', the witness stated.

Few days later, the Kamajors came with three people from Shenge accused committing cannibalism. 'The one accused person was burnt alive, whilst the two were taken to Shenge to do to them like wise. Mr. Ngobeah, Kenie Toima and Chuck Norris were the commanders by then in Moyamba Town". the witness concluded.

Standard Times, Tuesday March 15, 2005.

Ex - British high Commissioner bullets Special Court



Norman...suffering

The Special Court in Sierra Leone is the independent war crimes tribunal set up by the United Nations at the request of the Sierra Leonean

government and charged with bringing to justice "those who bear the greatest responsibilities" for the atrocities and human rights violations during Sierra

Leone's bloody 11-year rebel war.

It was established in January 2002 following an Act passed by the Sierra Leonean Parliament, but it was not until February 2004 that the Special Court building was officially opened and not until June that the trials of those detained since March 2003 finally got underway.



Peter Penfold... critical of the Special Court

Ex - British high Commissioner bullets Special Court

FROM PAGE 1

A month later, Foday Sankoh, the leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) the person observers agree was most responsible for the brutal rebel war, died in detention.

The Court has indicted Charles Taylor, the ex-President of Liberia, whose alleged support for the RUF in exchange for Sierra Leone's "blood diamonds" continued to fuel the conflict, and the court's Chief Prosecutor, the American David Crane, would love to get his hands on him.

The manner in which Crane issued Taylor's indictment (while he was in Accra for peace talks) severely embarrassed the Ghanaian authorities and nearly undermined the delicate Liberian peace negotiations.

Taylor is now in detention in Nigeria as part of the deal to secure an end to the equally bloody Liberian conflict, and in spite of intense pressure from the US

accept.

No one denies that some members of the CDF committed excesses in their struggle to restore peace and democracy, but these were far fewer than those committed by the rebels. The Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission in its report published in October noted that the RUF committed over 60 percent of the atrocities, the Army nearly 17 percent and the CDF just six percent. (The TRC also noted that Ecomog, the Nigerian-led West African intervention force, was responsible for one percent of the atrocities, though for political reasons they do not fall within the purview of the Special Court).

Sierra Leone is the first country to have had a Truth and Reconciliation Commission as part of the conflict resolution process. Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia have their war crimes tribunals and TRCs have been established in

est of Sierra Leone.

With a budget of \$76 million spread over three years, supporters of the Sierra Leone Special Court claim that this is cheap compared to the Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal, which spends \$120 million a year.

Most of the Sierra Leone Special Court's funds have come from the US government with some support from others such as Britain.

But where has all this money gone?

Millions have been spent erecting the purpose built courthouse, detention facil-

particular concern are the thousands of dollars being paid by the Court to Prosecution witnesses who testify with anonymity behind screens, some of whom are provided with homes outside the country in Ghana.

An expensive "outreach programme" has been conducted throughout the country, led curiously by the Chief Prosecutor, to explain to the Sierra Leonean people why a Special Court is needed as they try to put the past behind them and pick up the pieces of their broken lives.

"In Sierra Leone the relationship between the Special Court and the TRC has been far from easy and there was much confusion in people's minds over their respective roles"

though the Special Court and the national courts of Sierra Leone have concurrent jurisdiction, the Special Court shall have primacy. The Sierra Leonean Constitution clearly states that its Supreme Court is the supreme authority in Sierra Leone, and therefore defence counsel are arguing that the Sierra Leone Special Court is unconstitutional.

To change an entrenched clause in the Constitution requires a referendum before legislation is passed through the Sierra Leonean Parliament. This was not done in the case of the Bill setting up the Special Court.

Norman himself has refused to cooperate with the Special Court on the grounds that he and the CDF members have not been properly indicted.

At the hearing at the beginning of December the presiding judge, Justice Ito from Cameroon, supported Norman's contention.

He declared the present consolidated injunction against the three CDF indictees null and void, but his two fellow judges did not share his views.

putting the squeeze on the UK to provide more funds. Once again, Britain seems to be being dragged along an American agenda.

Mindful of the British Prime Minister's much heralded Commission for Africa and his expressed wish to put Africa high on the agenda when the UK holds the Presidency of both the EU and the G8 during the second half of this year, the British government claims that the Sierra Leone Special Court is contributing towards peace not only in Sierra Leone but throughout Africa.

They argue that other African rebel leaders will think twice before embarking upon the path of violence that has wreaked havoc on the continent if doing so could find them facing war crimes tribunals.

But it could have the opposite effect.

Most conflicts in African start at a low level and the perpetrators will pay scanty attention to international war crimes courts.

As the conflicts escalate, their resolution will depend upon persuading both sides to lay down their guns and

government to secure Taylor's presence before the Court, President Obasajo of Nigeria seems unlikely to break the unwritten code among African heads of state not to do to fellow heads of state what may one day happen to you.

Without Taylor and with Sankoh's death, plus the previous death of the infamous RUF commander Sam Bockarie, and the reported death or disappearance of the AFRC junta leader Johnny Paul Koroma, the only person of note being prosecuted by the Special Court is Chief Sam Hinga Norman.

He was the former Minister of Internal Security and erstwhile coordinator of the Civil Defence Forces (CDF), the groupings of indigenous civil militia who fought against the rebels and helped restore the legitimate democratic government of President Tejan Kabbah.

Thus the impression is given that Norman is the person most responsible for the awful atrocities committed during the rebel war, an impression which even Norman's detractors do not

South Africa and El Salvador, while other conflicts such as in Mozambique were successfully resolved without recourse to either.

In Sierra Leone the relationship between the Special Court and the TRC has been far from easy and there was much confusion in people's minds over their respective roles.

The TRC was always the poor relations. Nevertheless, with a budget of only \$6.5 million, it completed its work earlier this year and in October tabled its 5,000-page report based upon the thousands of testimonies presented to it. (The only significant testimony missing was that of Hinga Norman who was refused permission by the Special Court to appear before the TRC.)

The report has been called "a document of great importance" and is widely seen as contributing positively towards the reconciliation process in Sierra Leone.

By contrast, the Sierra Leone Special Court is seen by many to be merely assuaging the conscience of the international community rather than serving the inter-

ity and prefabricated administrative blocks, all encased in a 12-foot-high concrete security perimeter wall guarded by razor wire and patrolled by UN troops.

All the buildings other than the detention blocks are air conditioned and the whole complex is swathed in bright lights supplied from constantly running electricity generators, which would be enough to provide one-third of Freetown's desperate power needs.

Situated somewhat inappropriately on Jomo Kenyatta Avenue in the middle of the capital, it is in stark contrast to the surrounding environs of shanty huts lit by oil-filled lamps and evokes an image of an East European stalag at the height of the Cold War.

And all this is just for the nine indictees detained inside!

The salaries and wages paid to the Court's judges, officials and administrative staff are widely exorbitant compared to salaries outside.

A security guard earns more than the Sierra Leone Chief of Police, the judges more than the President. Of

Their reaction to the Court remains mixed in Freetown, not surprisingly, those who can take advantage of the well-paid jobs available with Court, while others follow the intermittent reporting in the local press on the court's activities. The majority of Freetown residents just get on with their lives.

Outside in the provinces, especially in the south and east, many people are concerned and bitter about the continued detention of Norman and his two fellow CDF indictees. To them, Norman and the CDF are the heroes who, along with Ecomog, the UK and the UN, helped bring peace and restore democracy to their country.

Their anger bubbles under the surface, kept in check only by the combination of a reducing UN presence, a new British-trained but yet to be tested Sierra Leonean army and, more importantly, Norman's own message to his supporters to remain clam and not disrupt the fragile peace in the country.

The legality of the Special Court is under question. The Sierra Leone Act setting up the Court states that, al-

Norman has now lodged a further appeal on the strength of Justice Ito's assertion.

As the present pace it appears unlikely that the defence will start its case before September this year, after the prosecution has completed the testimony of the nearly 100 witnesses it says it will call.

This raises the question of whether the Court will run out of fund before it completes its work. The UN has managed to secure funding up to the end of 2005, but not beyond.

The Americans want to make the Sierra Leone Court a success. They seem determined to demonstrate to the rest of the world that there is an alternative to the international criminal Court (ICC), which they continue to boycott.

They appear to equate "success" by the conviction of Norman and the others.

Even before the trials commenced, Crane injudiciously remarked that none of the indictees "would ever see the light of day again".

But even the Americans are feeling the pinch financially and are reportedly

stop killing one another.

This inevitably will require some form of assurance that they can do so without fear of reprisals, as was the case in Sierra Leone.

But what good would assurances from governments be if it were seen that the international community could trample over delicately negotiated peace agreements?

Apart from the US and UK, other members of the UN are less enthusiastic about the Sierra Leone Special Court.

Some fear that part of the US strategy is to prepare the way for Special Courts to be set up in Sudan and Uganda, Afghanistan and Iraq, with the same caveat that no American national may appear before them.

Is that justice? And why should the UK government endorse something like this?

Peter Penfold is a former UK High Commissioner to Sierra Leone.

This article was published in the African Week Magazine February, 2005 special edition

Mon Mar 14 03:00:00 2005 Pacific Time

ADVISORY for 9:15 a.m. Friday, March 18 - Stanford Law School

International Judges to Discuss Rule of Law and Human Rights in Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Former Yugoslavia, and the Overall Role of International Courts

STANFORD, Calif., March 14 (AScribe Newswire) -- Stanford Law School today released the following advisory.

At an extraordinary summit this Friday at Stanford Law School, almost a dozen judges serving on the most important international courts will discuss their experiences in trying to promote the rule of law and to end human rights abuses. The judges come from the International Court of Justice, the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia, the European Court of Human Rights, the International Criminal Court, the Court of Justice for the European Communities, and the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

The full-day event will take place on Friday, March 18, 2005 in Room 290 at Stanford Law School. It is part of a Global Jurisprudence Colloquium, called "Decisions of International Legal Institutions: Compliance and Enforcement." The event is free and open to the public and the media but registration is required at: www.globaljurisprudence.org

DATE:

Friday, March 18, 2005

TIME:

9:15 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Source: News & Business > [News](#) > **News, Most Recent 90 Days (English, Full Text)** |

Terms: **special court and sierra leone** ([Edit Search](#))

☑ Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery

Africa News March 14, 2005 Monday

Copyright 2005 AllAfrica, Inc.
Africa News

March 14, 2005 Monday

LENGTH: 114 words

**HEADLINE: Sierra Leone;
Special Court** Witness Threatened

BYLINE: Concord Times

BODY:

Special Court witness, TF1-002 who is testifying in the ongoing AFRC trial alleged Tuesday that she was threatened by two ladies on her way home after court.

She says the two called her real name and threatened to deal with her.

Special Court Judge, Richard Lussick disclosed Wednesday that the matter has been referred to **Special Court** Register, Robin Vincent for investigation.

Special Court Spokesman, Peter Anderson says it is unknown on whose indictee's behalf was the threat made.

"But the court takes issues relating to the safety and well-being of any witness very seriously," he said, adding, "I can't speak further because the investigations are ongoing."

LOAD-DATE: March 14, 2005

Source: News & Business > [News](#) > **News, Most Recent 90 Days (English, Full Text)** |

Terms: **special court and sierra leone** ([Edit Search](#))

View: Full

Date/Time: Tuesday, March 15, 2005 - 4:35 AM EST

About [LexisNexis](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

Copyright © 2005 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.



It's not just a place on the map.

Rwanda: UN Tribunal Sentences Ex-Civic Leader to Six Years in Jail

UN Integrated Regional Information Networks

NEWS

March 14, 2005

Posted to the web March 14, 2005

Arusha

The UN International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) sentenced a former Rwandan civic leader on Monday to six years in prison after he pleaded guilty to involvement in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.

Vincent Rutaganira, 60, is the fourth man to have pleaded guilty to genocide before the tribunal, set up by the UN Security Council in November 1994 following the April-July genocide in which 937,000 people were killed, according to Rwandan government estimates.

Former Rwandan Prime Minister Jean Kambanda was the first to plead guilty before the tribunal. He is serving a life sentence in Mali.

A journalist and the only non-Rwandan convicted by the tribunal, Georges Ruggiu, a Belgian, was the second to plead guilty to genocide before the UN court. He was sentenced to 12 years in prison. Rwandan businessman Omar Serushago was the third; he is also serving a 15-year prison sentence in Mali.

Rutaganira, a former councillor for Mubuga Commune in Rwanda's western province of Kibuye, entered a guilty plea when he appeared before the tribunal in December 2004.

Judge Andresia Vaz, presiding, ruled that Rutaganira was guilty of the crime against humanity by extermination.

However, she said Rutaganira's sentence would take into account the three years he had already served in the UN detention facility in Arusha. Therefore, he will only serve three years of the sentence.

Rutaganira, a diabetic father of 10 children, was arrested in March 2002 in a refugee camp in northwestern Tanzania after he surrendered to the tribunal's authorities. Initially, he faced 19 counts of genocide and crimes against humanity, but these were later reduced to seven and finally, to one count of crimes against humanity (extermination) after he entered into a guilty-plea bargain with the tribunal's Office of the Prosecutor.

Under this deal, Rutaganira acknowledged full culpability for the deaths of thousands of Tutsi civilians who took refuge at Mubuga Church in Kibuye on 8-15 April 1994.

He admitted that he took no action to protect the Tutsi refugees in the commune where he was a government official during the genocide.

Rutaganira's conviction brings the number of suspects already sentenced to 24, including three acquittals.

The special representative of the Rwandan government to the tribunal, Aloys Mutabingwa, said Rutaganira's admission of guilt demonstrated his willingness to express remorse.

"He showed courage by admitting to what happened in Rwanda and this helps in reconciliation," he said.

[This report does not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations]

Copyright © 2005 UN Integrated Regional Information Networks. All rights reserved. Distributed by AllAfrica Global Media (allAfrica.com).



WHERE DOES YOUR BUSINESS FIT?

'Hard-Hitting' Report Needs Grass Roots Support To Turn Bold Recommendations Into Policy, Amoako Says

allAfrica.com

NEWS

March 12, 2005

Posted to the web March 12, 2005

Washington, DC

Declaring the living conditions for most Africans to be "intolerable and an affront to the dignity of all mankind," a commission of eminent international figures established by British Prime Minister Tony Blair has called on wealthy nations to double aid to the continent over the coming decade. "There can be no excuse, no defence, no justification for the plight of millions of our fellow beings in Africa today," Blair said while launching the report of his Commission for Africa in London on Friday.

"On the edge of this new century, in an age of unprecedented wealth and economic progress by all continents, it is unacceptable that Africa drifts further from the rest of the world, unseen in its misery and ignored in its pain," the Commission said in a declaration accompanying the 450-page report.

"African poverty and stagnation is the greatest tragedy of our time," said the report of the commission, which includes Blair, the British ministers of finance and international development; several African leaders, including Tanzanian President Benjamin Mkapa, Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi and South African Finance Minister Trevor Manuel; former U.S. Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker; and Bob Geldof, an Irish rock star who has become a prominent campaigner for African aid.

"For its part, Africa must accelerate reform," the Commission added, saying that African leaders must take responsibility for improving accountability and for preventing and managing conflict. "Bold comprehensive action on a scale needed to meet the challenges can only be done through a new kind of partnership," the report concluded.

*"This is the first time in my experience of reports on African development - and I have been involved in a great many - in which all sides really take responsibility for what has happened to our continent," commissioner **K. Y. Amoako**, said at the launch of the report in Addis Ababa. Amoako, an economist from Ghana with a Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley who is completing his second five-year term as executive secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, was interviewed by telephone from his office in the Ethiopian capital about the commission's major findings and the steps that are required to make the recommendations a reality.*

You called the report "a very significant document." Why is it different from previous efforts to study Africa's problems, most of which have had little, if any, impact on solving them?

First, we went back and reviewed the past. We studied all the other reports and recommendations and in some

cases we came to the same conclusions and we make some of the same recommendations. But even in those cases, I think we pushed the envelope a bit more. On the issue of debt, on the issue of trade, we put greater emphasis on some of the recommendations than the other efforts. I think that is significant.

Let me give you one or two examples. I'm not aware of any report of this type that has come out with such a strong recommendation on the need for infrastructure and investment in infrastructure as critical for growth in Africa. Second, we recognize, like other reports, that basic education is important, but we also say we need to make an equal push for higher education, science and technology, because growth will be critically dependent on having the capacity for economic development. I think those are very, very significant recommendations that we have made.

Look at the emphasis we placed on the responsibility of our development partners. I'm not aware of any report that is as hard-hitting as this report on issues of what the developed world has to do and that they have been part of the problem.

Let me give you one specific example: the whole discussion on corruption. We say corruption is an African problem, but we also say it's a problem for our development partners. We come out with recommendations for them also to fulfill their responsibilities.

By acknowledging shared responsibility, are you hopeful that developed country partners are going to follow through with the needed resources?

It's going to be a very important process that we need to engage in. We hope that will be the outcome. But we still have a lot of work - not just the commissioners but all those who believe in Africa, who believe in seeing progress on the continent and who think that by doing these things we can turn things around and reduce poverty.

What do we have to do? We recognize that this is a first important step. Over the next couple of months, we need to ensure that there are discussions around the world - both in Africa and in the north - have debates and discussions, involve civil society, involve Parliamentarians. Most of all, we need to involve our policymakers.

We need to ensure that the African Union, through its own processes, will get behind this report. In that context, I think the timing of the report is important, with the G8 Summit [in June in the United Kingdom], with the Millennium Development Goals report [issued in January] and the September meetings [World Bank and International Monetary Fund] and the December meeting in Hong Kong on trade.

This report will give impetus to all that. I hope it can generate the support and therefore translate into the availability of resources that will be required. But we have our job to do.

Is there a certain level of additional support that you hope will flow to Africa as a corollary of this initiative?

We say let's double aid to an additional \$25 billion by the year 2005 and then increase that by an additional \$25 billion beginning in 2010. The question is the modalities and where the money is going to come from.

Was that beyond the scope of the commission or was it discussed?

It's also discussed in the report.

So, really, you're talking about a political process in Africa and on the international front?

Not just a political process. We need to get grassroots support behind the recommendations - civil society, the media - to put these issues on the table. We need to do that at the regional level in Africa and at the level of the G8 and the European Union. So we need political support at all levels and also the support of technicians and the practitioners of development.

The report advocates a 100 percent multilateral debt cancellation for sub-Saharan Africa. What kind of difference would this make for Africa's future?

There are two figures we used in the report. Debt service in Africa today is more than the health expenditures that African countries can afford, which means that debt relief is still an issue.

We also say in the report that of every \$2 that enters in the form of aid, almost \$1 goes out. When you put it in that context, you realize the significance of debt cancellation and debt relief. It will bring more resources for Africa for development.

Are you hopeful that debt cancellation will come about?

On the debt issues, I think we've made quite a bit of progress, not only in getting the HIPC and some of these other initiatives to give debt relief. But I think there is also a recognition that it hasn't gone far enough. I think there is a consensus at all levels that we need to do more.

The recent meeting of the G7 finance ministers in London - if you look at the communiqué and the discussions, I think it is clear that they all agreed that we need to do more on debt relief, including multilateral debt.

What is still not fully agreed are the modalities and how to achieve that, and I'm hopeful that in the coming months and by the spring meetings of the World Bank and IMF, some work has been done to come up with a concrete proposal that hopefully everybody can agree on.

Is HIV/Aids an apocalyptic problem for Africa if it's not tackled more forcefully and do you think more action will be forthcoming?

The answer to both parts of your question is yes. On both sides, we need to do a lot more because when you look at the dynamics and the demographics, the numbers and the trends, it's pretty scary.

We have made some efforts, and some progress has been made. The recent UNAIDS report came up with three possible scenarios, including the "doomsday" scenario and the "hopeful" scenario. They declared that the outcome will depend on the level of efforts that are put into prevention, treatment and care.

These efforts will also require a significant increase in resources, and we made specific recommendations on that also.

Copyright © 2005 allAfrica.com. All rights reserved. Distributed by
AllAfrica Global Media (allAfrica.com).
