

**SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
OUTREACH AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE**



Railroad crossing at Bumbuna.

PRESS CLIPPINGS

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

Thursday, 14 June 2012

Press clips are produced Monday through Friday.
Any omission, comment or suggestion, please contact
Martin Royston-Wright
Ext 7217

Local News

Special Court Hands Long Term Prison Sentences for Charles Taylor / <i>The Monitor</i>	Pages 3-4
Revenge Will Not Bring Back My Mother / <i>Concord Times</i>	Page 5

International News

Africa: How Close Is an African Criminal Court? / <i>IRIN</i>	Pages 6-8
Why Taylor Was Found Guilty: Chief Prosecutor Detail 'Planned' / <i>Front Page Africa</i>	Pages 9-11
Taylor's Trial 'Free and Fair', Chief Prosecutor Asserts / <i>Daily Observer</i>	Pages 12-13
ICC Seeks 30-Year Sentence for Congo Warlord Lubanga / <i>BBC</i>	Page 14
Liberia: 'Taylor's Lawyer Says Trial Was Fair' / <i>The Informer</i>	Page 15

Special Court Hands Long Term Prison Sentences for Charles Taylor

By Joseph A. K. Sesay

On 30th May 2012, Trial Chamber II of the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCL) issued the court's final set of sentences in the case for former Liberian president Charles Ghankay Taylor. Presiding Justice Richard Lussick read the judgment that sentenced Taylor to a single prison term of 50 years with credit for the time he was detained pending trial. While the Trial Chamber issued a sentence below the prosecution's requested 80 years, it nonetheless granted a reasonably lengthy sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offences for which Taylor was convicted.

As a full court room listened at the STL in The Hague, Justice Lussick outlined the factors that the court considered in issuing its judgment pursuant to Article 19 and Rule 101 of the Court's Statute and Rules of Evidence and Procedure, noting the gravity of the offences, individual circumstances of the accused and the aggravating and mitigating circumstances surrounding the commissions of crimes and the accused's behavior, during and after the war. The judgment also touches on two issues

raised at the sentencing hearing on May 16: Taylor's selective prosecution and whether his house arrest in Nigeria amounts to credit for term served. The chamber noted that Taylor was not singled out for prosecution, and that his purported house arrest in Nigeria does not amount to credit for time served as the conditions for his asylum cannot be a factor for consideration. Also, the Judges said they considered sentencing practices from ICTY, ICTR and SCSL's Trial Chambers, but insisted that the court is not bound by their decisions.

After a lengthy and graphic description of the crimes for which Taylor was convicted and the modes by which he was convicted, the judgment discussed the Prosecution's and Defence's submissions and the Chamber's deliberations on each sentencing factor. In the end, the Chamber rejected almost all the mitigating factors suggested by Taylor's defence. It further rejected all arguments relating to the personal circumstance of the accused, such as good character both in detention and during trial proceedings should mitigate the sentence. In contrast, the Chamber accepted some

Centre for Accountability and the Rule of Law (CARL-SL), 7 Percival Street (3rd Floor), Freetown, Sierra Leone

Tel: (+232) 33 997 333 Email: info@carl-sl.org www.carl-sl.org

Page5

of the Prosecution's submission about aggravating factors. While the Chamber had earlier found that Taylor was not guilty for his alleged participation in a Joint Criminal Enterprise (JCE) and command responsibility, it nonetheless considered the acts of the RUF as an aggravating factor, suggesting that his role of aiding and abetting crimes committed by this group should be an aggravating factor.

The judgment also considered Taylor's role in Sierra Leone's peace processes. The court, however, did not consider it as a mitigating factor as Taylor undermined his efforts by secretly fuelling the RUF and urging them not to disarm. Also it ruled that Taylor's statement during the sentencing hearing did not amount to mitigating factor as he only accepted that crimes were committed in Sierra Leone, but failed to take responsibility for these crimes and this did not constitute remorse. After describing the considerations surrounding the Chamber's deliberations, the judgment condemned Taylor to a single term of 50 years designed to reflect his overall culpability, with credit for time served since 29th March 2006.

Charles Ghankay Taylor was indicted on 7 March 2003. The indictment was unsealed on June 4, 2003. He was arrested and transferred into the custody of the SCSL in March 2006, but for security reasons, his trial was transferred to The Hague on

30 June 2006. The Prosecution opened their case on 4 June 2007, in the absence of the accused – who subsequently dismissed his defence team. Following the appointment of a new Counsel, the prosecution started calling witnesses on 7 January 2008 and closed their case on 27 February 2009, calling 91 witnesses, including 58 crime base witnesses, 29 insider (linkage) witnesses and four expert witnesses. In addition, written statements were admitted from four crime base witnesses, and reports from two additional expert witnesses. On 4 May 2009, the Trial Chamber dismissed, in its entirety, a Motion for Judgment of Acquittal brought by the Defence. The Defence opened their case on 13 July 2009, and concluded on 12 November 2010 calling 21 witnesses, including Mr. Taylor himself. Also during the case for the defence, the prosecution was granted leave to re-open its case calling an additional 3 witnesses in August 2010.

The Chamber issued its judgment on April 26, 2012 and held a sentencing hearing on 16 May 2012. In determining the appropriate sentence, the Chamber considered both the oral submissions from all parties at the sentencing hearing and their written submissions previously filed with the Chamber. With these verdicts, the trial has now closed, although both the defence and prosecution have a right to appeal.

'Revenge will not bring back my mother...' - Victim affirms

Ayouth whose mother was killed in his presence by one of the dreaded commandos of the defunct Revolutionary United Front named C.O Mbolatay or cut throat, has said that even if he retaliates that will not bring back her mother to life.

Testifying during Fambul Tok's reconciliation ceremony in Jaama, Upper Bambara chiefdom, Kailahun district, last week Thursday June 7, in a tearful mood, Dennis Allieu recalled the day his mother was killed. He said he was a kid but could still recall Umaru taking a knife and stabbing his mother (who was pregnant) to death.

He said after the war he had met the former commando on several occasions but had no dealing with him. Allieu further told the gathering that had it not been for the timely intervention of Fambul Tok, he

would never have faced Umaru.

Umaru in his testimony said he was responsible for the death of Adama Allieu. He confessed that he caught Adama in one of their usual attacks in Kailahun district and later killed her in front of her only child (Dennis) who was a very small boy by then.

Confessing further, Umaru went on to state that he had wanted to also kill Dennis but changed his mind and let him go. The former commando however asked local authorities including Dennis to forgive him for committing series of atrocities during the war.

The former RUF fighter was remorseful and asked authorities to join him plead for mercy and forgiveness. The elders responded and asked Dennis to forgive him.

Dennis accepted the apologies and forgave the former fighter in the interest of peace and unity.

UN Integrated Regional Information Networks

Wednesday, 13 June 2012

Africa: How Close Is an African Criminal Court?

Analysis

The long-running spat between the African Union (AU) and International Criminal Court (ICC) over perceived bias has prompted the AU to push ahead with plans to form its own Africa-wide criminal court, but analysts believe the move could complicate, rather than enhance, international justice.

"Africa wants regional ownership of its crimes and its leaders," Alan Wallis, an international justice lawyer at the Johannesburg-based Southern African Litigation Centre (SALC), told IRIN, but pointed out: "There is a misbelief [by the AU] that Africa is being targeted, as all cases before the ICC concern African situations, but this ignores the fact that of those six [cases], three were referred to the ICC by the countries concerned."

AU commission chairperson Jean Ping has accused ICC of "bullying" Africa, with a key bone of contention being the 2009 indictment of Sudan's President Omar al-Bashir for alleged atrocities committed in Darfur.

Plans for an African criminal court moved into an advanced stage with a final draft protocol drawn up in the Ethiopian capital Addis Ababa on 15 May. It is widely expected to be adopted at an AU summit meeting of heads of state in July.

The venue for the summit was originally intended to be Malawi, but the host president, Joyce Banda, said it would honour its ICC obligations and arrest Sudan's president should he attend. The meeting was subsequently switched to Addis Ababa.

Adoption of the new court, according to analysts, requires formalizing the crime of "unconstitutional change of government", and it would require ratification by 15 AU member states - a process which could take a few years.

The jurisdiction envisaged by the new AU court replicates that of the ICC, covering such things as the major international crimes of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity - and adds others such as piracy, terrorism, mercenary activity, corruption, money-laundering, human and narcotics trafficking and the illegal exploitation of natural resources.

Calls by the AU "in the interests of peace and security" on the UN Security Council to defer or postpone legal proceedings against Bashir - and against the alleged instigators of Kenya's post-electoral violence in 2008 - have fallen on deaf ears.

Stephen Arthur Lamony, Africa outreach liaison and situations adviser for the Coalition for the ICC, an umbrella organization of 2,500 civil society organizations in 150 countries, told IRIN: "The AU feels ignored". He said AU requests to defer legal proceedings in the two cases would remain "a sticking point" between the AU and the ICC.

He added that the ICC had been attempting to establish an AU-ICC liaison office for "quite a while", but had not met with success.

Amalgamation

The African Court of Justice and Human Rights is supposed to be formed through a merger of the African Court on Human and People's Rights and the AU Court of Justice, and is envisaged to comprise three sections: general affairs, human rights and international criminal law.

According to the court's draft protocol, the AU Peace and Security Council and the office of the prosecutor will be eligible to submit cases; the court's jurisdiction for international crimes will commence after its inception. This

means that the court would not trump current cases being considered by the ICC regarding the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Libya, Kenya and Sudan.

Here is a completely new creature - a regional criminal court, with identical jurisdiction to the ICC

Wallis said the court's composition, combining a human rights function and criminal prosecutorial powers was "unprecedented" under international law, and the process appeared to be rushed. "Here is a completely new creature - a regional criminal court, with identical jurisdiction to the ICC, but with no bridges between the two and it is difficult to anticipate the potential implications and challenges."

Where the ICC will fit in, if at all, was unclear. Lamony said the ICC has agreements with national courts but not with regional courts. Wallis foresees confusion should the AU court materialize. "In this regard guidance to African ICC states parties on balancing the relationship between obligations assumed through their ratification of the Rome Statute and the anticipated obligations imposed by the proposed expansion, and the legal implications, should be properly canvassed through further state engagement. A wait-and-see approach may do more harm than good."

Jonathan O'Donohue, Amnesty International's legal adviser for international justice, told IRIN: "The ICC already exists, but it does not seem clear and it is not set out if there is any relationship between the ICC and the [proposed] regional criminal court. There is a danger of duplication [between the two international criminal courts] and also the potential for conflict over jurisdiction. This needs to be resolved before it goes any further."

The ICC

The ICC was established by the Rome Statute in July 1998 and the court entered into force four years later and now counts 121 state parties - 33 of which are African - but noticeable by their absence are the USA, Russia, China, Israel, Sudan and India among others.

Established as an international court of "last resort", it was designed to pick up the slack should domestic laws or local criminal justice systems be unable to proceed against the major international crimes of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. In August 2002 South Africa became the first African state to enact the Rome Statute's provisions into its domestic law, and is only one of four African states to have complied so far.

Weapon of the West?

In 2009, the AU adopted the Sirte Resolution calling for non-cooperation by African ICC member states in the arrest of Bashir. Malawi (during the presidency of the late Bingu wa Mutharika), Chad, Kenya and Djibouti - all ICC state parties - have hosted Bashir since the arrest warrant was issued and did not apprehend him.

In a 2010 Institute for Security Studies monograph entitled *The International Criminal Court that Africa Wants*, the author, Max du Plessis, a practising advocate and associate professor of law at South Africa's University of KwaZulu-Natal, cites Bashir's arrest warrant as the "flashpoint" that spawned a raft of allegations by the AU against the ICC, with the AU accusing the ICC of being "a hegemonic tool of Western powers" and of having double standards.

Don Deya, an advocate of the High Court of Kenya and CEO of Pan African Lawyers Union which was tasked with drawing-up the legal foundations of the AU's regional court, said in a March 2012 article for the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa entitled; *Is the African Court Worth the Wait?* that there was no reason an African court and the ICC could not work "harmoniously" to end impunity for international crimes, "despite the current bitter divide between Africa and the ICC".

Deya said in the article that the genesis for the African criminal court was not the "furore" surrounding Bashir, but three other pertinent issues - universal jurisdiction, Senegal's impending prosecution of former Chadian President Hissene Habré, and formulation of the international crime of "unconstitutional change of government".

A French court's November 2006 arrest warrant for, and subsequent arrest of, Rose Kabuye, the post-genocide Rwandan chief of protocol, in Germany in 2008 was "a turning point", Deya said: The AU determined that "African states... try international crimes on African soil."

Is it affordable?

An AU report following a two-day meeting of justice ministers and attorney-generals in May 2012, attended by 29 African states as well as representatives of the African Court on Human and People's Rights, the Pan African Parliament and the Africa Prosecutors Association, highlighted the cost implications of establishing an international criminal court.

"Technically it is not a bad idea on paper. Any forum that seeks to punish perpetrators of international crime is a good idea. But the concern is that you create this institution which may take years to formally get off the ground, but technically could nonetheless allow for 'forum shopping' by providing a choice between the African criminal court and the ICC, and could delay prosecutions and frustrate efforts at accountability," Wallis said.

Lamony said many AU member states do not pay their fees, which handicaps the continental body's operations. "I do not know where they will get the money from [for the court]. In the past [former Libyan president] Muammar Gaddafi would have probably contributed."

O'Donohue said there were also concerns that the proposed combined AU court could see the criminal functions of the court drain resources from the already under-resourced human rights court and there "needs to be clarity on the budgetary system".

The estimated average cost of an ICC trial is about US\$20 million or 14 percent of the AU's overall annual budget. The ICC trial of former Liberian President Charles Taylor cost about \$50 million. The 2011 costs for the Special Court of Sierra Leone (SCSL) were \$16 million, while the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) had a budget of \$130 million in 2010, with 800 staff involved in simultaneous trials.

The cost of individual criminal trials far outweighs those of civil and human rights cases, Wallis said, adding: "The nature of international criminal proceedings makes them extremely resource intensive. Insufficient funding has the potential to prevent the proper dispensation of justice and could raise questions about the integrity and credibility of the court's future proceedings..."

"There is no excuse in this day and age to make anything less than a perfect criminal court... The experience of international criminal tribunals demonstrates that states' broad support is essential to arrests and assistance in investigations. The conceptualization of a regional criminal tribunal must take into consideration the experiences and shortcomings of other international criminal tribunals such as the Special Court for Sierra Leone, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and ICTR and the ICC, so as to avoid problems down the line."

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

Why Taylor Was Found Guilty: Chief Prosecutor Detail ‘Planned



Linda Hollis, Chief Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, says Judges found that the former Liberian President and Bockarie jointly planned the operation adding that the two men wanted to make the operation fearful and use all means to get to Freetown the capital of Sierra Leone.

Monrovia - The chief Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone sitting in The Hague says Prosecutors and judges at the court established that former Liberian President Charles Taylor along with the late Sam Bockarie of the Revolutionary United Front, RUF, planned and executed an operation codenamed ‘Operation No Living thing’ to draw the West African nation into a full blown warfare.

“The first reason that the judges found was that Charles Taylor along with Sam Bockarie who’s also known as mosquito or mosquita planned an operation that was called ‘Operation No living thing’ that was carried out in Sierra Leone at the end of the 1998 through January and February of 1999,” says Hollis.

She says Judges found that the former Liberian President and Bockarie jointly planned the operation adding that the two men wanted to make the operation fearful and use all means to get to Freetown the capital of Sierra Leone.

“There were many terrible crimes committed during this operation and the judges found that these crimes resulted directly from the plan Mr. Taylor and Sam Bockarie devised,” says Hollis.

Speaking at a special edition of the Edward Wilmot Blyden forum of the Press Union of Liberia, PUL, held at the university of Liberia Capitol Hill campus, Hollis who is visiting Liberia and Sierra Leone to gauge public opinion and explain the conclusion of the Taylor Trial, says former President Taylor was aware that the RUF and the AFRC were carrying on a campaign of atrocities on civilians of Sierra Leone.

“That was the first reason why Mr. Taylor was found guilty against eleven charges he has been indicted,” she says.

The United Nations backed Special court’s prosecutor stated before a gathering of members of the media and students that the second reason the Judges found Taylor guilty was that it was established that he funded the operations of the RUF in return for blood diamonds.



Former Liberian President Charles Taylor.

“The judges found out that throughout the indictment period from the 30th of November 1996 until the end of the conflict in Sierra Leone Mr. Taylor had provided critical support to the RUF and the AFRC-RUF alliances and they found that this support took many forms one of this was to supply the RUF with arms and ammunitions

and facilitate those arms through rebels groups in sierra Leone,” she says.

Continued Hollis: “The judges found that the supply provided indisputable support to enable these two groups get large quantity of arms from Burkina Faso and transport through Liberia to Sierra Leone and that these arm and ammunition were used to commit these crimes during “Operation No living thing and they found that Mr. Taylor was the main supplier of arms to the AFRC and RUF throughout the period of indictment.

Hollis says the supply of arm and ammunition was critical to the crimes committed in Sierra Leone by the RUF adding that the judges found that Mr. Taylor provided advice to the two rebel groups in relations to their military and tactical operation which was characterized by terror against the civilians.

“And the judges found out that Mr. Taylor provided fighter to both groups and that these Liberians fighters also took part in crimes in Sierra Leone and those where the two crimes Taylor was found guilty,” she says.

Trial Not Ended Yet

Chief Prosecutor addresses a special edition of the Edward Wilmot Blyden forum of the Press Union of Liberia, PUL, held at the university of Liberia Capitol Hill campus Tuesday.

Hollis says the sentencing of Taylor by the court is not the end of the trial process but added that the trial of others involved in the Sierra Leonean conflict has been concluded.

“The RUF, AFRC and CDF their trail has been completed all the way through appeal. As all of you know, on the 26th of April this year the three judges of the Trail Chamber unanimously found Taylor guilty of all the crime he was charge with; he was found guilty of was act of terrorism against the people of Sierra Leone, murders, amputation and beating, rape, sexual enslavement, slavery and the use of child soldiers and that is known as pillage which means stealing from the people of Sierra Leone.”

Continued Hollis: “Crime against humanity, war crimes and other serious violation of international humanitarian law, so with that limited mandate in mind investigation begin in 2002, indictment were approve by judges of the special court in 2003 and the first trail begin in 2004 and for the conviction of Mr. Taylor in April of this year the court has concluded the cases against the leader of the three main faction in Sierra Leone.”

Taylor Was Not Directly Involved?

Responding to questions posed by the audience at the event, Chief Prosecutor Hollis noted that Taylor was not in Sierra Leone when the crimes were committed stressing that the crimes were physically committed by member of the RUF and member of the AFRC. “Mr. Taylor did not physical commit any of those crimes,” says Hollis.

She noted that the former Liberian President can now appeal the sentence. She also says that the President of Sierra Leone cannot grant clemency in the case of Taylor and other warlords.

The Chief Prosecutor who left the country Tuesday for Sierra Leone to hold similar discussions says Taylor will stay in the detention facility in The Hague until his appeal is heard by the court.

Al Varney Rogers JHR Intern contributed to this story

Daily Observer
Wednesday, 13 June 2012

Taylor's Trial 'Free and Fair', Chief Prosecutor Asserts

Written by Keith Morris



Brenda Hollis, Chief Prosecutor in Taylor's case

Brenda Hollis, the Chief Prosecutor in the trial of former Liberian President, Charles Taylor, yesterday dispelled contention raised regarding the fairness of Taylor's trial by saying that even one of the trial judges had expressed satisfaction in the trial.

Madam Hollis, speaking during a lecture session organized by the Press Union of Liberia (PUL) on the main campus of the University of Liberia told a gathering of predominantly students and journalists that the trial was "fair, transparent and independent to the extent that at one lunch session, one of the judges said the trial was fair."

Madam Hollis' revelation that one of the trial judges had already reach a conclusion on the trial process even before all the evidence had been submitted and reviewed prompted inquiries from the public to know the name of the judge.

But Madam Hollis refused to give the name of the judge throughout the entire program.

This stirred mixed reactions from the audience with some claiming that the Chief Prosecutor was hiding some vital information from the public relating to the trial.

Concerns expressing political interference and manipulation by Britain and the United States of America were highlighted during the session and Madam Hollis refusal to name the judge in question reignited similar concerns with some doubting the independence of the trial judges in the case.

Others argued that if the trial was free and fair as claimed by the Chief Prosecutor, the court should have entertained the dissenting view of Judge El Hadji Malik Sow, a Senegalese jurist who served as alternate judge for Trial Chamber II.

It can be recalled that following the end of Presiding Judge Richard Lussick's reading of the final verdict in Taylor's trial, Judge Sow started to speak and people seated in the public gallery heard a few words before the microphones were cutoff.

Alternate Judge Sow began to present his dissenting position but as he did, the three presiding judges stood up and left the courtroom in an apparent protest of Judge Sow's action.

"I disagree with the findings and conclusions of the other Judges, because for me, under any mode of liability, under any accepted standard of proof, the guilt of the accused from the evidence provided in this trial is not proved beyond reasonable doubt by the Prosecution.

"My only worry is that the whole system is not consistent with all the principles we know and love, and the system is not consistent with all the values of international criminal justice," Judge Sow declared.

"It is pretty damning stuff. Sow's is a voice that needs to be heard not silenced," Taylor's defense sources said of Sow's dissention.

On the issue of reparation, Madam Hollis disclosed that the Special Court for Sierra Leone sitting in The Hague does not involve itself in state accountability, stressing that in the case of Charles Taylor and the Sierra Leone crisis; the Liberian Government does not take responsibility.

Questioned why Mr. Taylor was sentenced to 50 years for aiding and abetting criminals in Sierra Leone and not for the other eleven counts, Madam Hollis said aiding and abetting was also criminal under international laws.

"In the case of Rwanda a person accused of killing 200 people is no different to the person providing 200,000 machetes to kill thousands of people," the Chief Prosecutor indicated.

BBC

Wednesday, 13 June 2012

ICC seeks 30-year sentence for Congo warlord Lubanga



Lubanga's conviction was the first verdict passed by the court since it was set up 10 years ago

The International Criminal Court (ICC) has sought a 30-year sentence for Congolese warlord Thomas Lubanga.

In March, the Hague-based court found him guilty of recruiting and using child soldiers between 2002 and 2003.

At that time, an inter-ethnic conflict was raging in the north-east of the Democratic Republic of Congo and Lubanga headed a rebel group.

ICC Chief Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo said he was asking for a "severe sentence".

"The prosecution will request a sentence in the name of each child recruited, in the name of the Ituri region," he told the court on Wednesday.

Apology wanted

"These children were told to kill and rape. That was the education he [Lubanga] gave these children," Mr Moreno-Ocampo added.

However, Associated Press news agency reported that the prosecutor said he would be willing to lessen the sentence to 20 years if Lubanga could offer a "genuine apology" to the children and communities affected by his crimes.

Lubanga protested his innocence and said he had not supported the use of child soldiers.

"I have always opposed such recruitment," he was quoted by AFP news agency as telling the judges during Wednesday's hearing.

His conviction was the first verdict reached by the court since it was set up 10 years ago. It is not clear when the court will pass sentence.

In a unanimous decision in March, the three presiding judges said evidence proved that as head of the Union of Congolese Patriots (UPC) and its armed wing, Lubanga bore responsibility for the recruitment of child soldiers under the age of 15 who had participated actively on the frontline.

Human Rights Watch says more than 60,000 people were killed in the conflict between Hema and Lendu ethnic groups in Ituri, in north-eastern DR Congo.

The Informer (Monrovia)

Wednesday, 13 June 2012

Liberia: 'Taylor's Lawyer Says Trial Was Fair'

The Chief Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, Brenda Hollis, has disclosed that one of former Liberian President Charles Taylor's lawyers has commended the fairness of Mr. Taylor's trial at a dinner party in The Hague.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone, sitting in The Hague found Mr. Taylor guilty on April 26, 2012 for aiding and abetting war in neighboring Sierra Leone which led to the killing and amputation of thousands of Sierra Leoneans. The Court sentenced him for fifty years in prison, but his lawyers have filed in an appeal against the court ruling.

A three-judge panel issued a unanimous decision that Taylor, 64, was guilty on all 11 counts of the indictment against him. The judges found him guilty of a campaign of terror that involved murder, rape, sexual slavery, terrorism, conscripting child soldier and amputation.

Addressing the Edward Wilmot Blyden Lecture Series at the University of Liberia, Hollis disclosed that "one of Mr. Taylor's Lawyers at a dinner party of both prosecution and defense lawyers expressed happiness that the trial of his client, Charles Taylor was fair," but declined to name the lawyer that made the assertion.

Madam Hollis also disclosed that the current set of judges will not form part of the appeal process which is expected to take next year. She said there will be a panel of new judges that will take on the appeal process.

She further indicated that Mr. Taylor was sentenced for aiding and abetting and planning "operation no living thing" with the late rebel commander Sam Bockarie in Sierra Leone. She said on November 30, 1996, Mr. Taylor provided critical support to the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) of arms and ammunitions.

According to Madam Hollis, Mr. Taylor provided money to the RUF for the purchase of arms and ammunitions from ULIMO and also provided indispensable for arms purchased from Burkina Faso to the RUF. She noted that the appeal process which is expected to begin next year will involve whether to reduce or increase the sentence of Mr. Taylor or whether or not he had a fair trial amongst others.

The Chief Prosecutor also indicated that a court will be established in Sierra Leone to keep Special Court records and for the protection of witnesses who testified in the Taylor trial against reprisal. She used the occasion to advise Liberians not to listen to speculations in the public, but rather take a keen look of the trial to determine whether or not is fair. Author's contact, 231886270297; email: .