

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



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:

Friday, 20 April 2012

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

Local News

Judgment Day Nears... Will Taylor Survive / <i>Equity</i>	Pages 3-4
Millions Await Taylor's Judgment / <i>The Exclusive</i>	Page 5

International News

Indeed, We Must Not Prejudge Taylor's Final Trial Verdict / <i>Heritage</i>	Page 6
Justice for Dictator / <i>The Economist</i>	Pages 7-9
Making a Difference / <i>Buffalo News</i>	Pages 10-11
Top Khmer Rouge Accused Denies Role in Torture Prison / <i>AFP</i>	Page 12
The Art of the Possible / <i>AllAfrica.Com</i>	Pages 13-16

Equity

Friday, 20 April 2012

Judgment Day Nears... Will Taylor Survive

EQUITY PRESS has gathered from the Special Court for Sierra Leone that April 26 this year has been set aside as the day the Trial Judgment, the day most Sierra Leoneans and Liberians will either jubilate or shed tears.

INCIDENTALLY, THIS is the day Sierra Leoneans will be celebrating the eve of the country's 51st Independence Anniversary, when former President of the Republic of Liberia, Charles Ghankay Taylor will either be sentenced or acquitted by the Special Court for Sierra Leone. This press is strongly convinced that our 51st Independence Anniversary will either be spoiled or be made merrier depending on the outcome of the Trial Judgment. More or less it hinges on whether Charles Taylor will be sentenced or acquitted and subsequently freed.

WE SAY this because we believe many or most Sierra Leoneans hold the strong view that Charles Taylor masterminded the decade long rebel incursion and destruction of this nation. But it is left with the Special Court and the evidence before it to prove Sierra Leoneans right or wrong.

THE QUESTION now tormenting most Sierra Leoneans is whether Charles Taylor will survive April 26, which date is just few days away. As a nation we spend sleepless nights eagerly awaiting the judgment as memories of the rebel carnage live with us till this day. So on April 26, either Sierra Leoneans or Taylor will rejoice and jubilate.

QUOTING THE Special Court for Sierra Leone, Charles Taylor was indicted on 7th

March, 2003 on 17 counts (later amended to 11 counts) of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious violations of International Humanitarian Law. He was turned over to the Special Court for Sierra Leone on 29th March 2006 and on 3rd April 2006 he made his initial appearance in Freetown where he pleaded not guilty to all the charges.

SPECIAL COURT for Sierra Leone sources also reveal that on November 12, 2010, the defence rested their case after calling 21 witnesses including Charles Taylor while the prosecution submitted the evidence of a total of one hundred witnesses, ninety four of whom testified in person.

FROM THE past records of international war crimes trials, Equity Press believes that Charles Taylor will be one of the luckiest men on Planet Earth to escape the Special Court for Sierra Leone as warlords indicted by international war crimes tribunals hardly go scot-free.

ALREADY THE Special Court for Sierra Leone has jailed some of Sierra Leone's Civil Defence Forces warlords including Moinina Fofana and Allieu Kondewa and Issa Sesay and Morris Kallon, all of whom are under lock and key in Rwanda learning trade, though according to the Court they will be back soon.

WE WILL highly appreciate any outcome of the judgment as we rely on the integrity of the Court. As it is Sierra Leoneans are in an expectant mood.



Millions Await Taylor's Judgment

See story page 2

Millions Await Taylor's Judgment

By Musa Sesay

The 20th of this month will be a historic day in Africa as it will mark the day the former President of Liberia, Charles Taylor will walk out court room in The Hague a free-man or sent to jail for years.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), which indicted Charles Taylor, presided over the case of war crimes spanning more that three years.

The former Liberian leader has been answering questions to murder, rape, terrorism, pillage, sexual harassment and recruiting of children during the war in Sierra Leone.

Meanwhile, Charles Taylor has denied all the charges.

However, the Special Court in Sierra

Leone has been working round the clock to ensure that the judgment attracts a wide publicity. Information reaching The Exclusive from the Special Court reveals that international journalists including BBC's Africa, Marke Doyle and Sierra Leonean born Josephine Hasley will be in Freetown to give wide coverage to the case described as a landmark in the history of the Special Court.

The Special Court has also invited Paramount Chiefs, government officials and civil society groups to witness the event. Special Court sources also reveal that local journalists will have the opportunity to ask questions through video links after the judgment.

Heritage

Wednesday, 18 April 2012

Indeed, We Must Not Prejudge Taylor's Final Trial Verdict

When he addressed the press on Saturday, April 14, 2012, United Nations Under-Secretary General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Herve Ladsous, voiced out that the final trial verdict of former Liberian President Charles G. Taylor in The Hague must not be prejudged.

Mr. Ladsous, who is currently visiting Liberia, urged Liberians to wait until the final trial verdict of the former Liberian leader is out.

The United Nations Under-Secretary General added that he will not presume to prejudge the decision of the justice on grounds that the UN made it a policy neither to prejudice nor to comment on decision of judiciary.

The top UN official comments were in response to a question posed to him by a journalist at the press conference regarding what will become of Liberia if Mr. Taylor is declared not guilty come April 26, 2012 when the trial verdict is delivered.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone judges in The Hague has since announced that the judgment to determine Taylor's guilt or innocence will be delivered on April 26, 2012.

Mr. Taylor faces an 11 count-indictment of war crimes, crimes against humanity and other serious violations of international humanitarian law allegedly committed in the territory of Sierra Leone from November 1996 to January 2002. Mr. Taylor has maintained his innocence throughout the trial.

For us, we welcome the comments by the United Nations Under-Secretary General as they are well thought-out and in the right direction.

We agree with the top UN official that the final trial verdict of Mr. Taylor must not be prejudged, as doing so could adversely undermine the outcome of the trial.

As he rightly advised, It is indeed prudent for us to wait patiently until the final trial verdict is delivered and thereafter we can take a position either to accept it or not.

Again, we welcome the United Nations -Secretary General comments as it relates to the final trial of the former Liberian president.

It is hoped that everyone of us will pay heed for the integrity of the trial.

The Economist
Friday, 20 April 2012

Justice for Dictator

Justice for dictators

History rules

A verdict is imminent in the case of Charles Taylor, pictured below, the first former head of state to be judged by an international court since the Nuremberg trials



ON APRIL 26th the UN-backed Special Court for Sierra Leone will make judicial history, giving its verdict on Charles Taylor, Liberia's former president. He is accused of fuelling the decade-long savage civil war in neighbouring Sierra Leone in the 1990s by,

among other things, providing rebel groups with arms in exchange for "blood diamonds". Six of the rebel leaders involved have already been convicted and jailed for between 25 and 52 years.

Whatever the verdict in the complex and unpredictable trial, it marks a milestone in the 20-year transformation of international criminal justice. In dealing with perpetrators of so-called atrocity crimes, international law allows no amnesty for time elapsed or the seniority of the accused. That should make dictators and warlords wary everywhere, and especially in Africa, site of so many heinous deeds in recent decades.

In this section

For decades, the only head of state to be convicted by an international court was Karl Dönitz, briefly Germany's leader after Hitler's suicide. He was jailed at Nuremberg. But in the past 13 years international courts have prosecuted five heads of state, four of them African. None of these prosecutions has so far resulted in a verdict. Slobodan Milosevic, president of the former Yugoslavia, died in 2006 during his trial. Rebels killed Libya's leader Muammar Qaddafi in October, four

months after the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant. The ICC has also indicted Sudan's president Omar al-Bashir for atrocities in Darfur. Laurent Gbagbo, former president of Côte d'Ivoire, is due to go on trial in June after his transfer last November to The Hague.

Hopes are also growing that Hissène Habré, Chad's former tyrannical ruler, may at last be called to account 22 years after fleeing into exile in Senegal; his protector against trial or extradition, President Abdoulaye Wade, was defeated in an election last month. Other countries have put their leaders on trial, but not before international tribunals. Iraq executed Saddam Hussein in 2006. Egypt is trying its leader of 30 years, Hosni Mubarak.

But it is still rare for African countries to put their rulers in the dock—perhaps because incumbents fear creating an unwanted precedent if and when their turn comes. Over the past decade, that task has increasingly fallen to the ICC. But it was always intended to be a court of last resort. Its statutes stipulate that it is to prosecute an atrocity crime only when the country involved is itself “unwilling or unable” to do so. Cases must be referred to it either by a member state in which the alleged crimes have taken place or, in the case of non-members, by the UN Security Council. The chief prosecutor may open an investigation on his own initiative, but only after approval by the court's judges. It is not allowed to investigate crimes committed before it was set up in 2002.

Some critics of the 121-member ICC see it as too Western and anti-African, others as too toothless. Until last month (when it found Thomas Lubango Dyilo, a Congolese warlord, guilty) it had failed to secure a single conviction. All seven countries being investigated are indeed African. But four of them—Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and Côte d'Ivoire—specifically asked the ICC to intervene, whereas in two others, Sudan and Libya, the Security Council requested the court's action. In only one case, involving post-election violence in Kenya in 2008, did the ICC's chief prosecutor, Luis Moreno-Ocampo, initiate the investigation himself.

Case not proven

With 33 members, Africa forms the ICC's biggest regional block. Another two African countries, Egypt and Côte d'Ivoire, are expected to sign up soon. Five of the 18 ICC judges are African. Yet the African Union (AU) asks its 54 members not to co-operate with the court, and wants the Security Council to “defer” (ie, abandon) its cases against Mr Bashir and in Kenya. Instead, the AU says Africans should prosecute their own tyrants. But that requires properly functioning courts, a rarity on the continent. The AU's own African Court of Justice and Human and People's Rights has made almost no progress.

Meanwhile, the ICC presses ahead. As well as Mr Lubango, three more Congolese are in The Hague awaiting trial. Jean-Pierre Bemba, a former Congolese vice-president accused of mass atrocities a decade ago in the Central African Republic, has been on trial for the past 17 months. Mr Gbagbo, Côte d'Ivoire's former president, is expected to be joined in his cell block soon by other Ivorian suspects who are still being investigated.

Other cases have proved trickier. Of the seven Sudanese charged with atrocity crimes in Darfur, three have appeared voluntarily before the court, but four others, including Mr Bashir, ignore it. Of the five leaders of the Lord's Resistance Army, a brutal Ugandan rebel group, charged by the court, two are dead; three others, including their leader, Joseph Kony, are still on the run almost seven years after warrants were issued for their arrest. Kenya's government is challenging the ICC's right to prosecute four senior politicians; two are leading candidates in next year's presidential elections. Libya, too, is challenging the court's jurisdiction to try Qaddafi's son, Saif al-Islam, and the ex-spymaster Abdullah al-Senussi, though it may allow the ICC to take part in a domestic trial.

When asked about his record over the past ten years, the much-pilloried prosecutor, Mr Moreno-Ocampo, replies without hesitation: "Mission more than accomplished!" Controversy was to be expected, but "from the victims, we have had full support." In June he will be replaced by his deputy Fatou Bensouda, a former Gambian justice minister. She may persuade the AU to look a little more kindly on the court—though not by showing greater indulgence towards villains.

Buffalo News
Thursday, 19 April 2012

Making a difference

By ELIZA LEFEBVRE

Teens were called to activism recently when they were made aware of the atrocities of Ugandan warlord Joseph Kony in a documentary that was posted on YouTube. This 30-minute video produced by Invisible Children, a nonprofit group, has been viewed by more than 85 million people so far. This is not the first time teens have come together to discuss ways to help stop oppression.

There is a place where teenagers from all over Western New York come together to discuss human rights; listen to Holocaust survivors and genocide resisters; sketch; act; write; and collaborate with one another to work toward a more peaceful and just world.

The Summer Institute for Human Rights and Genocide Studies was founded by Andrew Beiter, who is also the director along with program coordinator Lori Raybold.



The Summer Institute For Human Rights And Genocide Studies Gives Teens A Place To Work Together To Discuss Ways To Stop Oppression.

Last year's program, "Women's Rights are Human Rights," included conversations with Holocaust survivors; an Eleanor Roosevelt impersonator; trips to the Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls, the Susan B. Anthony House in Rochester and the Robert H. Jackson Center in Jamestown; the fifth annual International Law Dialogues at the Chautauqua Institute; and much more.

One of the most moving events of the program came during a visit from Syracuse University professor **David Crane, former chief prosecutor of the Special Court of Sierra Leone.** Crane engaged the students and teachers in a role-playing exercise where students took on the role of "child soldiers" as Crane explained the types of abuses they suffer in war. At the conclusion, Crane asked each participant to draw a red line on their wrist to signify the loss of life and limb and to remember the children who experienced this kind of torture.

This unique program speaks to teens in a variety of ways. It was clear by the end of the sessions the teens felt empowered to change the world in some way.

Ted McKnight, a junior at Frontier High School, was motivated to participate in the Summer Institute to interact with others who also feel passionate about human rights issues.

Currently a Life Scout, one step below an Eagle Scout, Ted is currently working on earning his next badge. His project, aimed at helping pregnant women in Africa, involves the creation of birthing kits, which include a plastic bag with gloves, plastic tarp, umbilical cord cutters, a razor, soap and gauze. These birthing kits will be sent to Rwanda.

“Being involved in human rights and activism and the way I am, I wouldn’t be able to sleep knowing that I didn’t help as much as I possibly could,” Ted said.

He said his favorite part of being a participant in the Summer Institute is “... how un-school-like the program was, and [the facilitators] listened to our views.

“Whenever I go through the Summer Institute I become culturally enriched and am around like-minded people.”

Ted shares advice for other teenagers who desire to help the

world: “I firmly believe that activism is a lifestyle, whether

it’s the product you [buy and] use to wash your hair, every little bit counts.

“I want to be able to tell my grandkids that I made a

Difference,” Ted said.

The Summer Institute of Human Rights and Genocide Studies runs from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. July 16-19 and July 23-26 at the Erie 1 BOCES Center on Harlem Road in West Seneca. The theme this year is “The Power of One: Civil Rights are Human Rights.” It will address topics on Native American history, gay and lesbian history, contemporary genocide issues and Holocaust studies.

The program is open to incoming ninth-grader through and including exiting high school seniors.

For an outline of the program, visit www.summerinstituteofbuffalo.org.

For registration information, contact Stephanie Brown at summerinstituteadmissions@gmail.com.

Eliza Lefebvre is a sophomore at Sweet Home High School.

Agence France Presse

Thursday, 19 April 2012

Top Khmer Rouge accused denies role in torture prison

In this photo released by the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, Nuon Chea, who was the Khmer Rouge's chief ideologist and No. 2 leader, listens to testimony during his trial at the UN-backed war crimes tribunal in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Tuesday, Mar 20, 2012. -- PHOTO: APPHONOM PENH (AFP) - A Khmer Rouge leader on trial for crimes against humanity on Wednesday rejected claims from the regime's chief jailer as 'untruthful', denying he was ever in charge of a torture prison.



In this photo released by the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, Nuon Chea, who was the Khmer Rouge's chief ideologist and No. 2 leader, listens to testimony during his trial at the UN-backed war crimes tribunal in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Tuesday, Mar 20, 2012. -- PHOTO: AP

Brother Number Two' Nuon Chea urged Cambodia's UN-backed court to ignore testimony by Kaing Guek Eav, better known as Duch, who accused him of ordering the 'smashing' of hundreds of inmates at the S-21 detention centre in the late 1970s.

'I would like to inform the Cambodian people that I have never at any time been responsible for the operation of S-21,' said the former deputy leader of the brutal regime, which oversaw the deaths of up to two million people.

'What Duch has accused me of has been untruthful and very unjust towards me... I have never been Duch's superior,' Nuon Chea read out from a prepared statement, challenging his accuser to provide the documents to prove otherwise.

AllAfrica.Com
Friday, 20 April 2012

The Art of the Possible

On the evolving system of international criminal justice

By Jacqueline Bhabha



Photograph by James Stejskal

David Scheffer in 1997 at the Nyanza massacre memorial site in Rwanda

ELEMENTS of a system of international criminal justice abound on the contemporary world stage. Radovan Karadzic, the former president and commander of the Bosnian Serb Republic, the defiant architect of the 1995 Srebrenica massacre of approximately 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys, is in the dock in the Hague, before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, facing 11 charges of war crimes, including two counts of genocide. On March 14, 2012, in the same small Dutch city, the International Criminal Court (ICC) delivered its first judgment—a unanimous finding of guilt for war crimes—against Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, leader of the Patriotic Forces for the Liberation of the Congo, who conscripted boys and girls under 15 and deployed them as front-line soldiers in the brutal civil war in the Democratic Republic of Congo. For the first time in history, an exploiter of child soldiers is being punished. Muammar el-Qaddafi was indicted by the ICC before he died, a fugitive in disguise—and as the deaths mount in Syria, world leaders have called Bashar al-Assad a war criminal, and the United Nations has recommended referral of his regime to the ICC for investigation. International accountability for attacks on unarmed civilians is no longer just the preserve of diplomats, jurists, or law scholars. Millions have watched the American-student-produced video *Kony 2012*, documenting the brutality of the infamous commander of the Lord’s Resistance Army in Uganda.

Twenty years ago, those who questioned the viability of a permanent system of international criminal justice were considered hardheaded realists, puncturing the idealism of enthusiastic but naïve human-rights advocates. Today, to argue that heads of state responsible for systematic brutality against civilian populations are shielded by “sovereign immunity” is to place oneself amid international pariahs.

All the Missing Souls: A Personal History of the War Crimes Tribunals, by David Scheffer ’75, Brown-Helman professor of law and director of the Center for International Human Rights at

Northwestern University School of Law, traces this remarkable political, legal, and diplomatic journey—what one expert calls “the biggest step forward in law since the Magna Carta.” A lucid, frank, and fascinating personal testimony, the book provides a key participant’s chronicle of the vital albeit deeply ambivalent role of the United States in building the existing international criminal justice system.

The story starts in early 1993, when Scheffer was appointed to lead the U.S. effort to establish what eventually became the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the first war-crimes court created in the midst of the conflict it was charged with judging. The book ends in 2000, with the convoluted negotiations leading to the establishment of the so-called “Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia,” a “hybrid” court of Cambodian and international judges that started to gather steam during Scheffer’s term as U.S. ambassador for war crimes in the second Clinton administration. (The notorious commandant of an infamous Khmer Rouge prison finally entered the court for the first day of his prosecution in February 2009, 10 years after his arrest and more than 20 years after his crimes were committed.) Along the way, *All the Missing Souls* describes the unimaginable intricacies and obfuscations involved in addressing the Rwandan genocide, the brutal carnage in Sierra Leone, the second phase of Balkan atrocities in Kosovo, and the protracted negotiations culminating in the creation of the first-ever permanent International Criminal Court—despite the United States’ refusal to support it.

Several key themes emerge from the narrative. One is the tension between setting aside past pain in the interests of harmonious coexistence, on the one hand, and pursuing an accurate historical record for the sake of the victims or their survivors, on the other. Most striking is the ever-present tussle between justice and peace, as the author’s unshakable conviction that justice must and shall be done rubs up against the pragmatic imperative of saving lives at all costs, stopping torture, and reestablishing peace without other preconditions. For example, could Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic persuade U.S. assistant secretary Richard Holbrooke to offer amnesty to Bosnian Serb leaders Ratko Mladic and Radovan Karadzic in return for a cessation of hostilities in Bosnia? Throughout the Dayton Peace talks, many observers, including the Yugoslav Tribunal prosecutor Richard Goldstone, concluded that “the United States was prepared to sacrifice justice for peace...[and] that the Dayton negotiating team would not insist that the parties cooperate with the Yugoslav Tribunal.” Was that stance wise and justified—or a cynical abdication of responsibility?

In Rwanda, the stakes of achieving peace were if anything even higher. How should the imperative of arresting those responsible for unimaginable massacres measure up to the critical task of securing an end to the killing? As Scheffer tells it, while General Roméo Dallaire, the heroic Canadian commander of the UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda, was reporting that Hutu leaders were training their men “to kill Tutsi (at a rate of up to 1,000 Tutsi in 20 minutes)...in Washington the unreasonable view that everything must relate to the peace process [between Tutsi and Hutu leaders] prevailed.”

Again and again, war-crime work is an unwelcome interference and complication in the business of dealing with governments, particularly when the stakes are very high. Nowhere is this clearer than in the tragic history of the negotiations surrounding the civil war in Sierra Leone. As intoxicated child soldiers were mutilating civilians by the hundreds—chopping off hands, arms, ears, and legs—the international community entered peace talks with the rebels led by Liberia’s “charismatic and diabolical former president” Charles Taylor and his Sierra Leone counterpart, Foday Sankoh, despite the rebel insistence on unconditional amnesty. Scheffer describes a scene at Netland Hospital in Freetown, the capital of Sierra Leone, as the peace negotiations got under way in February 1999: “I visited with one teenage girl, ‘Nancy,’ whose eyes had been

burned out by pouring heated plastic into them. She was still traumatized from being gang-raped and refused to speak to anyone.”

Five months later, the Lomé peace agreement included an “absolute and free pardon” for Sankoh and for “all combatants and collaborators in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives...” up to the time of the peace agreement. The U.S. and British governments congratulated the parties and expressed their support for the agreement “which will bring to an end the tragic war of Sierra Leone.” Instead the rebels, apparently emboldened by their victory in securing immunity, resumed their butchery and the peace process imploded. It took more than two years for a new compromise to be negotiated—this time anchored by the creation of a special criminal court where leaders would be held accountable. But by the time the Special Court for Sierra Leone got around to handing down judgments, some of the key culprits, including Sankoh himself, had died. Only Charles Taylor was successfully indicted and put on trial. At this writing, the verdict on his case is expected on April 26, but procedural delays may yet again push the day of reckoning back.

The book also tackles the chess-like complexity of international diplomacy—the art of the possible—particularly complex for a principled actor such as the author. Charged with representing a superpower with a multiplicity of agendas, personalities, and strategic interests, he is forced to straddle a stated commitment to human rights and nondiscrimination, on the one hand, and a vigorous rejection of any scrutiny of American actions undertaken by international judicial entities, on the other. His narrative, depicting split-second decisions over key issues, the astute elaboration of multilayered negotiating tactics, and the excruciating obligation to forcefully present and defend positions diametrically opposed to one’s own, could pass as a terrific diplomatic primer.

This theme emerges with particular clarity in his account of the U.S. negotiating position during the final drafting conference for the statute establishing the International Criminal Court, held in Rome during the summer of 1998. Scheffer presents the complex and shifting diplomatic and legal terrain clearly and, at times, poignantly. Faced with the Pentagon’s insistence that U.S. military staff should *never* risk international criminal liability, Scheffer—who had dedicated his career to building an architecture of international criminal justice and accountability—had to press for a requirement that states give their consent prior to the prosecution of their nationals, a position that sounded “impractical” (surely an understatement!) to the rest of the world. In the end he was compelled to vote against the treaty in the company of China, Israel, Iraq, Cuba, Syria, and Yemen. To many observers and participants, he appeared, as he accurately notes, “the guardian of impunity rather than its slayer,” arguing on the same side as some notorious and persistent violators of human rights.

Some of the most interesting ideas in the book are surprisingly underexplored. For example, Scheffer suggests that the outcome of the Rome conference and the eventual participation by the United States in the ICC might have been different if the case for American exceptionalism had been presented more creatively. The imperative of U.S. government consent prior to any prosecution of U.S. citizens by the ICC was justified simply by reference to the country’s national security and economic interests—an argument, Scheffer implies, that could be advanced by any country. Instead he suggests America’s changing role in a post-Cold War world, as a key player in international humanitarian and peacekeeping missions with unparalleled global troop deployments, would have constituted a much more persuasive argument to explain the unique risk of malicious or rogue prosecutions facing American leaders. I disagree. Other governments, and close U.S. allies such as the United Kingdom, also deploy sizable military contingents in challenging situations without calling for international immunity for their soldiers. Why should an international court not prosecute U.S. war criminals if the U.S. courts refuse to do so?

One of the most convincing legal arguments is made at the end of the book. In a short postscript, Scheffer advances the powerful suggestion that the term “atrocities crimes” should replace the complicated and confusing trinity of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity as a unified category underpinning international criminal culpability. The egregious failures in Rwanda, he suggests, might have been averted if critical time had not been wasted on vacillations over what constituted genocide. But maybe not. The most enduring and sobering message of *All the Missing Souls* is that—unless the most powerful players in international military actions insist otherwise—international criminal justice is always at the bottom of the list.

Jacqueline Bhabha, Smith lecturer on law, is the director of research at the Harvard François-Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health and Human Rights, and the University adviser on human-rights education. Her research focuses on transnational child migration and trafficking, and on children’s and adolescents’ economic and social rights.