

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



Mohamed Fadika "Fadix" at the AV booth in The Hague

**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:**

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

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

### Local News

Taylor War Crimes Trial Will Take Star... / <i>Concord Times</i>	Page 3
I Was Made Interim RUF Leader by West African Leaders / <i>Concord Times</i>	Pages 4-5
Naomi Campbell to Testify August 5 / <i>Premier News</i>	Pages 6-9
Special Court Reacts to Press Reports / <i>Awoko</i>	Page 10
Germany Donates £1M to Special Court / <i>Awareness Times</i>	Page 11
President Koroma wishes... “Special Court leaves a Magnificent & Imposing legacy” / <i>Awoko Online</i>	Page 12

### International News

Interview With Courtenay Griffiths, Part 1 / <i>BBC World Service Trust</i>	Pages 13-14
Interview With Courtenay Griffiths, Part 2 / <i>BBC World Service Trust</i>	Pages 15-16
Taylor War Crimes Trial Will Take Star Turn With Model's Testimony / <i>Voice of America</i>	Pages 17-18
Cambodians Upset by Genocide Sentence / <i>Asia Times Online</i>	Pages 19-20
UK Court Rejects Serbia's Extradition Request, Releases Ex-Bosnian President / <i>RTTNews</i>	Page 21

## Taylor War Crimes Trial Will Take Star Turn With Top Model's Testimony

By Nico Colombant

The ongoing Charles Taylor West African war crimes trial in The Hague will take a star turn next week when supermodel Naomi Campbell testifies.

Officials at the Special Court for Sierra Leone say Campbell is due to appear August 5, after she asked for a postponement from a scheduled appearance this week.

They say they hoped there would be no more delays.

Earlier this month, the British supermodel was subpoenaed to testify about claims Charles Taylor gave her a large rough-cut diamond, allegedly linked to Sierra Leone's conflict, at a dinner party in South Africa in 1997.

Earlier this year, Campbell had told American television host Oprah Winfrey she did not want to be involved in the Taylor case. She said she did not want to put her family in danger.

But after the court's subpoena, she said she would testify.

Lawyers for the former Liberian president have called the move a publicity stunt, and say the testimony will be a distraction.

Former chief prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone David Crane, who indicted Mr. Taylor in 2003, disagrees.

"I think what the prosecutors there are doing, they are just showing everybody the fact that Charles Taylor was very much involved, moving about using diamonds as cash and guns for influence," he said.

Mr. Taylor, who has been on trial since 2008, has denied charges he backed rebels in Sierra Leone in exchange for diamonds. He says he is being blamed for situations he did not control.

American actress Mia Farrow wrote a statement to the court saying Campbell had told her she had been given a large diamond from Charles Taylor after the 1997 dinner in South Africa, which they all attended.

Crane says the incident is revealing. "The fact that Charles Taylor was showing off and using the diamonds that he received from Sierra Leone, giving them allegedly to other people, famous people like Naomi Campbell, just shows the kind of a mindset," Crane says, "an evil-thinking mind of Charles Taylor, and what he was doing with the diamonds from Sierra Leone."

Yale University political anthropologist Mike McGovern, a West Africa expert, says besides the Campbell involvement there has been little awareness in the United States of the Taylor trial.

"Honestly, West Africa tends not to make the news unless there is some kind of horrible event taking place or famine or a visit by some American official," McGovern states.

But Mr. Taylor and his family have a long history with the United States. The former Liberian president was a student in the Boston area in the 1970s.

After fleeing Liberia in the 1980s, he was put in jail in Plymouth, Massachusetts, on a warrant for extradition to face embezzlement charges. He allegedly escaped, but during his current trial he said he had received help from a prison guard and U.S. agents, claims that have not been independently confirmed.

His son, who was born in Boston, Emmanuel Chuckie Taylor, is serving a 97-year sentence in Florida, after being convicted of torturing or ordering the torture of dozens of his family's political opponents in Liberia.

Today, it's Orlassel, who knows who's next.



His conviction marked the first time a U.S. law allowing prosecution for overseas torture was used.

McGovern says the Charles Taylor trial is also very significant, and deserves attention beyond the Naomi Campbell appearance.

"Heads of state who abuse their citizens may now find themselves in the dock later on, in the way that Taylor did," McGovern said. "It is really a precedent setting trial. Presidents from any country in the world might one day find themselves in the same situation."

The Special Court for Sierra Leone was created jointly by the government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations.

It is also the first international criminal tribunal to be funded entirely from voluntary contributions. The trial is taking place in the Hague because of security concerns.

# 'I was made interim RUF leader by West African leaders'

**...Issa Sesay**

*Alpha Sesay*

As the trial of former Liberian president Charles Taylor resumed Monday, the much-anticipated testimony of supermodel Naomi Campbell was delayed until Thursday next week, August 5.

Meanwhile, a former Sierra Leonean rebel leader returned to the witness stand and said his appointment as the top rebel was made by a group of West African leaders - not by Taylor alone, as prosecutors have alleged.

Before last week's judicial recess, prosecutors had asked the Special Court for Sierra Leone's judges to reschedule Ms. Campbell's testimony from the end of this week to a later date. When court resumed, prosecution counsel Nicholas Koumjian told the judges that Ms. Campbell's representatives have made a written request for the supermodel's appearance to take place a week later.

"There is an outstanding court order for her [Campbell] to appear on the 29th of July. A communication has been re-

ceived by, I believe, the court, that they are requesting a modification of the order to the 5th of August. The prosecution has no problem with that, so we would request that the date of appearance be modified to 5 August, for Ms. Campbell," Koumjian asked the judges.

After consulting her colleagues, presiding judge of the Trial Chamber Justice Julia Sebutinde granted the prosecution's request.

"We can only say that the leave is granted and the date is postponed ac-

*Contd. page 4*

## 'I was made interim RUF leader by West African leaders'

From page 3  
Accordingly for her appearance, with the hope that it would not be postponed yet again," Justice Sebutinde said.

Issa Hassan Sesay, the former interim leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) rebel group, then took the witness stand to resume his testimony as a defense witness for Taylor, who is responding to allegations that he had control over and provided support to RUF rebels during Sierra Leone's 11 years civil conflict.

Sesay denied claims that he was appointed as leader of the RUF in May 2000 by Taylor (a claim that the former Liberian president has also denied). According to Mr. Sesay, his appointment as leader of the RUF was made by West African leaders at a meeting in Liberia. He said the West African leaders told him that working with the RUF leader, Foday Sankoh, to bring the Sierra Leonean conflict to an end had become impossible. The leaders present at the meeting were Taylor, former Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo, former Togolese president Gnassingbe Eyadema, former Malian president Alpha Oumar Konare and Gambian president Yahya Jammeh, Sesay said.

The former RUF stringman explained that "...during that meeting, the Heads of States spoke one after another but the main thrust of their discussion was that they were the moral

guarantors of the Lome Peace Accord [peace agreement between the RUF and the Sierra Leone government] and that they were no longer able to work with Foday Sankoh."

"President Obasanjo asked Mr. Taylor that time you were negotiating the release of the peacekeepers, 'who did you speak with?' and Mr. Taylor said it was this young man sitting here. And Obasanjo said 'well it seems like Issa is someone who listens to people so do you think we should give him the leadership?' and Mr. Taylor said 'yes, Issa is a man that listens to people'," Sesay said.

The other West African leaders at the meeting agreed to the suggestion that Mr. Sesay be made leader of the RUF, he said.

According to him, he insisted that Sankoh be consulted on the matter. He then wrote a letter which the West African leaders took to Sankoh (who was then in the custody of Sierra Leone government). Sankoh wanted another RUF commander, Mike Lamin, to be given the RUF leadership but according to Sesay, the West African leaders insisted that he was the person with whom they were prepared to work.

At a second meeting that was held at the Roberts International Airport (RIA) in Monrovia, the West African leaders informed Sesay that they had got support from other West African leaders - including Sierra Leone's president Ahmed

Tejan Kabbah - that he (Sesay) was to become leader of the RUF. The following day, a helicopter flew Sesay from Monrovia to the Liberian town of Foya, before he proceeded to Sierra Leone.

Prosecutors have long maintained that it was Taylor who appointed Sesay as leader of the RUF. This, prosecutors say points to the control that Taylor had over the Sierra Leonean rebels. Prosecution witnesses have also testified that it was Taylor who made Sesay leader of the RUF and that on his return to Sierra Leone via Foya, Taylor had given Sesay supplies of arms and ammunition which were dropped at Foya by the same helicopter that Mr. Sesay had used, and were then transported to Sierra Leone. The witness described these accounts as false.

"Were you appointed leader of the RUF by Charles Taylor alone?" Courtenay Griffiths, lead defense lawyer for Taylor asked Sesay.

"No. In fact, it was Obasanjo who brought about the idea," he responded.

When asked whether he returned to Sierra Leone with a consignment of arms and ammunition, he said "no, not at all."

The former rebel leader insisted that Taylor never at any point gave him arms and ammunition to be taken to Sierra Leone.

Sesay's testimony continues tomorrow.

# Naomi Campbell To Testify August 5

**A**s the trial of former Liberian President Charles Taylor resumed Monday, the much-anticipated testimony of supermodel Naomi Campbell was delayed until Thursday next week, August 5.

Meanwhile, a former Sierra Leonean rebel leader returned to the witness stand and said that his appointment as the top rebel was made by a group of West African leaders not by Mr. Taylor alone, as prosecutors have alleged.

Before last week's judicial recess, prosecutors had asked the Special Court for Sierra Leone's judges to reschedule Ms. Campbell's testimony from the end of this week to a later date.

*Contd. Page 6*

## Naomi Campbell To Testify August 5

*From front page*

Judges had previously issued a subpoena for Ms. Campbell to testify on July 29 regarding allegations that she received rough diamonds from Mr. Taylor after they had both attended a star-studded dinner in September 1997 in South Africa.

When court resumed, prosecution counsel Nicholas Koumjian told the judges that Ms. Campbell's representatives have made a written request for the supermodel's appearance to take place a week later.

"There is an outstanding court order for her [Campbell] to appear on the 29th of July. A communication has been received by, I believe, the court, that they are requesting a modification of the order to the 5th of August. The prosecution has no problem with that, so we would request that the date of appearance be modified to 5 August, for Ms. Campbell," Mr. Koumjian said to the judges.

After consulting her colleagues, presiding judge of the Trial Chamber Justice Julia Sebutinde granted the prosecution's request. "We can only say that the leave is granted and the date is postponed accordingly for her appearance, with the hope that it would not be postponed yet again," Justice Sebutinde said.

Issa Hassan Sesay, the former interim leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) rebel group, then took the witness stand to resume his testimony as a defense witness for Mr. Taylor, who is responding to allegations that he had control over and provided support to RUF rebels during Sierra Leone's 11 years civil conflict.

Mr. Sesay today denied claims that he was appointed as leader of the RUF in May 2000 by Mr. Taylor (a claim that the former Liberian president has also denied). According to Mr. Sesay, his appointment as leader of the RUF was made by West

African leaders at a meeting in Liberia. He said that the West African leaders told him that working with the RUF leader, Foday Sankoh, to bring the Sierra Leonean conflict to an end had become impossible. The leaders present at the meeting were Mr. Taylor, former Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo, former Togolese president Gnassingbe Eyadema, former Malian president Alpha Oumar Konare and Gambian president Yahya Jammeh, Mr. Sesay said.

Mr. Sesay explained that "...during that meeting, the Heads of States spoke one after another but the main thrust of their discussion was that they were the moral guarantors of the Lome Peace Accord [peace agreement between the RUF and the Sierra Leone government] and that they were no longer able to work with Foday Sankoh."

"President Obasanjo asked Mr. Taylor that the time you were negotiating the release of the peacekeepers, 'who did you speak with?' and Mr. Taylor said it was this young man sitting here. And Obasanjo said 'well it seems like Issa is someone who listens to people so do you think we should give him the leadership?' and Mr. Taylor said 'yes, Issa is a man that listens to people,'" Mr. Sesay said.

The other West African leaders at the meeting agreed to the suggestion that Mr. Sesay be made leader of the RUF, Mr. Sesay said.

According to Mr. Sesay, he insisted that Mr. Sankoh be consulted on the matter. He then wrote a letter which the West African leaders took to Mr. Sankoh (who was then in the custody of Sierra Leone government). Mr. Sankoh wanted another RUF commander, Mike Lamin, to be given the RUF leadership but

according to Mr. Sesay, the West African leaders insisted that Mr. Sesay was the person with whom they were prepared to work.

At a second meeting that was held at the Roberts International Airport (RIA) in Monrovia, the West African leaders informed Mr. Sesay that they had got support from other West African leaders including Sierra Leone's president Ahmed Tejan Kabbah that he (Sesay) was to become leader of the RUF. The following day, a helicopter flew Mr. Sesay from Monrovia to the Liberian town of Foya, before he proceeded to Sierra Leone. Prosecutors have long maintained that it was Mr. Taylor who appointed Mr. Sesay as leader of the RUF. This, prosecutors say points to the control that Mr. Taylor had over the Sierra Leonean rebels. Prosecution witnesses have also testified that it was Mr. Taylor who made Mr. Sesay leader of the RUF and that on his return to Sierra Leone via Foya, Mr. Taylor had given Mr. Sesay supplies of arms and ammunition which were dropped at Foya by the same helicopter that Mr. Sesay had used, and were then transported to Sierra Leone. Mr. Sesay today described these accounts as false.

"Were you appointed leader of the RUF by Charles Taylor alone?" Courtenay Griffiths, lead defense lawyer for Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Sesay. "No. In fact, it was Obasanjo who brought about the idea," Mr. Sesay responded.

When asked whether he returned to Sierra Leone with a consignment of arms and ammunition, Mr. Sesay said "no, not at all." The former rebel leader insisted that Mr. Taylor never at any point gave him arms and ammunition to be taken to Sierra Leone.

Mr. Sesay's testimony continues tomorrow.

*Continued from last edition*

US Appeals Court Upholds 97 Years for Charles Taylor Jr.

Judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Thursday issued a decision affirming the conviction of Charles Taylor Jr., aka Chuckie Taylor.

He was convicted in October 2008 by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and sentenced to 97 years imprisonment for "committing numerous acts of torture and other atrocities in Liberia between 1999 and 2003," while he served as head of the country's "Anti Terrorist Unit" (ATU) during the presidency of his father, Charles Taylor Sr. who is himself presently being tried by the Special Court for Sierra Leone sitting in The Hague for allegedly controlling and supporting rebel forces who fought and committed heinous crimes in Sierra Leone from 1991 to 2002.

Mr. Taylor Sr. has denied the charges against him.

Mr. Taylor Jr. was convicted and sentenced in 2008 under a United States domestic statute—the Torture Act which establishes the basis for prosecution of United States citizens for crimes of torture committed abroad. Mr. Taylor Jr., a United States citizen by birth, sought a reversal of his conviction on the basis that the "Torture Act is unconstitutional." According to Mr. Taylor Jr., while the Torture Act derives its authority from the obligations owed by the United States as a signatory to the United Nations Convention Against Torture (CAT) of 1984, the Act "impermissibly exceeds the bounds of that authority, both in its definition of torture and its proscription against conspiracies to commit torture." Mr. Taylor Jr., also challenged his conviction on several other grounds, including based on a section of the Torture Act which makes it a criminal offense to use or possess a firearm in connection with a crime of violence, that the said provision does not apply extraterritorially to his actions in Liberia, and that the conviction was unfair based on several procedural errors, and that the United States District Court erred in sentencing him after his conviction.

After assessing all the facts of the case, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit issued a decision that Mr. Taylor Jr.'s convictions were constitutional, and that it was within the powers of the United States Congress to criminalize torture as well as conspiracy to commit torture. The Court of Appeals also ruled that contrary to Mr. Taylor Jr.'s suggestions, "both the Torture act and the firearm statute apply to extraterritorial conduct, and that their application in this case was proper." According to the Court of Appeals Mr. Taylor Jr.'s trial and convictions "were not rendered fundamentally unfair by any evidentiary or other procedural errors, and that his sentence is without error." The convictions and sentence of the District Court were affirmed in entirety by the Court of Appeals.

At age 20, Mr. Taylor Jr., called mostly in the Court's judgment as "Emmanuel" was appointed as head of Liberia's ATU, which was also known as "Demon Forces" after his father, Mr. Taylor Sr. became the democratically elected president of Liberia in 1997 after having led the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) rebel group in a bloody war that sought to unseat the government of Master Sergeant Samuel K. Doe. The ATU was charged with the responsibility of providing security to the Liberian president and his family.

As head of the ATU, Mr. Taylor Jr. recruited men into the Unit and established its training camp at a place called the Gbatata Base. As described in Court by one of the ATU recruits Wesley Siah, under the direction of Mr. Taylor Jr., ATU soldiers dug "twenty grave-size prison pits," and covered them with "metal bars or barbed wires." The base also contained a holding cell for ATU soldiers who became disobedient and an educational training center called the "College of Knowledge." The commander of the Gbatata Base was David Campari, who took his orders from Mr. Taylor Jr. According to the Court, the ATU was Mr. Taylor Jr.'s self described "pet project" and that all ATU affiliates called him "Chief" and that his car license plate carried the inscription "Demon." The Court noted that from 1997 to 2002, Mr. Taylor Jr. wielded his power in a terrifying and violent manner, torturing numerous individuals in his custody who were never charged with any crime or given any legal process. Several witnesses testified at Mr. Taylor Jr.'s trial including victims such as Sierra Leonean refugees who were arrested at checkpoints and tortured at the Gbatata Base, and Liberian nationals who were arrested and tortured because they were perceived as being affiliated with groups opposed to Mr. Taylor Sr.'s presidency in Liberia. Witnesses also spoke about individuals being executed based on orders from Mr. Taylor Jr. After his father, Mr. Taylor Sr., left the Liberian presidency and sought asylum in Nigeria before he was finally taken into the custody of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, Mr. Taylor Jr. left Liberia in July 2003. In March 2006, as he attempted to enter the USA from Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. Taylor Jr. was arrested at the Miami International Airport for attempting to enter the country using a false passport. When his luggage was searched, US lawmakers discovered a book on guerrilla tactics and notes of rap lyrics which made reference to the ATU. In November 2007, a grand jury sitting in the US District



**Charles Taylor Jr.**

Court for the Southern District of Florida issued an indictment against Mr. Taylor Jr., with charges relating to “conspiracy to commit torture in Liberia against seven unnamed victims with death resulting to at least one victim by seizing, imprisoning, interrogating, and mistreating them, and by committing various acts with the specific intent to inflict severe physical pain and suffering, conspiracy to use and carry a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, and committing substantive crimes of torture against five named victims...” in violation of the US Torture Victim Protection Act of 1994 (The Torture Act). In October 2008, after a trial which lasted for one month, Mr. Taylor Jr. was convicted on all counts and sentenced to an imprisonment term of 1,164 months or 97 years.

Mr. Taylor Jr. appealed his conviction and sentence before the US Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. On said appeal, the Court of Appeals noted the following:

On Mr. Taylor Jr.'s appeal that the Torture Act is “invalid because its definition of torture sweeps more broadly than that provided by the CAT [ UN Convention Against Torture],” the Court of Appeals noted that “Notably, the existence of slight variances between a treaty and its congressional implementing legislation do not make the enactment unconstitutional; identity is not required. Rather... legislation implementing a treaty bears a “rational relationship” to that treaty where the legislation “tracks the language of the [treaty] in all material respects.”

“Applying the rational relationship test in this case, we are satisfied that the Torture Act is a valid exercise of congressional power...because the Torture Act tracks the provisions of the CAT in all material respects...and the CAT declares broadly that its provisions are “without prejudice to any international instrument or national legislation which does or may contain provisions of wider application...Put simply, the CAT created a floor, not a ceiling, for its signatories in their efforts to combat torture,” the Court of Appeals said.

On Mr. Taylor Jr.'s appeal that “the Torture Act oversteps the bounds of the CAT by criminalizing not only consummated acts of torture, but acts done with no more than the “specific intention to inflict” severe pain or suffering, whether or not such pain or suffering is actually inflicted,” the Court of Appeals noted that “The CAT expressly directs state parties to punish unconsummated crimes of torture. Specifically, it requires that state parties criminalize not only torture, but also attempts to commit torture.”

“In simple terms, an attempt to commit torture is exactly the same as an act done with the specific intent to commit torture,” the Court of Appeals said.

The Court of Appeals also rejected Mr. Taylor Jr.'s claim “that the Torture Act is invalid because its official-conduct requirement uses the phrase “under the color of law,” rather than the phrase “in an official capacity,” as found in the CAT. The Court responded that based on an explanation given by the Senate Executive Committee charged with evaluating the CAT, “there is no distinction between the meaning of the phrases “under the color of law” and in “an official capacity.”

“In sum, we can discern no merit to any of Emmanuel's constitutional challenges to the way in which Congress defined torture in the Torture Act. If anything, the arguably more expansive definition of torture adopted by the United States is that much more faithful to the CAT's purpose of enhancing global efforts to combat torture,” the Court of Appeal said.

Mr. Taylor Jr. also challenged the “Torture Act as



unconstitutional because it applies during armed conflicts.” The Court of Appeals referenced Article 22 of the CAT itself, which provides that “no exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.”

“Accordingly, there is no merit to Emmanuel's contention that the CAT, or legislation authorized by the CAT, cannot apply during armed conflicts,” the Court said.

The judges also rejected Mr. Taylor Jr.'s argument that “he cannot be prosecuted for torture committed before Liberia became a signatory to the Convention Against Torture in 2004.” According to the judges, “nothing in the CAT limits its application to torture committed within the territorial borders of its signatories.”

The Court of Appeals stated that “The Supreme Court made clear long ago that an absent United States citizen is nonetheless “personally bound to take notice of the laws [of the United States] that are applicable to him and to obey them.”

“Emmanuel was a United States citizen at all relevant times when the Torture Act was passed and when he committed all of the acts for which he was convicted. As such, he is bound by United States law “made applicable to him in a foreign country...For disobedience to its laws through conduct abroad, he was subject to punishment in the courts of the United States. Thus, there was nothing improper about application of the Torture Act to Emmanuel's conduct in Liberia before that country signed the CAT,” the Court said.

Mr. Taylor Jr. sought to argue that he should not have been prosecuted for his actions because “all of his alleged acts in furtherance of the conspiracy to commit torture were “governmental self-preservation tactics.” The Court rejected this argument, noting that “the CAT thus anticipated prosecutions such as this one, where torture is committed by a regime in order to maintain its brutal control over an unhappy populace.”

Mr. Taylor Jr. also appealed his conviction on the basis that the District Court had made multiple errors which had had a huge effect on his fair trial rights as an accused. The Court of Appeals rejected this claim.

“As this Court has explained, evidentiary errors are not grounds for reversal “unless there is a reasonable likelihood that they affected the defendant's substantial rights; where an error had no substantial influence on the outcome, and sufficient evidence uninfected by error supports the verdict, reversal is not warranted,” the Court of Appeals said.

Mr. Taylor Jr.'s objection that notes of rap lyrics obtained from him had been used as evidence against him, the Court of Appeals ruled that the language used in the lyrics were relevant and that their probative value was not outweighed by any unfair prejudice.

“The rap lyrics were relevant and their probative value was not outweighed by any unfair prejudice that might have arisen from their admission into evidence. Specifically, the lyrics stated such things as: “Take this for free, six feet is where you gonna be. ATU niggas on the scene. Body bag is all you see”; “More sweat in my training means less blood in my life. So with the shots from guns keep it dead and precise. Bull-doze ambushes in the midst of a fight. Try to cut my supply, you'll be losing your life”; and “army thugs united.” Such lyrics were probative on multiple fronts,” the Court said.

According to the judges, they were not persuaded by Mr. Taylor Jr.'s argument that his 1,164 months or 97 years imprisonment was invalid.

As the Court of Appeals judges concluded their judgment, they stated that “In sum, we affirm [Mr. Taylor Jr.'s] convictions and sentence in full. The Torture Act's proscriptions against both torture and conspiracy to commit torture are constitutional, and may be applied to extraterritorial conduct...Finally, Emmanuel's advisory Sentencing Guidelines range was correctly calculated by the district court, and the sentences imposed violate neither the CAT nor the Constitution.”

Awoko

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

## Special Court reacts to press reports

The Special Court for Sierra Leone has reacted to articles which were mostly opinion pieces concerning the operations of the courts and its funding.

According to a release, it stated that the “articles contained factual errors and misunderstandings, a few of which should be addressed.”

It was further stated that the Special Court has not spent \$400 million or anything like that as was alleged by the articles. “The total amount the Court has raised since its inception in 2002 is just over \$100 million. International courts cost money, but compared to sister tribunals such as the ICTR and ICTY, which have had budgets well in excess of \$100 million a year; it has been widely regarded as a model” the release added.

People have been accusing the court as a waste of money and that the money should have been spent on developmental projects rather than on the court, and that the funds for the Special Court was taken from Sierra Leone's development funds, or that had the Court not existed the money would have been spent on development. To this the release stated “nothing could be further from the truth. The Court's funds come from voluntary contributions from State donors - the same countries which also support development in Sierra Leone. An institution or government, having received funding from donors for one purpose, cannot then divert money to another purpose, and had the Court not existed, the money would not have come to Sierra Leone at all.”

The court also in reaction to the opinion piece suggested that the Special Court spends more than UNIPSIL. They said “The Special Court has spent in eight years just over \$100 million. According to published sources, UNIPSIL will spend \$350 million through 2012. Money is, however, not a valid comparison of institutions. Both institutions have provided great assistance to Sierra Leone in recovering from more than a decade of war. It is

worth noting that both the Court and UNIPSIL have cost Sierra Leone nothing.”

On the issue concerning the convicts detained at a cell in Rwanda, the article suggests that keeping those convicted by the Special Court in Rwanda is a waste of money and that they should serve their sentences at Pademba Road Prison. “The Special Court for Sierra Leone is an international criminal tribunal, bound to observe minimum standards set down by the United Nations. This is not a choice. At present, there is no facility in Sierra Leone which meets international standards. Again, the money does not come from Sierra Leone's budget. It comes from funds set aside by donor nations for international justice” the release stated.

Awareness Times  
Wednesday, 28 July 2010

**Germany Donates £1M to Special Court**

Reports say the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has donated an additional sum of £1 Million to the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The money was expended from a bilateral Germany development cooperation fund set aside for such purposes. Reports say Germany has provided over £7million in total to the court since it was set up in 2002.

## Awoko Online

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

### **President Koroma wishes... “Special Court leaves a magnificent & imposing legacy”**

By Poindexter Sama

Special Court Prosecutor Brenda J. Hollis has said at her first press conference with Sierra Leonean journalists that President Ernest Bai Koroma wished that the Special Court will leave a magnificent and imposing legacy for posterity. This legacy, she said, comprises the activities of the Special Court which goes beyond the trial of war criminals, considering the level of know-how the Court has instilled in the minds of Sierra Leoneans. She further pointed out that since the inception of the Court after the end of the war, many Sierra Leoneans have been employed who will now be able to bring their new skills and experience to the Sierra Leonean workplace.



The citation from the President also noted that “In school and universities around the world, students study the laws that we have created at the Special Court. These laws are now used to fight war crimes and crimes against humanity where they are committed. For example, because we proved here in Sierra Leone that it is a crime to use children in war, now more than ever those who want to do that know they face trial and punishment”

Paramount among the legacy of the Special Court will be to show that there can be no impunity for those who abuse power to commit atrocities against fellow human beings, even those at the highest level of government or authority will not be immune from justice.

## BBC World Service Trust

Monday, 26 July 2010

### Interview with Courtenay Griffiths, Part 1

Reports have been circulating in Liberia that Accused Former Liberian President, Charles Taylor had been suffering from heart problem, and the Special Court denied him medical treatment. Is Mr. Taylor sick? What is the Defence reaction to the Judges ruling to invite Supermodel Naomi Campbell? Is Mr. Taylor interfering with local politics in Liberia? These were some of the questions BBC World Trust Joseph Cheeseman asked Lead Defence Lawyer Courtenay Griffiths in The Hague on Monday.

COURTENAY GRIFFITHS: It's not a question of Mr. Taylor suffering from heart problems, but you have to bear in mind that he's not a young man, and a trial of this length and gravity must have its effect on him. And he has had one or two complaints and we have always endeavoured, through the Registrar, to get him the appropriate medical treatment, so as far as I'm aware they've provided him with new spectacles. They've also arranged for a consultant to check him over and, as I understand it, he has been given a clean bill of health.

*We understand also that he was complaining about back ache.*

GRIFFITHS: Mr. Taylor has had a back problem, and it's mostly to do, I think, with him still playing quite a bit of tennis. But he's receiving physiotherapy for it and he tells me that the situation is improving. So I don't think there's any need for alarm regarding his physical condition – I don't think so at all.

*There's also rumour in Liberia that Mr. Taylor has again begun using his telephone in the detention facility to interfere with local politics in Liberia. Have you received any complaint from the Prosecution definitely regarding Mr. Taylor's interference?*

GRIFFITHS: None whatsoever. There have been various suggestions made that he's doing that. On each occasion that suggestion has been made we've investigated the matter, we've explained the situation to the Registrar who has responsibility for these matters, and in every instance those claims have been proved to be totally unfounded.

*Now, how do you react to the Judges' ruling that the supermodel from Great Britain should come here to testify to diamonds that she allegedly received from Mr. Taylor?*

GRIFFITHS: Joseph, I am literally fuming with anger at that decision, because remember, what's the nature of the evidence? We have one actress who for the first time, over a decade after the event, in July of last year for the first time, that she was told by Naomi Campbell that Naomi Campbell had been visited late at night by three men who claimed they'd been sent by Charles Taylor. So that's total hearsay. After Mia Farrow the actress made that claim, Naomi Campbell was interviewed on television, ABC News, in the United States, and she denied that Charles Taylor had given her a diamond. Naomi Campbell thereafter went on the Oprah Winfrey show. She was asked again, 'did Charles Taylor give you a diamond'. She denies it. So it means that the Prosecution are calling a witness who will give evidence contrary to their claim. Because remember, the Prosecution claim is that she was given a diamond, and calling Naomi Campbell to say 'I wasn't given a diamond', so why is she being called? Frankly Joseph, you know what this is all about? This is a pure publicity-seeking exercise by the Prosecution.

*But the Prosecution has said that they want to refute Mr. Taylor's evidence that he had never handled a rough diamond in his life.*

GRIFFITHS: That...precisely, which is why, if that's your case, why are you calling this supermodel to deny that she was given a diamond by Charles Taylor. Why call her? How does that support their allegation?

*Will you be surprised if Naomi came here and said 'indeed, I received a diamond from Mr. Taylor'?*

GRIFFITHS: Well, I would be extremely surprised, given that she's publicly stated on two previous occasions that she didn't, then we'd have to brand a...

*Do you have concrete evidence to counter that?*

GRIFFITHS: Well, yes, we've got the TV footage from ABC News and from the Oprah Winfrey Show of her stating publicly on television that she didn't receive a diamond. So it would be somewhat strange if she turned up now, after those two very public denials, and claims that in fact now she did.

## BBC World Service Trust

Monday, 26 July 2010

### Interview with Courtenay Griffiths, Part 2

As the Defence case is gradually approaching its end, Lead Defence Lawyer, Courtenay Griffiths has indicated what he would do if his client, Charles Taylor is adjudged guilty. Mr. Griffiths denied that his witnesses are coming out with contradictions and inconsistencies. Mr. Griffiths spoke with Joseph Cheeseman in The Hague today Monday.

*You've produced 19 witnesses now, including Mr. Taylor himself. Are you satisfied that you are convincing the Judges?*

GRIFFITHS: I can't lay claim to being able to read the Judges' minds. I really don't know whether or not they accept the evidence of our witnesses or not, but what I can say is we have called several witnesses who have given credible evidence which totally undermines the Prosecution case and totally exposes the lies told by many Prosecution witnesses. Whether the Judges choose to accept that is a matter for them, but we feel that the evidence we've called has been compelling.

*What's responsible for some of the inconsistencies that we continue to see coming from most of your witnesses?*

GRIFFITHS: Well, I'm not aware of any inconsistencies. Perhaps if you can tell me.

*Mr. Taylor said he was not aware of the SOD, the Special Operations Division in Liberia during his presidency. A witness came and said indeed the SOD had existed.*

GRIFFITHS: Because you're a president of a country does not mean that you must be aware of every single thing that goes on in that country, which is the fallacy at the very heart of this Prosecution case. And so what if there is that contradiction? How does it support the Prosecution case that he was supplying arms and ammunition to the RUF, receiving diamonds in return, and controlling the RUF during the period of the indictment? How does it prove that?

*The Prosecution might say that these inconsistencies border on the credibility of your client.*

GRIFFITHS: Well, Joseph, you've been following the trial right from the start. Look at the number of inconsistencies that we were able to establish within the evidence of individual Prosecution witnesses and between those witnesses. Don't you agree that we did more damage to the Prosecution case in terms of exposing inconsistencies than they have done to our witnesses? I certainly think we have.

*Now finally, what would you do if the Judges adjudge Mr. Taylor guilty?*

GRIFFITHS: Well, we'd appeal of course. We'd appeal, because our case is that this Prosecution is fatally flawed and that most of it is incredible and no one would convict, you know, a cat on this kind of evidence. So of course we would appeal it.

*Okay, what have you to say to the Liberian people as we gradually approach the end of this case?*

GRIFFITHS: Well, I would ask the Liberian people, firstly, to be vigilant in observing the remainder of the trial, and also, for those who've had the opportunity of following the evidence, to ask themselves whether or not they think, based on this kind of evidence, their former president ought to be convicted.

And in my view, I think the resounding conclusion most Liberians would arrive at is that their former president should not be convicted on this kind of evidence.

*How many more witnesses should we expect from you?*

GRIFFITHS: A couple more.

*Three?*

GRIFFITHS: Difficult to say. A couple more...not many.

*Should we expect your side of the case will end by, say, August or September?*

GRIFFITHS: I hope to be concluded by the end of August or very early September.



## Voice of America

Monday, 26 July 2010

### Taylor War Crimes Trial Will Take Star Turn With Model's Testimony

Nico Colombant



**Photo: AP**

The ongoing Charles Taylor West African war crimes trial in The Hague will take a star turn next week when supermodel Naomi Campbell testifies.

Officials at the Special Court for Sierra Leone say Campbell is due to appear August 5, after she asked for a postponement from a scheduled appearance this week.

They say they hoped there would be no more delays.

Earlier this month, the British supermodel was subpoenaed to testify about claims Charles Taylor gave her a large rough-cut diamond, allegedly linked to Sierra Leone's conflict, at a dinner party in South Africa in

1997.

Earlier this year, Campbell had told American television host Oprah Winfrey she did not want to be involved in the Taylor case. She said she did not want to put her family in danger.

But after the court's subpoena, she said she would testify.

Lawyers for the former Liberian president have called the move a publicity stunt, and say the testimony will be a distraction.

Former chief prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone David Crane, who indicted Mr. Taylor in 2003, disagrees.

"I think what the prosecutors there are doing, they are just showing everybody the fact that Charles Taylor was very much involved, moving about using diamonds as cash and guns for influence," he said.

Mr. Taylor, who has been on trial since 2008, has denied charges he backed rebels in Sierra Leone in exchange for diamonds. He says he is being blamed for situations he did not control.

American actress Mia Farrow wrote a statement to the court saying Campbell had told her she had been given a large diamond from Charles Taylor after the 1997 dinner in South Africa, which they all attended.

Crane says the incident is revealing. "The fact that Charles Taylor was showing off and using the diamonds that he received from Sierra Leone, giving them allegedly to other people, famous people like Naomi Campbell, just shows the kind of a mindset," Crane says, "an evil-thinking mind of Charles Taylor, and what he was doing with the diamonds from Sierra Leone."

Yale University political anthropologist Mike McGovern, a West Africa expert, says besides the Campbell involvement there has been little awareness in the United States of the Taylor trial.

"Honestly, West Africa tends not to make the news unless there is some kind of horrible event taking place or famine or a visit by some American official," McGovern states.

But Mr. Taylor and his family have a long history with the United States. The former Liberian president was a student in the Boston area in the 1970s.

After fleeing Liberia in the 1980s, he was put in jail in Plymouth, Massachusetts, on a warrant for extradition to face embezzlement charges. He allegedly escaped, but during his current trial he said he had received help from a prison guard and U.S. agents, claims that have not been independently confirmed.

His son, who was born in Boston, Emmanuel Chuckie Taylor, is serving a 97-year sentence in Florida, after being convicted of torturing or ordering the torture of dozens of his family's political opponents in Liberia.

His conviction marked the first time a U.S. law allowing prosecution for overseas torture was used.

McGovern says the Charles Taylor trial is also very significant, and deserves attention beyond the Naomi Campbell appearance.

"Heads of state who abuse their citizens may now find themselves in the dock later on, in the way that Taylor did," McGovern said. "It is really a precedent setting trial. Presidents from any country in the world might one day find themselves in the same situation."

The Special Court for Sierra Leone was created jointly by the government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations.

It is also the first international criminal tribunal to be funded entirely from voluntary contributions. The trial is taking place in the Hague because of security concerns.

Asia Times Online  
Wednesday, 28 July 2010

## **Cambodians upset by genocide sentence**

By Steve Finch

PHNOM PENH - The Khmer Rouge tribunal delivered its first verdict on Monday and sentenced a top leader of the genocidal regime, comrade Duch, to 30 years behind bars, but many victims outside the emotional courtroom were left complaining over this sentence.

Duch, whose real name is Kaing Guek Eav, was chief of the notorious S-21 detention and torture facility in the Cambodian capital, where at least 12,380 people were killed during the Khmer Rouge's rule from 1975 to 1979.

Because the 67-year-old Duch had been in detention since May 1999 before his trial began in February last year, or more than 11

years ago, his sentence in the end was reduced to about 18 more years from now. He would be 86 years old at the time of his release.

"The verdict is too light," complained Bou Meng, one of just 12 people to walk out alive of Duch's torture facility at Tuol Sleng prison. "We are victims two times, once in the Khmer Rouge time and now once again," another survivor, Chum Mey, told the New York Times.

Although the prosecution had asked for the maximum 40-year sentence, judges at the United Nations-backed war crimes tribunal said Duch's compliance with the court and "limited remorse" meant that a total sentence of 35 years was sufficient.

"This court has tried and punished a perpetrator of Democratic Kampuchea, one of the most macabre regimes of the modern era," co-prosecutor Chea Leang said following the hour-long verdict, which found the defendant guilty of crimes against humanity and crimes against the Geneva Conventions of 1949 that limit the barbarity of war.

A further five years were removed from the sentence due to what was already deemed to be illegal detainment by a military court following Duch's original arrest in May 1999 up to July 2007, when he was handed over to the United Nations-hybrid court. With this taken into consideration, Duch will likely be imprisoned until 2029, subject to appeal.

"Anything under 30 [years] is not acceptable because it's inconceivable that he could even have one minute on the street," said Theary Seng, president of Cambodia's Board for Justice and Reconciliation. "Now if the international community isn't providing us justice, it leaves us with hopelessness," she added.

Close to 1.7 million people, or nearly a quarter of Cambodia's population at the time, were executed or died during the Khmer Rouge's rule due to forced labor or from starvation, as the leader of the extremist Maoist group, Pol Pot, tried to create an agrarian utopia in the country.

It was not just the Duch verdict that caused disquiet, particularly among the civil parties, in what was the first time that victims and their families have been considered part of an international hybrid court process.

In a surprise move, president of the trial chamber Nil Nonn told the packed courtroom that only 66 of the civil parties would be recognized in relation to the groundbreaking verdict, meaning that some 21 who had formed part of the process, mostly relatives of those killed under Duch's command, were not eligible for this recognition.

"I am not happy," said Hong Savath, whose uncle died in S-21. "The judge should have told me from the beginning that I am not a civil party."

She said she would appeal, although lawyers representing the civil parties throughout the process lamented that reparations were little more than symbolic anyway. This is because the Khmer Rouge tribunal had not set up the

likes of a trust fund to compensate victims, as is the case with the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

Along with a compiled list of Duch's confessions of guilt and remorse, the names of those deemed victimized as a result of his actions are to be compiled on the official tribunal website. But as some civil party lawyers noted, many of the relatives of the Khmer Rouge victims are unlikely to ever witness this gesture anyway because Cambodia is among the least Internet-connected countries in the region.

"It seems what has been ordered is the most minimal, most conservative and - perhaps it's fair to say - rather unimaginative reparations," said Karim Khan, a legal representative of some of the victims.

While lawyers, court monitors, spokespeople, judges, journalists and humanitarian workers announced and debated the verdict and its many intricacies, the most quiet person in the whole process on July 26 was Duch himself.

Asked to stand for the final verdict, he gave little indication of emotion. The five judges did not give the former revolutionary a chance to respond to the deliverance of justice that he denied his own detainees at S-21.

After firing his previous lawyer before the verdict, Duch is expected to lodge an appeal, especially given his surprising request for acquittal during the final hearings at the end of 2009. The question many have asked throughout this lengthy process is: has Duch changed?

Despite Duch's metamorphosis from mass murderer to Christian aid worker after the fall of the Khmer Rouge regime, Chum Mey told Inter Press Service he had seen little in the way of remorse and humility in the regime's chief torturer. "Until now, he is the same man. I still see the violence in him and I still see the arrogance."

One major point of contention against the proceedings from human-rights groups has been the court's decision to prosecute only a few individuals in connection with the Khmer Rouge genocide.

"His prison is comfortable with air-conditioning, food three times a day, fans and everything," Chum Mey told the New York Times. "I sat on the floor with filth and excrement all around."

Later this year, the court will decide whether to indict other senior members of the regime on war crimes: head of state Khieu Samphan; foreign minister Ieng Sary; his wife, the minister of Social Affairs Ieng Thirith, and Nuon Chea, a senior ideologue known as "Brother No 2."

Human-rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch are also urging both the Cambodian government and the United Nations to uphold a standard of justice over political concerns.

"Progress could be undermined by political interference from Cambodian officials who openly oppose more prosecutions, and by disagreements between the Cambodian and international co-investigating judges," said Donna Guest, Amnesty International's deputy director for the Asia-Pacific.

In a press release, chair of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee John Kerry, said, "I support the ECCC [Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia] as it moves forward with its investigations and urge all involved to ensure the process lives up to and reflects the imperatives of justice, transparency and reconciliation for the Cambodian people."

Kerry played a significant behind-the-scenes role in the tumultuous founding of the tribunal in the late 1990s, which was marked by clashes between the government and United Nations for control. In 1997, the failed presidential candidate suggested the hybrid nature of the court that was eventually adopted.

RTTNews

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

## **UK Court Rejects Serbia's Extradition Request, Releases Ex-Bosnian President**

A court in Britain has ordered the release of former Bosnian President and Muslim wartime leader Ejup Ganic after rejecting an extradition request from Serbia to try him on war crime charges.

The judge at the City of Westminster Magistrates Court said in his ruling on Tuesday that there was no justification to try Ganic as two independent investigations had already concluded that there was no case against the former Bosnian President.

Judge Timothy Workman said he felt the extradition proceedings initiated by Serbia were "being used for political purposes and as such amount to an abuse of the process of this court.

"In the absence of any additional significant evidence, there would appear to be only two possible explanations, that of incompetence by the Serbian prosecutors or a motive for prosecuting which is based upon politics, race or religion," the judge added.

Ganic was arrested in London's Heathrow Airport in March last following an extradition request from Serbia on allegations of war crimes. His arrest was under a provisional extradition warrant, and it came as he tried to leave Britain after attending a convocation ceremony at the University of Buckingham. He is President of the Sarajevo School of Science & Technology (SSST), which is partnered with the University of Buckingham.

Serbia accuses him of involvement in an attack on a retreating Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) convoy in Sarajevo in May 1992. It claims that 42 Bosnian-Serb soldiers were killed in that attack, which came a month after the start of the Bosnian war.

Ganic was later granted bail on a security of £300,000 by the British High Court on "stringent" conditions, under which he was required to stay at a specified address but undisclosed in London and observe a nightly curfew. He was also not permitted to apply for a passport or any other travel documents.

Ever since his arrest, Ganic and his family have maintained that the charges leveled against him by Serbian authorities are politically-motivated, while his lawyers claimed that his arrest in Britain was illegal as the allegations have already been rejected by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

Ganic was the Vice-President of Bosnia during the civil war there between 1992 and 1995, and has served twice as President of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina following the U.S.-brokered Dayton peace agreement in 1995. His first term as President of the Bosnian-Croat Federation extended from 1997 to 1999, and the second from 2000 to 2001.

By RTT Staff Writer

For comments and feedback: contact [editorial@rttnews.com](mailto:editorial@rttnews.com)