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Witness reveals...

To decorate Mamamah 15 civilians were killed

By Betty Milton

In evidence by the prosecutor, witness TF1-234 told the Special Court that Bazzy ordered that civilians were to be killed as a form of decoration. The witness said while they were at RDF camp, they were constantly attacked by the ECOMOG troops. Bazzy who was in charge of the junta troops at that time called Kankanda and ordered that they should go and decorate Mamamah to stop the ECOMOG troops from attacking them. "To decorate the village means that when they enter the village any civilian they meet will be executed." Kankanda

Contd. Page 2

From Front Page

and the other soldiers went when we went there we met the corpses of 15 civilians that have been chopped including two women, three children and ten men lying on the street. When Bazzy saw the corpses, he said that was a good job." The witness further stated that the family members were at Mile 9; later Bazzy turned the radio to Kafahun and called Mosquito. Mosquito said he was not happy about the way Gullit has treated him as he has attacked Makenti, killed Rambo and even Issa Sesay is missing in action. He also told Bazzy that Gullit was no longer the commander of the western jungle but Bazzy should attain that position before living Mamamah village. all the houses there were burnt. The witness stated: "Bazzy then called Colonel Fowah and said that we should move to Okra Hill where they will dig a hole on the highway. The troops then retreated to mile 58. We then moved to Magbeni where Bazzy made a new structure." He continued. "Bazzy gave an order that some should go to Gbere Banna and make sure that the area is a civilian free area by executing all civilians they meet there. 15 civilians were also killed there. The troops then attacked Port Loko, when we went there the ECOMOG troops had heavy manpower but we overpowered them and captured two armored cars and two Malians with enough arms and ammunition." he maintained.
Norman threatens hunger strike till he dies

War crimes indicts. Chief Hinga Norman has threatened to go on hunger strike until he dies. In a letter from the Civil Defence Force (CDF) Coordinator to COCORIJOKO last evening circulated by the Spokesman of the force, Rev. Alfred Siam Foray states.

The letter is addressed to the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General, with copies sent to President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah, Vice-President Solomon Berewa and international organizations including ECOWAS, The African Union, The European Union and all diplomatic and consular corps accredited to Sierra Leone. Rev. Sam Foray told COCORIJOKO that the letters have already been served to the intended recipients.

In the letter, he said, Chief Norman levied serious accusations of bias, injustice, impunity and corruption against the United Nations backed Special Court for Sierra Leone, though he did not detail examples to substantiate his claims. But the former Minister of Defence proceeded bitterly in the letter against the "humiliating" way he was arrested on March 10, 2003 by the Sierra Leone Police at his office in Freetown.

Norman outlined conditions, which he said must be met by July 4, 2005 or he will go on hunger strike until he dies.
Liberia: Uncontrolled Liberian resource exploitation and manipulation by Charles Taylor continue to threaten peace in West Africa

A report released on 15 June 2005 by Global Witness (1) titled ‘Timber, Taylor, Soldier, Spy’ details how uncontrolled exploitation of Liberia’s natural resources, structural violence and interference by former Liberian president Charles Taylor are undermining peace in West Africa. Global Witness calls on the UN Security Council to maintain the timber and diamond sanctions (2), and calls on US, UK, Nigeria and ECOWAS states to facilitate the extradition of Taylor to the Special Court for Sierra Leone, where he should face trial on the 17 charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity brought against him (3).

"West Africa is at a delicate point in its post-conflict recovery. Not dealing with the Taylor threat, not controlling Liberia’s natural resources and not taking action on poor governance in Liberia leaves West Africa at great risk of a return to war," says Natalie Ashworth, of Global Witness (4). "The international community must be more robust if it is to safeguard peace and its investment in the region’s future."

‘Timber, Taylor, Soldier, Spy’ details the results of Global Witness investigations in the region that show the links between the exploitation of natural resources and conflict remain strong. The report outlines how a lack of reform and lack of control by the National Transitional Government of Liberia (NTGL) and UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) peacekeepers over Liberia’s timber and diamond industries has facilitated an explosion in illegal diamond mining and organised logging by ex-combatants. This security threat is exacerbated by the failure of the Disarmament, Demobilisation, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (DDRR) process to break down former warring-party chains of command, or provide training and jobs for the over 100,000 registered ex-combatants. Many former fighters, including child soldiers, have since been re-recruited to fight in Côte d’Ivoire and Guinea.

Charles Taylor also remains a significant threat to regional security, flouting the terms of his exile with Nigeria (5) by maintaining regular contact with Liberian political and military figures (6), travelling to other countries and recruiting a small fighting force to destabilise Guinea (7). The Special Court has accused Taylor of backing a coup attempt against Guinean President Lansana Conte in mid January 2005 (8) and other diplomatic sources indicate his involvement (9). But due to political in-fighting, intelligence agencies in the US and UK governments have failed to hand over sufficient evidence of Taylor’s exile violations to Nigerian President Obasanjo that would help facilitate Taylor’s move to stand trial. President Obasanjo has also initiated his own investigations into Taylor’s activities, and the results of this inquiry will no doubt be a focus of great interest for the international community.

"Lifting timber and diamond sanctions now would make matters significantly worse, opening up the region to a flood of illegal Liberian diamond and timber exports exported by armed ex-fighters that could ignite a regional war,” says Ashworth. Lifting sanctions would also go against the expressed wishes of Liberian civil society (10). "It is time for the international community to stop risking the lives of West Africa’s war-weary citizens for political expediency: keep the sanctions in place, take the tough action necessary to help Liberia move forward, and bring an end to Taylor’s ability to undermine regional security."

For press inquiries on Liberia please contact Natalie Ashworth of Global Witness at +44 (0)207-561-6369, or Mike Lundberg at +44-(0)207-561-6372.

For questions on diamonds, please contact Corinna Gilfillan of Global Witness at +1-202-288-6111.

Notes for the Editor:

(1) Global Witness is an investigative non-governmental organisation that focuses on the links between natural resources exploitation and conflict. Global Witness was awarded the prestigious Giletsman Foundation Award for
International Activism in 2005, and was co-nominated for the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize. For more information on Liberia, see previous Global Witness reports at www.globalwitness.org.

(2) Diamond sanctions first came into effect through UN Security Council Resolution 1343 (2001), with timber sanctions first imposed through Resolution 1478 (2003). Both were re-established by Resolution 1521 (2003) and renewed for through Resolution 1579 (2004), with the diamond embargo renewed for six months and timber embargo for 12 months.

(3) For a full list of the charges filed against Charles Taylor, see the Special Court for Sierra Leone website at www.sc-sl.org.


(5) Under the terms of his exile, Nigeria forbade Taylor from ‘engaging in active communication with anyone engaged in political, illegal or governmental activities’, see ‘Taylor meddling in Liberian politics, diplomats say’, UN Integrated Regional Information Networks, 17 September 2003.


(8) Copy of Special Court document dated January 2005 as obtained by Global Witness.

(9) Global Witness interview with former military intelligence officer, April 2005.

(10) Open Letter from the NGOs Coalition for Liberia calling on the UN Security Council to maintain timber and diamond sanctions at its June review, June 6, 2005.

With the exception of public UN sources, reproduction or redistribution of the above text, in whole, part or in any form, requires the prior consent of the original source.
TheLiberianTimes.com EDITORIAL

Human Rights Groups Launch Fresh Initiatives to Compel Nigerian Federal Government to Extradite Charles Taylor
Jun 13, 2005
Republished from Vanguard (Lagos)

CHARLES TAYLOR STEPS DOWN
TAYLOR'S RISE AND FALL
1997 Taylor wins presidential election and after more than two dozen power-sharing deals fails to stand
2000 First attacks by LTUD rebels (Libera Union for Reconciliation and Democracy)
2001 U.S. embargo begins after Taylor's loot is seized from rebel leaders in Sierra Leone
2002 Taylor declares state of emergency in February
2003 February Rebel forces in Monrovia

June 1 Taylor goes to Europe for peace talks with UNTAG. On the same day he is indicted by the UN-backed war crimes tribunal in Sierra Leone
June 17 Warring factions in Monrovia agree to accept the negotiations to form a transitional government without Taylor.
July 4 Taylor agrees to step down and accepts an offer at a summit in Nigeria
August 4, 2003, speech is suspended for a day by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to protest.

REUTERS

TWO international human rights organisation's London based Amnesty International and Washington based Human Rights Watch have launched fresh initiatives to force the Federal Government to extradite Warlord Charles Taylor for prosecution by the International Criminal Court.

Human Rights Watch in a statement by the director of its international justice programme Richard Dicker asked the UN Security Council to back efforts to bring the former Liberian President to trial in Sierra Leone to ensure justice in troubled West Africa.

Amnesty International in a report said Charles Taylor has no immunity from prosecution as ruled by the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

"Charles Taylor remains in Nigeria. He had been granted refugee status with apparent guarantees that he would neither be surrendered to the Special Court nor brought before Nigeria's own courts" the report said.

http://www.th liberian times .com/article_2005_06_13_0558.html
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Human Rights Watch however said that the security councils handling of the Taylor issue will be a clear test of its commitment to its UN backed war crimes court.

Dicker said Taylor has broken the terms of his asylum in Nigeria by allegedly visiting Burkina Fasso and being fingered in the assassination attempt on Guinea President Lansana Conte.

Dicker said: "Taylor is a poster child for the link between justice and security in west Africa." Dicker said, just hours before the president of the UN-backed war crimes court, Judge Emmanuel Ayoola, was expected in New York to brief Security Council members on progress at the Freetown tribunal.

"The Security Council's handling of the Taylor issue will be a clear test of its commitment to both."

Nine people from three warring factions have since last year faced prosecution at the hybrid court for bearing the "greatest responsibility" for atrocities committed during Sierra Leone's decade of civil war, which was characterized by brutal rape and the hacking off of limbs of civilians.

Taylor faces an Interpol warrant for his arrest and a 17-count indictment by the UN-backed war crimes court for allegedly arming and training Sierra Leonean rebels in exchange for so-called blood diamonds.

The US-educated preacher is also accused of meddling in Liberia's eastern neighbor Ivory Coast and had an antagonistic relationship with Guinea President Lansana Conte, who is known to have backed rebels in their 1999 uprising, two years after Taylor became president.

Taylor was granted exile in Nigeria in August 2003, a reward brokered by west African leaders with the tacit approval of the United States and Britain for stepping down to bring an end to Liberia's second civil war since 1989.

Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo has come under mounting international pressure, led by the United States and Britain, to hand Taylor over but has thus far refused, saying only an elected Liberian government could demand his extradition.

But Obasanjo, currently in France stump ing for debt relief, has moderated his tone in the wake of meetings this month with top US officials including President George W. Bush, as well as new evidence from the war crimes tribunal that Taylor has violated the terms of his asylum.

Court documents accuse Taylor of complicity in the purported assassination attempt in January against his longtime nemesis Conte, and of leaving his luxurious exile in southern Nigeria for a trip to nearby Burkina Faso.
"Whatever deal was made two years ago to give Taylor asylum in Nigeria, he has more than broken the terms," Dicker said.

"The Security Council should affirm the urgency of Taylor being held accountable and commit itself to explore with Nigeria, which granted Taylor conditional asylum, a strategy to surrender him to the court as soon as possible," the New York-based watchdog said.
The trials of global justice

Anthony Dworkin
15 · 6 · 2005

From Rwanda to Iraq, Serbia to Sierra Leone, the search for "transitional justice" in post-conflict states involves difficult choices. Anthony Dworkin of the Crimes of War Project maps the current stage of a long-term process.

"No reason to waste time," said the spokesman for Iraq's new prime minister, announcing that the first trial of Saddam Hussein would begin within two months. "The position of the government is to speed up the trial," he added pointedly.

The comments may have served to reassure some Iraqis that their government, struggling to contain a surge of violence, was at least able to offer the satisfaction of a public accounting for their former leader's worst acts of brutality. But they were evidently not welcome to the supposedly independent investigative judges of the Iraqi Special Tribunal, the body that will hear the cases against Saddam and his co-defendants. They rushed out a press release to affirm that there was "no exact schedule" for Saddam's trial and that the final decision was up to the judges alone.

This skirmish over the political independence of the court is only one of the reasons why the Iraqi war-crimes tribunal has been greeted with some scepticism by many of those generally sympathetic to the cause of "transitional justice" – the idea that legal accountability for atrocities committed by an outgoing regime can help to heal divided societies. Human-rights groups have complained about the tribunal's failure to require proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and about the fact that Saddam and other defendants were not given a lawyer before their initial arraignment. Most significantly, many outsiders are horrified that the tribunal has the power to impose the death penalty – a fact that has prevented all European countries as well as the United Nations from cooperating with openDemocracy by sending us a donation so that we can continue our work and keep it free for all.

Also by Anthony Dworkin in openDemocracy:

"The trial of Milosevic: global law or war?" (February 2002)

If you find such articles valuable, please consider supporting openDemocracy by sending us a donation so that we can continue our work and keep it free for all.

http://www.opendemocracy.net/articles/ViewPopUpArticle.jsp?id=6&articleId=2604

6/16/2005
any investigation or prosecution.

How worried should we be by these deficiencies? Clearly the Iraqi Special Tribunal is not a model of the highest standards of international due process. Yet it should be evident by now, twelve years after the idea of international justice was revived from decades of neglect to be applied to the abundant crimes of the Balkan wars, that there are rarely simple answers in the aftermath of mass atrocity.

The notion that rendering justice for such offences is a legitimate international concern is here to stay – indeed it is institutionalised in the International Criminal Court (ICC), now up and running in The Hague. But the way that justice is applied remains a matter of frequent compromise and ambiguity.

"Special tribunals": lessons from ex-Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone

A recurrent tension is that between international standards of justice and local credibility or “ownership” of the proceedings. The first two in the modern wave of war-crimes tribunals – set up to prosecute crimes in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda – were based outside the countries concerned and staffed entirely by international (i.e. non-Yugoslav or Rwandan) officials. There were good reasons why this should have been so – the Bosnian war was still continuing, and the Rwandan justice system had been laid waste by the country’s genocide.

However it’s now widely accepted that in each case there was a cost. Whatever the tribunals’ achievements in providing justice to victims and removing the worst offenders from public life, they appear to have had a limited impact on Serbian and Rwandan opinion. In Rwanda there have been regular complaints that the most culpable figures tried by the international tribunal in Arusha, Tanzania can only be sentenced to life imprisonment, while lower-level killers left to Rwandan courts face death. In Serbia, it seems that the recent television airing of a videotape showing the execution by Serbian paramilitaries of Bosnian Muslim prisoners from Srebrenica may have done more to force acknowledgement of the crimes committed in Bosnia than several years of testimony in The Hague.
The lessons of the Rwandan tribunal in particular were by all accounts instrumental in determining the shape of the war-crimes court set up in Sierra Leone in 2002 – a so-called “hybrid” body with Sierra Leonean and international judges sitting together in the country’s capital city, Freetown. The Sierra Leone Special Court represents an attractive model for transitional justice but with the advantage of comparatively propitious circumstances: a war that had ended, a government that supported the idea of accountability, and a judicial system that – though weak – was able to provide some officials to participate in the court’s operations.

Nevertheless the Special Court has suffered some setbacks – notably in its inability to gain access to the former Liberian president, Charles Taylor, who was given asylum in Nigeria when he left power in 2003. Taylor was offered refuge with the tacit consent of Britain and the United States in a deal to prevent a bloody battle in the Liberian capital Monrovia between his supporters and attacking rebels – a reminder that balancing the objectives of peace and justice is not always as straightforward as some rights advocates make out.

**The ICC: Congo and Darfur**

Meanwhile, the landscape of international justice has been transformed by the ICC, established in July 2002. This permanent court represents a move away from the ad hoc nature of earlier tribunals created to respond to individual conflicts: international criminal justice is now an established part of our global order.

The ICC is built around a vision of international justice as a last resort. The court is “complementary” to national judicial systems: it steps in when domestic courts are unable or unwilling to deliver genuine justice. The first two situations it has begun to investigate are the Democratic Republic of Congo and northern Uganda, operating in both cases with the endorsement of the respective country’s government. These investigations are likely in different ways to test the question of how far the ICC’s prosecutor should take political considerations into account.

In Congo, leaders of some groups that undoubtedly committed atrocities during the country’s cataclysmic war of 1998-2003 are now partners in a fragile coalition government. In Uganda, a group of non-governmental organisations have lobbied the court not to
take steps that would derail a possible peace agreement with the
Lord’s Resistance Army.

In a joint statement with some of these groups, the court’s chief
prosecutor Luis Moreno Ocampo agreed recently to try to
“integrate the dialogue for peace, the ICC and the processes of
traditional justice and reconciliation.” The court’s statute gives the
prosecutor discretion to judge when a local wish not to prosecute is
based on genuine considerations of national interest (as opposed to
partiality or weakness) but there is already some muttering among
international justice advocates that Ocampo is tacking too far in a
political direction.

Most recently, the ICC has taken on what may be its biggest
challenge and most high-profile investigation, into possible crimes
in the Sudanese region of Darfur. Darfur was referred to the court
by the United Nations Security Council over the protests of the
Sudanese government, which is not likely to cooperate with the
investigation.

The Security Council has set in motion a judicial process without
taking any significant steps to halt the conflict, and it remains
unclear whether it will do anything to compel Sudan to allow
investigators access to gather evidence and speak to potential
witnesses. Persuading the Sudanese government to hand over
potential defendants will be a bigger challenge still. However, the
example of the Yugoslav tribunal – which after twelve years of
operation is at last gaining custody of prominent suspects with the
help of the Serbian government – shows that international justice
can be a very long game.

**Saddam’s trial, Iraq’s options**

What then of Saddam Hussein and the other Iraqi “regime
criminals”? Initially it was hoped by some coalition officials that the
Iraqi tribunal would emerge as a hybrid body with international
judges and advisors involved alongside an Iraqi majority. However it
has instead taken shape as a purely Iraqi body, albeit with
substantial American advice and support.

This development apparently reflects the desire of the Iraqis
involved to assert their own authority and competence (indeed there
have been recent suggestions that the country’s government may
introduce legislation to re-establish the legal basis of the tribunal, removing the taint of occupation that attached to its original statute). Similarly, trials will be conducted according to some Iraqi—rather than international—rules of procedure and with the death penalty available in keeping with Iraqi traditions.

Nevertheless it seems too early to condemn the proceedings. The trend in international justice has been to favour local solutions wherever possible, and if the trials turn out to be well-run and fundamentally impartial they could help establish the principle of the rule of law in Iraq. Conversely, anything that smacked of a show trial would probably reinforce the sense of exclusion among Iraqi Sunni Muslims.

The release of video footage showing Saddam being questioned about a series of executions in 1982—the incident that will provide the tribunal's first case—suggests that his first appearance as a defendant may indeed be imminent. Supporters of transitional justice should recognise the advantages of a tribunal that has credibility with Iraq's population while looking to see that a reasonable threshold of due process is met.

**Further Links:**

International Criminal Court
http://www.ictc-cpi.int/php/show.php?id=home&i=EN

Crimes of War Project
http://www.crimesofwar.org/

Iraq Special Tribunal
http://www.iraq-ist.org

International Center for Transitional Justice
http://www.ictj.org/

This article is published by Anthony Dworkin, and openDemocracy.net under a Creative Commons licence. You may republish it free of charge with attribution for non-commercial purposes following these guidelines. If you teach at a university we ask that your department make a donation. Commercial media must contact us for permission and fees. Some articles on this site are published under different terms.
Report Warns of Illegal Diamond Expansion in Liberia

By Jeff Miller

(Rapaport...June 15, 2005) Global Witness details the exploitation of Liberia's natural resources in a new report titled: Timber, Taylor, Soldier, Spy. The organization calls for continued sanctions of Liberia's diamonds and timber, as well as calling upon the United States, United Kingdom, and Nigeria to extradite Taylor to Special Court in Sierra Leone to face charges of war crimes.

"West Africa is at a delicate point in its post-conflict recovery. Not dealing with the Taylor threat, not controlling Liberia's natural resources and not taking action on poor governance in Liberia leaves West Africa at great risk of a return to war," says Natalie Ashworth, of Global Witness. "The international community must be more robust if it is to safeguard peace and its investment in the region's future."

Global Witness said the links between exploiting natural resources to fund conflict remain strong, and faults both Liberia's interim government and the United Nations peacekeeping efforts for an explosion in illegal diamond mining. Former fighters have been re-recruited to fight in Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea, the report says.

"Lifting timber and diamond sanctions now would make matters significantly worse, opening up the region to a flood of illegal Liberian diamond and timber exports exported by armed ex-fighters that could ignite a regional war," says Ashworth. Lifting sanctions would also go against the expressed wishes of Liberian civil society. "It is time for the international community to stop risking the lives of West Africa's war-averse citizens for political expediency: Keep the sanctions in place, take the tough action necessary to help Liberia move forward, and bring an end to Taylor's ability to undermine regional security."
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