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For di People
Monday, 30 April 2007

Following Kabbah’s Prison Pardon

SPECIAL COURT

ABDUCTS EX-RUF PRISONER!

AN RUF prisoner who was sentenced to over 100 years or life imprisonment has been whisked in a UN jeep accompanied by two blacks and a white expatriate immediately after he was released from Pademba prisons following a presidential pardon on Independence Day April 27.

Continued Page 3
A total of 42 prisoners were released from Pademba prisons and the provinces but [redacted] was among 14 released from Pademba Road prisons. He was also one of ten Ruf and seven Westside Boys who were convicted in April 2006 as a result of the 8 May 2000 shooting incident of murder, shooting with intent to murder at late rebel leader, Foday Sankoh’s residence.

[redacted] a communications expert was the only one pardoned out of the rest of the Ruf-Westside squad but that his pardon came at the request of the prosecution wing of the Special Court so that he could be used to testify against ex-president Charles Taylor of Liberia.

He was received by three prosecution team members from the Special Court and ushered into a UN Jeep that stood waiting for him escorted by another Jeep and is said to have been taken into a safe location in town for witness protection.

Note: The name of the purported witness has been blacked out in compliance with an order of the Court, which directs that the identities of all Prosecution witnesses in the Taylor trial not be disclosed.
At the end of the third Moot Court competition on International Humanitarian Law (IHL), organized by the International Community of the Red Cross (ICRC), Fourah Bay College (FBC) has again emerged as winners for the third time since the start of the competition.

The FBC will therefore be representing the country in this year’s competition in Arusha, Tanzania.

“You have put on a very good performance. Though you have not become lawyers yet, you were on the right track when you were doing your presentations,” the judge of the panel of jury, Justice Gelaga King who is President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, told the winning team.

He told them that, “the legal profession is a unique one and the tools of the trade are the spoken words and these words are English. In presenting your case you have to persuade the judges to see your points and you can only achieve this goal through the English Language. If you observe this principle then you will become fine lawyers and you will excel among your colleagues.”

Justice Gelaga King said, “the ICRC has done a good job especially for students doing law in colleges,” adding that all the colleges and universities which made presentations did a very good work as they all went to the competition and did the work delegated to them.

The head of the ICRC delegation, Jurgen Montani, said their mandate was to protect victims of armed conflicts in respect of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

He however disclosed that though “Sierra Leone is a signatory to most of the IHL treaties the country has been lagging behind in domesticating these treaties”.

The ICRC, he went on, was working with the army and the IHL had been integrated into all of their trainings because they wanted to create an awareness of the IHL in every sphere of the country.

“IHL will be effective where there is a court to try the act of violation on IHL so I challenge you to keep the IHL alive,” he said.

The ICRC head of delegation said they were using students in the competition as it was compulsory.
Presentation of Insignia and Awards and Reception

To be Grand Officers of the Republic of Sierra Leone (GORSL)
HON. JUSTICE GEORGE GELAGA-KING (GORSL)
HON. JUSTICE ABDUL CADRI KOROMA (GORSL)
PROF. DR. CHRISTOPHER BALOGUN LYNCH (GORSL)
PROF. JOHN KAMARA (GORSL)

To be Commanders of the Order of the Republic of Sierra Leone (CORSL)
HON. DR. ALPHA T. WURIE (CORSL)
HON. MRS. ELIZABETH ALPHA-LAVALIE (CORSL)
HON. JOE C. BLELL (CORSL)
HON. SHIRLEY YEMA GBULAYA (CORSL)
DR. AHMED RAMANDEY DUMBUYA (CORSL)
HON. JUSTICE MARYLADE EMMANUEL TOLRA THOMPSON (CORSL)
DR. JAMES DAVID ROGERS (CORSL)
MR. ALIE ESSE BANGURA (CORSL)
MR. SHEKA ABDULLAH MANSARAY (CORSL)
MR. FRANCIS GABRISON (CORSL)
DR. IEKUNILE ISREAL MAY-PARKER (CORSL)
HON. ABDUL SERRIE KAMAL (CORSL)
DR. LEN GORDON-HARRIS (CORSL)
HON. MANA KPAKA (CORSL)
ALHAJI SHEKU AHMED TEJAN KOROMA (CORSL)

To be Grand Officers of the Order of the Rakel (GOOR)
HON. JUSTICE SAMUEL ADEJOBI ADEMOSU (GOOR)
HON. JUSTICE SALIMATU KOROMA (GOOR)
MR. FOKAI DEMBY (GOOR)
MR. KANDIEH YILLA (GOOR)
MRS. MARY MUSA (GOOR)
MRS. BERNADETTE COLE (GOOR)
MRS. JOY SAMAKA (GOOR)
Mr. AMADU NDOEKA (GOOR)
MR. FODAY SOKO CONTENT (GOOR)
MRS. MEMUNATU PRATT (GOOR)
SHEIKH ABDUL KADER AL-FADAI–HON. CONSUL-JEDDAH (GOOR)

President of the Special Court
Husband of Outreach Coordinator Binta Mansaray
Sister of Defence Office Duty Counsel Clare Carlton-Hanciles
Freedom on Independence Day

Celebrations marking Sierra Leone’s 46th independence anniversary were this morning climaxed by a presidential pardon for some prisoners. In what still remains unclear to many, is that one of the freed prisoners was handed over to the UN-backed Special Court for Sierra Leone. From Freetown Umaru Fofana reports.

The forty two, including at least two women, were freed from prisons across the country. They were mostly common criminals convicted for stealing, larceny and what a prison officer referred to as “other petty crimes”. However, Attorney General and Minister of Justice, Frederick Carew, confirmed that one of the men had been handed over to the Special Court to serve as witness in the trial of the former Liberian president Charles Taylor. The Court would not comment on the matter, saying only that the identity of their witnesses is protected. It is not known how connected he was to Mr Taylor whose case open at The Hague in June accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity in Sierra Leone.

Earlier in the day, in what is his last independence day message to the nation, President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah said that his tenure had returned peace to the country. He said the infamy that marred the country’s image because of the war was now a thing of the past. For this he paid tribute to those who died in defence of the country. The president lauded what he called the “unity and steadfastness of Sierra Leoneans even in the face of adversity”. In what many here have taken with a pinch of salt, the president said the country was moving towards eliminating corruption and ensuring a transparent and accountable society. “I am encouraged by the new and increasing sense of nationalism and patriotism among Sierra Leoneans in the diaspora, or people of Sierra Leonean heritage who are abroad,” he said

While praising the country’s electoral commission, the president pleaded with politicians and the electorate ahead of July’s presidential and legislative elections, to comport themselves.
UN-backed Special Court denies in Liberia to select witnesses

Excerpt from report by independent Liberian Star Radio on 29 April

[Presenter] The delegation from the UN-backed Special Court in Sierra Leone, which has been on an outreach mission in Liberia, says there are no more indictments for individuals connected to the war in neighbouring Sierra Leone.

The Special Court delegation also told a news conference on Wednesday [25 April] that there are about 139 witnesses, 11 of which are expert witnesses (sic.). The delegation also called on President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, the Legislature, UNMIL [UN Mission in Liberia] and other groups. Moses Wenyou asked the chief of press and public affairs at the Special Court, Peter Andersen, what was his response to speculation that the delegation was in Liberia to select its witnesses.

[Andersen] That is not the reason why we came. It is very important for us to be here. In fact the UN Security Council urged us to do what we are doing to keep the people of Liberia informed about the trial of Mr Charles Taylor and that is why we are here.

[Wenyou] Why is it important to keep the people of Liberia informed about the trial of Mr Taylor?

[Andersen] He is a Liberian and you are Liberians and you are stakeholders in this whole process. You are also stakeholders because, very much like Sierra Leone, you have been in conflict. You have seen the erosion of the rule of law [Passage omitted; remarks largely indistinct]. We are all part of the Mano River Union here. [Passage omitted] I want to see a future that is bright for Sierra Leone and I want to see a future that is bright for Liberia. That is why I am here. That is why I am working for the Special Court.

[Wenyou] There were some other speculations that you had three sealed indictments for three other individuals in Liberia. How true is this?

[Andersen] There are no sealed indictments and he said forthrightly that no more Liberians are going to be charged before the Special Court.

[Wenyou] Just before you came here, a man by the name of Daniel James, alias Jungle James, was kidnapped by your court to serve as a witness [passage omitted].

[Andersen] That is another question that we all answered today and that is we cannot do that. We don't have a mechanism to do that. We don't have the legal right to do that and I think the government of Liberia will be very distressed to even suspect that we are doing that, not to mention our judges. But in fact, reading the newspapers since I came here, I see that the gentleman in question has reappeared and denied that he was kidnapped and that is the truth. We do not kidnap witnesses. They would not be good witnesses in any event because if you take a man or woman against their will before the court and say now speak the truth, the person is first going to say I was dragged here against my will. So we can never do that. [Passage omitted]
"Jungle James" Surfaces

Denies 'Kidnap' Claim

By C.Y. Kwenu

The man, who Cape Mount County Senator Abel Massaquoi, former warlord Charles Taylor's supporter, claimed was recently kidnapped in western Liberia to testify against the indicted former president during trial on war crime charges, has strongly denied the claims.

"I have never been kidnapped by agents of the Special Court in Sierra Leone. I was never kidnapped, nor have I ever come in contact with any member of the Sierra Leone Court in my life." Daniel James, the wartime diamond dealer otherwise known as Jungle James, said at the weekend as he appeared before the senate.

Grand Cape Mount County Senator Abel Massaquoi of Taylor's former ruling NPP, said last week that agents of the Special Court on Sierra Leone entered the country recently and abducted the diamond dealer as they try to gather evidence against Taylor's alleged weapons and diamonds trade in neighboring Sierra Leone.

Jungle James, who surfaced at the Liberian National Legislature over the weekend in Virginia, outside Monrovia where the body had convened a special session, vehemently denied his kidnap story.

However, Mr. James said he traveled out of the country especially to Switzerland on his private business tour. "But that should not be interpreted by some individuals for political gains as being kidnapped or taken to Sierra Leone either."

The information officer for the Sierra Leonean special court also denied ever sending any agent to Liberia to kidnap or invite would be witnesses in the case of former president Taylor.

Taylor, currently in custody in The Hague, is awaiting trial on 11-count war crime charges, including diamond smuggling.

Jungle James' kidnap story recently took the airwaves when Massaquoi, also a staunch ally of Mr. Taylor claimed during a news conference that Mr. James was recently kidnapped in the diamond-rich Lofa region by two unnamed 'white men' believed to be liaison officers of the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

According to Massaquoi, "following series of interactions with Mr. James in the region, on April 11, 2007, the same white men drove in a vehicle marked 'City 9' returned in the region to Mr. James house where they allegedly headed for an unknown destination."

But James said no one has ever approached him to testify against Taylor.
"I WAS NEVER KIDNAPPED"

..."Jungle James" Refutes Sen. Massaley's Claims

By Morrison O.G. Sayon

Barely three days following reports that he was kidnapped by operatives of the Special Court in Sierra Leone, Daniel James, alias Jungle James, has surfaced in Virginia, outside Monrovia.

Recently, Grand Cape Mount County Senior Senator, Abel Massaley, alarmed that Jungle James was kidnapped by some unknown man at his Lofa Bridge residence and taken to Sierra Leone to testify against former President, Charles Ghankay Taylor who is now in The Hague awaiting court trial.

Jungle James, a one-time chief diamond agent for the former Liberian leader and a well-known diamond broker in the country mysteriously disappeared from his Lofa Bridge home on March second. Following his absence for several weeks without the consent of his immediate family, an alarm was raised thus, claiming the attention of members of the Grand Cape Mount County Legislative Caucus who through its Chairman informed the world about his disappearance.

The Grand Cape Mount County Senator reported that the alleged kidnapping of Mr. James is a clever machination by the special court to covertly create tutors and to program witnesses in the pending trial of the former Liberian President.

But Jungle James who surfaced at the Unity Conference Center over the weekend where the lawmakers are meeting told journalists that he was neither kidnapped nor
"I Was Never...
Cont'd from front page

asked to testify against Mr. Taylor by the Special Court in Sierra Leone.

Mr. James said he has just returned from Geneva, Switzerland where he has been on a business expedition. When asked further about his trip abroad, Mr. James declined to give details about his travel but simply retorted that he will speak to the press at an appropriate time at which time he will give detail information about his business trip to Geneva.

When contacted last evening, Senator Masseley could not say whether he can maintains his earlier stand but expressed happiness that the objective he was seeking for the release of a fellow Liberian has been fulfilled.

The public has meanwhile greeted the reappearance of Jungle James with mixed reactions especially just three days following an alarm by Senator Massaley. Many are of the belief that his immediate return to the country creates suspicion especially so when the court was accused of carrying out covert operations intended to create secret witnesses against Mr. Taylor, though authorities of the Special Court have since denied the allegation.
Jungle James Denies Kidnap Story
-Demands Proof From Hon Massaley

By Rudolph O. Gborkor

Alphonso diamond broker Mr. Daniel James, aka Jungle James has resurrected in the township of Virginia, negating reports that he was kidnapped by agents of the Sierra Leone's UN backed special court to testify against former President Charles Taylor.

An announcing the kidnap story at a press briefing last week at his private office on Candy Street, Grand Cape Mount County senator senator Abel Mumbu Massaley said the diamond broker was kidnapped on March 2, 2007 by court agents and taken to Sierra Leone. He said the kidnappers used white jeep marked city-9 to carry on the act in the Lula bridge area where Jungle James was residing.

But debunking the Senator's kidnap story over the weekend, the onetime Taylor conformist indicated that he has never been kidnapped as alleged by Senator Massaley. He said he has never been kidnapped in his life and that he has not been seen in the public in recent times because of travel inside he made to Geneva, Switzerland.

He challenged Senator Massaley to go beyond the story by providing proof that he (Jungle James) was kidnapped, taken to Sierra Leone where he will be programmed to testify against Mr. Taylor, who faces eleven-count charges of war crimes and crime against humanity.

Speaking further, Mr. James said the story is a completeiot and must not be taken for anything. He stressed that he has nothing to do with the war crimes court and warned the Senator to concentrate on his Capitol Hill duties instead of spreading misinformation.

Because Senator Massaley is worried whether Mr. Taylor will be exonereated, he chooses to give unhealthy things since certain individuals are not been publicly; the diamond ex-

Hon. Abel Massaley

pert pointed out.

Meanwhile, Senator Massaley has asserted that he stands by the story and maintains that Mr. James was indeed kidnapped by the special court's agents and hastily taken to Sierra Leone where he was programed to stand as a witness against the former Liberian President.

The Special Court had earlier denied the story and described it as nonsense.

Mr. Peter Anderson, Information Officer of the Special Court averred that the court does not engage in abducting people. "In fact, we have no right to do so."
By Benjamin B. Sworh

Former President Charles G. Taylor's Diamond Agent, Daniel James, alias Jungle James, over the weekend broke silence at the Unity conference Center in Virginia outside Monrovia during a visit there.

Mr. James, dressed in an African Linen gown, disembarked from his vehicle and told reporters that he had gone to the Unity Conference Center to refute allegation that he was kidnapped by some unknown men from the Sierra Leonean Special Court. He said that at no time was he kidnapped by men believed to be members of the Sierra Leonean Special Court to testify against Mr. Taylor who is detained in The Hague on charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity for his alleged role in the ten years Sierra Leonean civil war as claimed by Grand Cape Mount County Senator Abel Massalay.

Mr. James, also a former General of the defunct National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL), said he traveled to Belgium on a business trip.

The Former President's Diamond Agent promised to give details of his trip to the press another time but only indicated that he went at the Unity Conference Center to dismiss the allegation of his kidnapping. Senator Massalay, who last week claimed that Mr. James was kidnapped by the Sierra Leonean Special Court told reporters that he stands by his statement.

Meanwhile, the Sierra Leonean Special Court has described Senator Massalay's allegation as nonsense.
The British lower House of Commons is currently debating whether to pass an emergency legislation allowing the detention of President Charles Taylor if he is convicted by the UN backed Special court in Sierra Leone.

The British Government is considering potential costs of detaining such a high profile inmate estimated at US$ 87,200 annually.

A pretrial case involving Taylor is slated for The Hague on May 7, to be followed by the actual trial on June 4.

Report said “A possible objection to the Bill relates to the potential cost of imprisoning Taylor in the UK.”

“Some have argued that, with the UK prison system heavily loaded and given the other demands on the UK taxpayer, it is not appropriate to commit government funds to imprison a foreign national.”

The report highlighted the fact that Taylor may choose to stay in Britain after his release or claim asylum and that this “might represent a danger to the public or a drain on UK public resources”.

It advises the government to argue that such commitments are not entered into lightly but by its action “the UK will be making a major contribution to the cause of international justice”.

Taylor is considered the single most powerful figure behind a series of civil wars in Liberia and neighboring Sierra Leone between 1989 and 2003, which killed an estimated 400,000 people.

He has been indicted by the United Nations-backed Special Court for Sierra Leone on charges of crimes against humanity, war crimes and violations of international human rights.

He is accused of sponsoring and aiding rebel groups who perpetrated murder, sexual slavery, mutilation and conscription of child soldiers in Sierra Leone’s civil war in exchange for a share in the lucrative diamond trade.

Britain’s Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett said last June that London had agreed to a request by the former UN secretary general Kofi Annan that if Taylor were convicted, he would serve his sentence in Britain.

Meanwhile Taylor’s Sister, Mrs. Thelma Taylor Saye has media report about the existence of any son of her brother called Tom Charles Taylor.

Thelma said while the Taylor family would not discourage anybody advocating for Taylor’s freedom, the family will not condone criminal behavior on the part of any person.

“Claims by the said Mr. Tom Charles Taylor that he operated for the former Liberian leader a $500 billion diamond empire in his capacity as a son is not true,” she said.

According to Thelma, the only business Taylor was involved in had to do with his two farms he operated in Arthington, Montserrat County and in Gbarnga, Bong County.

Thelma said said Tom Charles Taylor has no relationship whatsoever with Charles Taylor or the sister, “as far the family is concerned, the said Taylor is engaged in the campaign for his personal aggrandizement. Taylor, she claimed, had 14 children, and none of them bears such name.

Tom was reported to have launched a campaign in West Africa to free his father, Taylor from further detention on war crimes charges.

He was reported by a Ghanaian newspaper to have made his first stopover with the Ghanaian President John Kufuor urging him to use his good office as Chairman of the African Union (AU) to intervene in the on-going trial of Taylor. Tom claimed to have been in charge of diamond mining in Liberia during his father’s regime. “He is an imposter, a criminal and a liar; anybody who wants to advocate for Taylor’s freedom should do it in his own name” Thelma warned.
The TRC's Utime

Members of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the International Community, especially the International Contact Group on Liberia (ICGL), are said to be locked up in what seems to be a battle for the control of the TRC.

The Commission is supposedly to be a Liberian-run institution, but it appears that some members of the ICGL are not resting until they have the TRC placed under the control of non-Liberians. According to a TRC staff, who would not like to be named because of the sensitive nature of his disclosure, the turf war is costing the TRC up to one-third of its budget.

The source said, financial difficulties, began to wreak the TRC, triggering endless SOS calls from the TRC, invariably complaining of lack of support to the Commission from members of the International Community.

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) pledged to provide $150,000 in support to the TRC. The fund is said to be in escrow at the UNDP, but the source said, the UNDP has been slow in releasing the funds.

"There have been serious but unspoken disagreements between the TRC's commissioners and the international community, and these disagreements are not only bedeviling the Commission financially, but undermining the monumental works that lay in wait for both the international community and the TRC regarding transitional justice and impunity after the 14 years of conflict in the country," the anonymous TRC source said in an interview.

A source at the TRC told this paper that the confusion started when Ken Attafuah resigned his post as International Technical Adviser to the TRC. According to our source, Ken was being paid US$8,000 monthly, excluding other benefits from TRC funds, but could not perform to expectation.

Our source said, then, apparently unsatisfied with the missing of his lucrative job preceded by quarrels between him and the Chairman of the TRC for his inability to live up to expectation, he resigned but not without making wild allegations about corruption.

Copies of Ken's resignation letter were sent to members of the ICGL, our TRC source begged for anonymity said, intimating that purging of the expatriate staff marked financial strangulation the Commission. He said, investigation revealed that the allegation was forwarded to the Secretary General of the United Nations allegedly by his Special Representative to Liberia, Alan Doss.

The UN Chief reiterated the "alleged financial malpractices at the TRC when he addressed the General Assembly sometimes ago. "The point of wonder amongst the Liberian commissioners of the TRC is how the UNMIL chief hind a very damaging report to the UN if the least inquiry, let alone comprehensive audit, was done to verify the improbable allegations," the source said.

Investigation conducted by this paper shows that the Chairman of the TRC, Jerome Verdier, in August of last year, wrote the UNMIL Chief Doss, to commission an audit of financial records of the Commission but has since failed to respond.

The UNDP proposed the salary structure of US$4,400 for commissioners at the TRC. This according to information was meant to include benefits, due to the absence of funding from the Government of Liberia at the time. The UNDP had agreed to pay stipend of members of the commission until the GOL takes over such task.

The European Union said it was particularly concerned about information that the TRC was preparing to commence public hearings, while misunderstanding at the TRC was yet unresolved and said the resignation of Ken Attafuah made the situation more pressing, accusing the TRC of operating in breach of its Act, without the advice of any IAC members.

But our investigation also indicates that the disagreement is not just about Ken Attafuah but a ploy to have the TRC taken over by non-Liberians and away from the Liberian agenda. Investigation continues.

The European Commission has expressed concern over the misunderstanding at the TRC. The EC has also said that in the absence of proper mechanism to oversee and coordinate donors-funded activities of the TRC, the ICGL, of which it is a member, is requesting the establishment of a TRC Working Group to support the Commission in the full execution of its mandate.

The EU recommended that the working group be composed of representatives from the TRC, Ecowas, African Union, United States, UNMIL/UNDP, Nigeria/Ghana and the European Union and United Kingdom.

"In effect, the international community wants to take over the Commission in the same fashion, with expatriates playing a dominant role while the Liberian staff look on from the periphery," the source said.

"But with the Act establishing the TRC speaking otherwise, a serious quagmire is raging."

It is not clear how soon the TRC quagmire will give us such a long awaited and widely talked-about day when the first man or woman will take the floor to leaf through the horrors of the conflict beginning the late 1970s.
How Did Jungle James Leave Liberia?

This paper has reliably learnt that Daniel James, alias "Jungle James", traveled out of the country through Bwawie-Pungheish.

Immigration sources told The INQUIRER that records available did indicate that "Jungle James" went through the normal immigration procedures at the border and went into neighboring Sierra Leone.

The whereabouts of "Jungle James" have been an issue of concern following a claim by Grand Cape Mount Senator, Abel Massaley, that Jungle James had been kidnapped by the Special Court over vortical operatives in Sierra Leone.

However, Mr. James who surfaced over the weekend denied the claim and simply said that he went on a business trip to Geneva. Mr. James is not presently inclined to give details on how he left the country.

Deputy Immigration Commissioner, Archie Williams, who was contacted on the issue yesterday, said that documents available suggest that Jungle James left the country "legally" as he went through the normal immigration procedures.

As to whether Jungle James was indeed kidnapped, the Deputy Commissioner said that the situation did not suggest that he was kidnapped. "He went through normal immigration formalities," he maintained.

Meanwhile, Jungle James, who made a brief stop at The INQUIRER yesterday, still declined to give further details on his trip to Geneva, Switzerland; instead, he remained steadfast that he was never kidnapped. Jungle James said his initial reaction was necessary because of what the Senator said.

"I'll talk to the Liberian people at the appropriate time." James promised.
The “Jungle James” Scenario: Where Is The “Third Side?”

By Phillip N. Wesseh (PNW)

Once again the Liberian media is faced with the task of sorting the truth on the issue regarding the alleged kidnap of former President Charles Taylor's diamond agent, "Jungle James." Last week, Grand Cape Mount Senator, Abel Massaley, alleged that Daniel James, who had assumed the name "Jungle James" because of his long stay in the jungle seeking for diamonds, was kidnapped by the Special Court in Sierra Leone probably to testify against Taylor who has been indicted for war crimes in Sierra Leone. However, both the court and "Jungle James" have denied the Senator's claim. The Court termed the claim as "nonsense," while Jungle James said he was never kidnapped.

According to the NEWS Newspaper, the Information Officer of the Special Court for Sierra Leone has described as "nonsense" allegations that it kidnapped a Liberian diamond miner, Daniel James, alias "Jungle James" covertly to testify on behalf of the Special Court for Sierra Leone against Mr. Taylor. He went on: "the Special Court does not engage in abduction of people; in fact we have no right to do so," Peter Anderson, Information Officer, Special Court in Sierra Leone said.

He told journalists in Freetown, Sierra Leone that the court does not abduct people as alleged to serve as witnesses for the upcoming trial of former Liberian President, Charles Taylor. Anderson said he spoke to prosecutors after he became aware of the story in the press, and the Court's Chief Investigator termed the accusation as "nonsense." He said for now the Court does not know most of the witnesses because they are subject orders of protection. "I am the only one who does not know who those witnesses might be and if they are in fact in this country," he added. When asked if witnesses are being identified to testify against Mr. Taylor, the Special Court's Information Officer said according to the list of witnesses, about 133 witnesses of fact and several more expert witnesses may be called at some time.

Likewise, Jungle James who surfaced at the Unity Conference Center over the weekend where the lawmakers are meeting told journalists that he was neither kidnapped nor asked to testify against Mr. Taylor by the Special Court in Sierra Leone. Mr. James said he has just returned from Geneva, Switzerland where he has been on a business expedition. When asked further about his trip abroad, Mr. James declined to give details about his travel but simply retorted that he will speak to the press at an appropriate time at which time he will give detail information about his business trip to Geneva.

In the wake of these denials, Sen. Massaley is seemingly maintaining his stance. He told The INQUIRER he is happy that the objective for raising the alarm has been achieved by the resurfacing of "Jungle James."

Now with the denial of the court and "Jungle James," there is a missing link, which has to do with the truth. The truth in this matter has not been established. The public, which the media serves, is yet to be given the real story, whether it was indeed a kidnap or a private visit.

This is where the media comes in with the "third side of the story." An allegation of kidnap was made and it was rejected. So what really is the fact of this matter? The media has reported the first side (accuser), which was Massaley, it also reported the second side (accused) the court and Mr. James, what remains now is the “third side” which is principally intended to establish the veracity of this entire scenario.

This is where investigative journalism comes in the media. The media should do everything to dig out the truth to put the matter to rest. I am aware that such reporting is a painstaking and frustrating exercise. But it is the only means through which the truth will be brought by getting the "real story." I am of the conviction that if the media vigorously pursue the truth, it would be discovered because as it is said, "truth crushed to the ground, shall rise again." The truth, if pursued, will come to light.

Once again, the "third side" is necessary in that at the end, the media would be able to determine whether the story of kidnap is true or not, or whether indeed Mr. James did travel or did not travel to Geneva as he said. This is the challenge for the media. In fact, the work of the media is to report the real facts. It must rely on the truth; it should go beyond what it is told. The journalists should always strive for the truth. Even if they are told something, they have to still cross check to seek the fact. This is why it is said that skepticism is the hallmark for good journalism. Journalists should always have a skeptical mind, until the truth is established. Gone are the days of "stenographic journalism," where media practitioners were mere reporters. Today, they are analysts, interpreters, agenda setters, etc.

Lastly, the Jungle James scenario is a challenge to us in the media. We must discover the "third side" of the story, as this is good journalism. But to succeed, the members of the public with relevant information should assist the media. The media cannot work in isolation of the society; members of the society should help to strengthen its work.

Lest we forget, "there are three sides to a story." In this matter, the third side is missing; therefore it must be pursued.
Taylor's Trial Opens June 4

139 Witnesses Scheduled to Testify Against Accused

By J. Alfred Chea
& Fatoumata Bazana

The much awaited trial of former Liberian president Charles Taylor, indicted on 11-counts for war crimes by the United Nations-backed Special Court for Sierra Leone, is expected to start on June 4th 2007 in The Hague, the Netherlands.

Mr. Taylor is being tried for his alleged involvement in Sierra Leone's brutal civil war, during which thousands of innocent people were killed, hundreds of thousands injured and million more displaced.

Charges against the former Liberian leader range from mass murder, mutilation, rape, sexual slavery, burning of villages, use of child soldiers, violation of international humanitarian law, among others.

Addressing an array of local and international journalists yesterday in Monrovia, the Prosecutor of the Special Court, Stephen Rapp said the decision to indict Taylor was an obvious and essential one.

Flanked by Taylor's Principal Defender, Vincent O. N'Nehielle of Nigeria, and other court officials, Prosecutor Rapp declared that "The evidence against Taylor shows that no one is more responsible for the suffering caused" allegedly by Taylor.

The indictment against Taylor describes how he was responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Sierra Leone while he was in Liberia.

Prosecutor Rapp: "First as a rebel leader, then as President,

Taylor directed the actions of persons under his authority and collaborated with rebel forces to carry out a common plan in Sierra Leone to engage in a campaign of terror against the"
According to Security Council Resolution 1888, which provided for the legal basis for the Taylor trial, the Special Court for Sierra Leone was established in 2002 to prosecute individuals responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in Sierra Leone during the civil war. The court was tasked with investigating and trying those responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and serious breaches of international law.

Taylor's trial began in 2009 at the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague. The trial lasted for several years, with numerous defendants and witnesses testifying. The court's mandate was to ensure that the trial was fair, with due process and respect for the rights of the defendants.

During the trial, witnesses and families of victims testified about the atrocities committed during the civil war. The court also heard from experts on international law and human rights.

The trial was a significant milestone in the quest for justice for victims of the civil war. It was the first time a sitting head of state was put on trial for war crimes under international law. The court's decision to proceed with the trial was a testament to the international community's commitment to upholding justice and accountability.

The trial ended in 2012, with Taylor being found guilty on all counts and sentenced to 27 years in prison. The case set a precedent for international justice and accountability and showed that even the most powerful figures could be held accountable for their actions.
and as such would compromise its role, he said, the team's operations would be carried out with a high sense of independence and legal ethics.

He stressed that the prosecution has to work very hard to establish the guilt of the accused. "This trial must be subjected to a fair one!" he further emphasized.

Meanwhile, the Special Court has announced that during the trial, which would be broadcast on radio and television in the court room in Freetown, would be attended by journalists and members of civil society groups from both Sierra Leone and Liberia to observe the legal and historic proceedings.

Before and after his indictment, Taylor has categorically denied his involvement in the brutal war in Sierra Leone and his alleged support to the then dreaded armed insurgent group, Revolutionary United Front (RUF).

train Liberians who will qualify for ICT posts, thus reducing the country's reliance on expatriates in that field.

The Middle East and Africa regional director revealed that at least 100,000 Africans have benefited out of the two million people CISCO has trained worldwide.

Mr. Meshki spoke to the Observer at a local hotel during the break of CISCO Day session of the on-going National ICT Policy Conference.

About 80 percent of Liberia's population is illiterate and most unlettered Liberians are not computer literate, let alone fairly acquainted with hi-tech. Participants at the policy conference are concerned about the fact that expatriates may take common ICT jobs as the country opens for investment. They raised specific concerns over the Indian-owned Mittal Steel, which they said could bring in cheap Indian labor to the area.

Earlier, Mr. Anthony Vossee, managing director of CISCO Emerging Africa, the firm's branch that oversees investment on the Continent, explained to the audience of business people, government officials and ICT experts how his firm intends to work with government and other stakeholders in the Liberian society.

He claimed that owing to the huge youthful population in Africa, CISCO recognizes the brighter future of the continent and looks forward to working here as a partner and not a 'corporate raider'.

Outside of the firm's corporate interest it runs a Networking Academy, a community investment fellowship, Nobel programs and corporate philanthropy.

The firm, Mr. Vonsee, said was started 23 years ago at Stanford University by a couple that built the first router to communicate between themselves. Since then, the system has built thousands of routers and CISCO has grown from the two to over 50,000 people, with assets in billions of dollars.
Taylor’s Indictment Essential For Justice

Prosecutor

Sierra Leone Special Court Prosecutor, Stephen Rapp, says the trial of ex-President Charles Taylor has brought peace to the sub-region, adding, “The evidence against Taylor shows that no one is more responsible for the suffering caused.”

“The trial of Charles Taylor is both a concrete example and a symbol of turning point for the region. For many years, there was chaos, now there is order,” Sierra Leone Special Court Chief Prosecutor Rapp told local and international journalists at a jammed press conference Wednesday.

“The indictment against Taylor describes how he was responsible for these war crimes and crimes against humanity in Sierra Leone, even though he himself remained in Liberia,” Rapp went on.

Prosecutor Rapp denied reports that the Special Court was engaged in intimidating former allies of Taylor in getting them to testify against him and that the Court had sealed indictments against other Liberians.

“Let me make it clear that we are prosecuting Charles Taylor for alleged crimes committed in Sierra Leone, not any such crime that may have been committed in Liberia. Also, we do not anticipate prosecuting other Liberians before the Special Court,” Rapp said.

Taylor’s indictment was announced in 2003 and was arrested and transferred to Sierra Leone after he was turned over to the Liberian Government by the Nigerian Government upon request early 2006 and subsequently handed over to the Special Court in Sierra Leone.

Taylor’s trial at The Hague is expected to start on 4th at the premises of the International Court, with a pre-trial scheduled for early May.

Acting Special Court Registrar Herman Hebel told journalists at the press conference that as at now the date for trial remained unchanged but if there will be any changes in the date that would be decided by the Judges during the pre-trial in early May.

Mr. Hebel said the Court will ensure that access to the proceedings of the trial against Taylor.

He said the proceedings will be broadcast to the premises of the Special Court in Sierra Leone and that under the auspices of the BBC World Services Trust, journalists from Sierra Leone and Liberia will on a rotational basis, be present at the proceedings in The Hague to cover the proceedings.

He said members of the civil society for both countries will also be given the opportunity to witness the trial in The Hague.

Special Court Principal Defender Vincent O. Nnehilie said the prosecution has an easy job ahead based on the magnitude of allegations, adding, so much of the work is left with the defense to prove that Taylor is innocent.
Women Group Slams Senator Massaley

Women against human trafficking, an advocacy group, has strongly condemned Grand Cape Mount County Senator Abel Massaley, for deceiving Liberian people that Daniel James, alias Jungle James, who allegedly supplied ex-President Charles Taylor with diamond, had been kidnapped by the Sierra Leonean Special Court in Freetown, to be taken to the Hague to testify against the former Liberian leader.

Recently, Senator Abel Massaley told the Nation at a news conference that some officials of the UN-backed Special Court came in the country, kidnapped Jungle James from his Lofa Bridge residence and took him to Freetown, with intent to lure him with money so that he could testify falsely against the former Liberian leader.

Last Saturday, Jungle James visited the Unity Conference Center (UCC) as guest of the Grand Cape Mount County Legislative Caucus and refuted Senator Massaley's allegation that he was kidnapped by the court in Freetown.

Mr. James told reporters that Senator Abel Massaley lied to the Liberian people concerning his whereabouts and disclosed that he left Liberia a few days ago for Switzerland on a business expedition.

Following disclosure of what appeared to be the truth by Jungle James, WAHT Executive Director, Madam Cecelia George, held a news conference Monday at which she requested an apology to the Nation from the Cape Mount County Senior Senator, noting that he lied.

Madam George has threatened that her institution would take a class action in a court to compel the lawmaker to pay for his lying, should he fail to apologize to the Liberian people.

The women advocacy group maintained that the statement made by the senator was not only lie in character, but had the propensity to scare away potential investors, especially at a time that the investment climate was gradually improving.

Madam George furthered that Senator Massaley's action is intended to stop the windows of opportunity that President Sirleaf and the Unity Party have made over the relatively short period of time, basically to create the notion that Liberia was not safe for any country to invest in.

The WHAT boss indicted that Senator Massaley was playing political and hatred game with the Liberian people, stressing that since the NPP-led government of which he also served as senator failed, he and others were doing everything possible to have the UP-led equally experience failure.

She maintained that the Liberian people should be prepared to resist the devilish statements of Senator Massaley and some Liberians that there was no security across the country to protect the citizen and other national, and as such there was no need for people to do business in the country.

"We'll form partnership with other civil society organizations in the country to take Senator Massaley to court, to prove that Mr. James was actually kidnapped" WAHT boss reiterated.

Despite the admittance of Jungle James that no one ever kidnapped him but had instead traveled to Geneva, Senator Massaley is still maintaining his stance on the story.
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International Clips on Liberia
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African Democracy Forum Conference Calls for Political Women
By Naomi Schwarz, Dakar

Women attending an Africa-wide conference are expressing dismay at what they call the mismanagement of Africa and are urging women to work together to find solutions to problems facing the continent. Naomi Schwarz reports for VOA from Dakar the conference on empowering women in politics is wrapping up in Liberia’s capital, Monrovia.

Liberia: Help sought for nation's TB patients

MONROVIA, 26 April 2007 (IRIN) - The Liberian government's National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme says treatment for more than 4,000 tuberculosis patients is at risk because of a lack of funding. Financing under the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria ended in February and is not likely to resume until December.

International Clips on West Africa

BBC Last Updated: Friday, 27 April 2007, 00:07 GMT 01:07 UK

Laboring for chocolate
By Orla Ryan, Ivory Coast

Saturday afternoon in the heart of the Ivorian cocoa belt and farmer Cheba Ouattara is at work on his cocoa farm, his four children beside him. Mr Ouattara is one of about two million cocoa farmers who work across West Africa, producing the bean used to make one of the world's most delectable sweets, chocolate. Mr Ouattara's children all attend school. The eldest, 18-year-old Issouf hopes one day to be a scientist.

Local Media – Newspaper

Truth Commission Commences Statement Taking in Ghana
(Public Agenda, The Analyst, Daily Observer and The Informer)

- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) is expected to begin its outreach program and public information campaign in Ghana beginning May, this year. In an interview, the person responsible for the Commission’s Diaspora Project, Ms. Massa Washington said that a 5-man delegation would leave Liberia next week to commence the statement taking.

Lawmakers to Cite GEMAP Officials
(Heritage)

- The Plenary of the House of Representative yesterday agreed to set up a committee that would invite the Governance Economic Management Assistance Programme officials to public hearings. The lawmakers said they want GEMAP officials to appear before the body to account for the Programme’s achievements in Liberia.
President Sirleaf Dedicates University IT Center
(The Informer)

• A University of Liberia release issued in Monrovia yesterday said, President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf will today dedicate the newly established Internet café at the University. The release said following the inauguration of the Information, Communication and technology center, thousands of students are expected to have access to journals and periodicals online.

Local Media – Radio Veritas (News monitored today at 9:45 am)

President Johnson Sirleaf Congratulates Nigerian President-Elect

• A release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs quoted President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf as saying that the landslide victory of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) Presidential candidate in Nigeria demonstrated the confidence and trust Nigerians have in Umaru Yar’Adua. The President’s comments were contained in a Message of Congratulations sent to the Nigerian-President elect. (Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

ECOWAS Liaises with World Bank on Liberia’s Development

• According to a Ministry of Foreign Affairs release, the head of a visiting ECOWAS Commission, Mr. Jean Du Diasamba announced that the Commission was working with the World Bank to find ways to support Liberia in its reconstruction endeavours. The Commission’s Vice President Diasamba said ECOWAS was ready to assist Liberia and any of its member States in difficult situation. (Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

House of Senate Fails to Pass GRC Act

• The House of Senate yesterday failed to acquire the required 20 votes needed to pass an Act to establish the Governance Commission, instead 13 Senators voted contrary to the standing rules of the House. (Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

Lofa County Malaria Control Supervisor Reports 10 Deaths from Disease

• At least 10 persons died of malaria in Lofa County according to the County’s Malaria Control Programme Supervisor David Wolobah who said that the deaths occurred in March, this year. (Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

Lawmakers Seek Full Insight into Operations of GEMAP

(Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

Complete versions of the UNMIL International Press Clips, UNMIL Daily Liberian Radio Summary and UNMIL Liberian Newspapers Summary are posted each day on the UNMIL Bulletin Board. If you are unable to access the UNMIL Bulletin Board or would like further information on the content of the summaries, please contact Mr. Weah Karpeh at karpeh@un.org.
Sierra Leone tribunal members visit Liberia ahead of Taylor trial

MONROVIA, April 25, 2007 (AFP) - Members of an international tribunal for Sierra Leone arrived Wednesday in Liberia on a fact-finding mission ahead of the trial of former Liberian president Charles Taylor, facing war crimes charges in both countries. Stephen Rapp, the prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), sought to reassure Liberians that Taylor would be judged fairly when he stands in the dock.

President Sirleaf and BET Founder Bob Johnson in Breakfast Meeting

Apr 25, 2007 (Liberia Government/All Africa Global Media via COMTEX) --President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf has held a breakfast meeting with visiting American billionaire, Robert Johnson and delegation, now rounding up a three-day visit to Liberia. The breakfast meeting was held Wednesday morning at the President's residence in Sinkor, Monrovia.

Ivory Coast cuts budget following slump in cocoa production

ABIDJAN, April 25, 2007 (AFP) - Ivory Coast has set its 2007 budget at 2.9 billion euros (3.9 billion dollars), down three percent year-on-year, due to a fall in cocoa production in the world's top grower, a minister said Wednesday.

Ghana Ministers Draw Media Criticism over Coup Comments

By Peter Clottey, Washington, D.C.

Two ministers in President John Kufuor’s government have come under intense media criticism after making a hero out of the leader of the coup d'état that led to the overthrow of Ghana’s first President, Kwame Nkrumah. Many have condemned the coup as setting the precedent for the overthrow of subsequent governments. Supporters of the government however, say while the statements of the ministers were unfortunate, they were not official government statements.

Prosecutor Says Taylor’s Indictment Essential for Justice

Addressing a news conference in Monrovia Wednesday, the Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, Stephen Rapp said the trial of former Liberian President Charles Taylor has brought peace to the sub-region.
• “The evidence against Taylor shows that no one is more responsible for the suffering caused,” Mr. Rapp said.
• The Prosecutor said the UN-backed Court has identified 139 witnesses to testify against Mr. Taylor. The trial is expected to start on 4 June 2007 in The Hague, at the International Criminal Court, and the proceedings will take place under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Special Court.
• Responding to rumours that some Liberians, especially associates of Mr. Taylor would be indicted by the Court, Mr. Rapp said “We will not go after any other Liberian; we are going after top individuals who bear the greatest responsibility for crimes committed in Sierra Leone and not their lieutenants.”

UNMIL Boss Says Liberia is no longer a Failed State
(Liberian Express, The Informer, New Democrat, The Inquirer, Heritage and National Chronicle)
• The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Alan Doss has said Liberia is now elevated from a “failed state” to a “fragile democracy.”
• “UNMIL is here to help the Government to maintain peace and security while Liberia’s own security forces are developed and deployed,” Mr. Doss said. He made the assertions when he welcomed a high-powered Irish delegation in Liberia on Wednesday. Mr. Doss thanked the Irish delegation for their continuous support of UNMIL peacekeeping role in Liberia.

Newspaper Wants Government Prioritize Renovation of Executive Mansion
(The Analyst)
• In a front page article on Thursday, The Analyst newspaper accused the Government of down playing the renovation and reoccupation of the Executive Mansion which was gutted by fire last July. The paper said the renovation of the building must be prioritized because it is the symbol of governance in Liberia.

Local Media – Radio Veritas (News monitored today at 9:45 am)

Presidency Calls for Fair Trial for Taylor
• According to an Executive Mansion release, President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf called on the visiting senior officials of the Special Court for Sierra Leone to ensure that the trial of former President Charles Taylor was free, fair and conducted in a reasonable period, but lauded the Court for providing him legal defence.
(Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

Lawmakers Call for Fair and Speedy Trial of Taylor
• Acting House Speaker Tokpah Mulbah yesterday admonished the Special Court for Sierra Leone to guarantee a fair and speedy trial of former President Taylor.
• During a meeting with the Court’s officials yesterday, the Lawmakers questioned the Court on why it failed to first inform the Liberian National Legislature when they first decided to transfer Mr. Taylor to The Hague, adding that it was frustrating that the Court, of late, decided to inform the National Legislature about its activities and the upcoming trial of Mr. Taylor.
(Also reported on ELBS and Star Radio)

Speaker Tyler Holds Talks with State Department Officials
• A dispatch from the Embassy of Liberia in the United States said that the newly elected House Speaker Alex Tyler has held talks with American Government officials and called for more US involvement and support for Liberia’s reconstruction. Speaker Tyler also called on the Americans to help to improve the capacity of members of the National Legislature and their staff especially in the conduct of their proceedings.
City Zoning Committee to Tear Down Makeshift Structures in Monrovia
- A Special Presidential and Zoning Committee announced yesterday that it was prepared to reinforce its campaign to implement the city zoning code and ordinance throughout the city of Monrovia.
- Monrovia City Mayor Ophelia Hoff-Saytumah who is also a member of the Committee stated that the campaign would remove residents living in streets and alleys as well as street garages in Monrovia and that the Committee has already issued notices to residents in these areas to leave at once.

Health Ministry Launches Anti-Malaria Campaign
- The head of the National Malaria Control Program at the Ministry of Health, Dr. Joel Jones yesterday launched in Liberia, the decision of the Ministers of Health of African Union States to eliminate malaria in Africa by 2010, saying that the Ministry would scale up its preventive strategies to eliminate the disease.
- Speaking at celebrations to mark Africa Malaria Day. Dr. Jones stated that the Ministry would carryout a massive education program on behavioural change. He emphasized that the Program would teach people how to observe basic hygiene, and destroy breeding grounds for mosquitoes.
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UN lifts Liberia diamond sale ban

The United Nations Security Council has voted to lift a 2001 ban on the export of diamonds from Liberia.

The ban was meant to stop proceeds from the sale of so-called "blood diamonds" fuelling wars in West African nations.

Correspondents say the UN decided Liberia has made enough progress, but that it must certify diamonds for sale do not originate from conflict zones.

Two years ago Liberia elected its first democratic leader, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, since its civil war.

Employment hopes

The 15-nation Security Council unanimously passed the resolution, including a provision to review the decision after 90 days, council president, British ambassador Emyr Jones Parry, said.

Nearly half of the world's diamonds come from west, central and southern Africa.

But the lucrative trade fuelled conflicts in countries such as Angola, Congo, Sierra Leone and Liberia, as rebel groups fought for control of diamonds and found willing international buyers to finance their activities.

Mrs Johnson-Sirleaf had pressed for the ban to be lifted, arguing that funds were desperately needed to improve living standards in Liberia.

Unemployment is at 85% in the West African nation, and this is a chance to create much needed jobs and reinvigorate the country's economy, says the BBC's Laura Trevelyan at the UN.

Liberia must now sign up to the Kimberley Process, the UN says, to ensure it does not revert to exporting conflict diamonds.

The international diamond certification scheme, established in May 2000, tracks the origin of diamonds on the international market.

This is the council's second vote of confidence in Mrs Johnson-Sirleaf's presidency. In June it lifted an embargo on Liberian wood.

Mrs Johnson-Sirleaf, who took office in January 2006, was the first woman to be elected president of an African country.
PETER ANDERSEN: Members of the press, I’m Peter Andersen from the Special Court for Sierra Leone. Ben Malor, I’ve just been told, is not yet here, and I would have liked him to have had the first word today. I would like to introduce to you the panellists who have come from Freetown to this press conference. The press conference, and in fact this mission from the Special Court, is being led by the Acting Registrar, Herman von Hebel. To his left is the Prosecutor, Stephen Rapp, and to his right is the Principal Defender, Vincent Nmehielle. I would like to call on each of them to make a very brief opening statement, and then I’d like to turn the floor over, as it should be, to the members of the press. When you ask your question, it would help us if you would state your name and the media house that you represent.

HERMAN VON HEBEL: Thanks very much for coming over to our press conference this afternoon. I can say that this is the first meeting of principals of the Special Court for Sierra Leone that is visiting Liberia since the arrest of Charles Taylor and his transfer to Freetown first and later to The Hague. The reason for our visit and for us being here lies in Security Council Resolution 1688 which as such provided the legal basis for the transfer of Charles Taylor to The Hague, but also provided us with the obligation to make the trial against Charles Taylor as accessible as possible to the public in Sierra Leone and in the region, and in particular of course also to Liberia.

The Court representatives have already met this morning with a variety of people from UNMIL, the Legislature, the President of Liberia, and we will continue to meet with members of Civil Society, with the press as now, and we’ll brief them on the mandate of the Special Court, what we do and what we don’t do, and our activities. Tomorrow morning also we will undertake a number of outreach activities of which we hope there will be many to follow, and that is in accordance with the practice of outreach activities that we have been developing over the last couple of years in Sierra Leone, and has proven to be such an important asset of the functioning of the Special Court.

The trial against Charles Taylor, as you all know, is expected to get started on the fourth of June 2007 in The Hague at the premises of the International Criminal Court. However, I would like to stress that although the premises of the ICC are going to be used, Mr. Taylor is in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and the proceedings there will also be exclusively in conformity with our own proceedings. It is merely the building that is being provided by the ICC in order to make the trial possible in The Hague.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone is based on an agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations. It is an international organisation in itself. It is not part of the UN family but certainly closely related to it.

The Special Court, as of the beginning, has focused on those persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the crimes committed in the territory of Sierra Leone, and I think that is also an important element to stress at the moment – that all our activities, also here in Liberia in relation to Charles Taylor, do relate to the alleged criminal responsibility of Mr. Taylor to the crimes committed in Sierra Leone. We do not focus on crimes committed here in Liberia.

Under the Statute of the Special Court, trials will take place in accordance with the highest standards of regional and universal human rights instruments. We are very keen to stress that, and we will have of course during the trials all possibilities for the parties, for them to try to make their case before the Judges. We are very keen to show, and that is also our mandate for bringing the accessibility of the proceedings to Sierra Leone and Liberia, to show to everyone that our proceedings are up to the highest standards, and that we want to discuss and show the quality of our work to the population of Sierra Leone and of Liberia.
In order to make the proceedings as accessible as possible to the region, to Sierra Leone and to Liberia, we have developed a number of instruments, only a few of them I will to bring to your attention at the moment. In the first place, the proceedings of the trial in The Hague will be broadcast to our Court facilities in Freetown, so that the people in Sierra Leone, the people in Freetown, can come and see every day the proceedings as they are undergoing in The Hague. So that allows for everyone who could make it to come to our courthouse can have an equal access as if the proceedings were taking place in our courthouse.

Also, and that is under the auspices of the BBC World Service Trust, we have elaborated a programme with the BBC which will allow for journalists, both from Sierra Leone and from Liberia on a rotational basis, to go to The Hague and go to the proceedings in the case of Charles Taylor. Those journalists will be based there for up to about three months and will then rotate with other colleagues. During their presence, and also when coming back, they will be assisted by the BBC in producing documentaries, in making media presentations, and also use that work in any outreach activities that may take place in the country. And so we will do that on a rotational basis so that the number of journalists, and again from both countries, Sierra Leone and Liberia, will be able to have their own coverage of the proceedings.

Also what we will have is that there will be members of Civil Society, and here again from Sierra Leone and Liberia, that will be invited to come over to The Hague for about a week and actually see the proceedings themselves so that they have a full picture of how the proceedings are going, make their own assessment, share that with members of their organisations, and see simply how the proceedings are working, and how fair and effective trial is being given to Mr. Taylor.

And lastly, we will organise a number of broadcasts in which summaries of the trial proceedings will be made available, knowing of course that radio is a very important instrument in disseminating information, we will strongly focus on that. These are my comments; for the moment I would like to hand over to Stephen Rapp, the Prosecutor of the Special Court.

STEPHEN RAPP: Thank you very much, Herman. My name is Stephen Rapp. I was appointed Prosecutor of the Special Court by Secretary-General Kofi Annan in December and took up my duties in Freetown in January 2007. Before that time I had been for almost six years at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda with responsibility for prosecuting those allegedly responsible for the Rwanda genocide of 1994. My prepared remarks will be handed out; you’ll have a chance to get a copy of them and hope that will allow you to have some information to begin with. Of course, I’m more than willing to answer any question that you have about the work of the Office of the Prosecutor or of the Special Court.

It’s a pleasure and an honour to be with you today to address the Liberian media, and the people of Liberia. Though the seat of the Special Court is, of course, Freetown, Sierra Leone, I believe strongly in the importance of our work for the region as a whole. That is why I am so pleased to be here in Monrovia, both to share news of the work of the Prosecution, and to hear the thoughts and concerns of Liberians.

When the United Nations and the government of Sierra Leone established the Special Court, they created the mandate of the Prosecution – to prosecute those individuals who allegedly bear the greatest responsibility for the terrible crimes committed and the suffering caused during the civil war in Sierra Leone. The Prosecution has the jurisdiction and the responsibility to bring these individuals to justice, and we carry out our work in the name of the people who suffered so terribly at their hands.

Of course, suffering of this kind was not unique to Sierra Leone. Until most recently, the region itself was burdened with many years of terrible and brutal civil wars. Like their Sierra Leonean neighbours, Liberians endured the terrible affliction of war because of the actions of self-serving men seeking power and wealth. Thousands of innocent people were killed, hundreds of thousands injured, and millions more displaced.

The decision by the Prosecutor to indict former President Charles Taylor was an obvious and essential one. The evidence against Taylor shows that no one is more responsible for the suffering caused. Taylor’s indictment was strongly supported by governments and non-governmental organizations alike throughout the world. The charges against him allege involvement in some of the most horrible and vicious things human beings can do to one
another, including: mass murder, mutilation, rape, sexual slavery, the burning of villages and the use of child soldiers.

Let me make it clear that we are prosecuting Charles Taylor for alleged crimes committed in Sierra Leone, not any such crimes that may have been committed in Liberia. Also, we do not anticipate prosecuting other Liberians before the Special Court.

The indictment against Taylor describes how he was responsible for these war crimes and crimes against humanity in Sierra Leone, even though he himself remained in Liberia. First as a rebel leader, then as President, Taylor directed the actions of persons under his authority and collaborated with rebel forces to carry out a common plan in Sierra Leone to engage in a campaign of terror against the civilian population. Taylor allegedly ordered, instigated and aided the crimes and knew full well of the death, damage, and destruction inflicted.

The trial of Charles Taylor is both a concrete example and a symbol of a turning point for the region. For many years, there was chaos, now there is order. Where once there was volatility and violence, now there is peace. Where once powerful men shattered many thousands of lives without fear of prosecution, now impunity no longer reigns. The Taylor trial is certainly not the only part of this turning point, but it is indeed a crucial component.

I must also state in strong terms that one of our primary concerns is to see a fair trial carried out at the highest standards of international justice. The Defendant does and must have the full opportunity to test the evidence presented against him, with the benefit of proper representation. As should be expected of an international tribunal like the Special Court, the rights of the accused are a foremost consideration. It is our position that the prosecutor wins his case when justice is done.

Another concern is the well-being and safety of our witnesses. All efforts that are needed to be made have been made, are being made, and will be made to protect the security and the identity of all prosecution witnesses. Our efforts are supported by the protective measures for witnesses put in place by the judges of the Special Court. No person has been or will be threatened or pressured into assisting or testifying for the prosecution. And let me emphasize – no witness should be intimidated by attempts by some to prevent or discourage people from coming forward and telling the truth.

Once again, let me say how pleased I am to address the people of Liberia and to be visiting this country. I look forward to hearing your questions.

VINCENT NMENHIELLE: May I use this opportunity also to welcome you to this press conference. I’m Vincent Nmenielle, Principal Defender of the Special Court. And of course for some of you this will appear quite strange to have the Prosecution and the Defence on the same table in terms of a press conference. Well, under the mechanism that the Special Court has, the founders of the Special Court thought it very important to have the office of the Principal Defender, unlike what used to be before now right from Nuremberg through the ICTR and ICTY, which makes it quite different from the others.

Now, in essence, the Statute of the Special Court in Article 17 of the Statute, makes elaborate provisions for what it refers to as minimum guarantees of the rights of the accused. And as part of actualising the minimum guarantees of the rights of the accused, the Court established the Office of the Principal Defender under Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court, tasking the Principal Defender with the responsibility of insuring the rights of the accused in the process of the trial. And that meant that the Office of the Principal Defender represented the accused in the initial appearance and advised the accused in terms of the charges against him and also beyond that, if the accused person is found to be indigent, to ensure that as one of those minimum guarantees, the right to legal assistance is provided to him at no charge to him to enable him to acquire the necessary legal defence, more so because he does not have the means to do so by himself. Of course there is a process of determining whether or not an accused person is indigent, and as a result to determine whether or not he or she has the means to defend himself. In the case of Mr. Charles Taylor, it is our view that for the interests of justice and under the circumstances that we have found, he’s entitled to legal defence under the legal aid mechanism that the Court provides.
Now of course we must come to a realisation that the essence of any standard international criminal trial is one that seeks the truth but one also that must ensure the highest level of respect of fundamental rights of the accused because we work under the presumption which is standard in every criminal jurisdiction, particularly where Common Law operates as in the case of the Special Court, that an accused person is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. While most of the times of course it may be difficult...

Of course, the trial is not going to be in the public arena in terms of the opinion of the international civil society, but rather an inquiry made by the Court. But whether you like it or not, the opinion of the world means a whole lot as it affects the perception of the trial process.

But again, it is the work of the Defence to ensure that the Prosecution does not have an easy task in the process of trying to establish the guilt of the accused. The Defence is determined to do everything necessary within the bounds of law to defend the rights of the accused. And the Office of the Principal Defender does that by constituting a legal team, by appointing a team to defend the accused on a day-to-day basis. And on that basis, I have appointed and assigned a team of Defence lawyers to Mr. Taylor under the regulatory instruments of the Special Court.

Again, the Prosecution must work very hard to prove the guilt of the accused. You may well say, “oh well, the Prosecution has all the big work to do”. We don’t believe that. We believe that they have the simple job in view of the nature of the kind of trial that we’re in. And of course it therefore becomes a heavy burden on the Defence to really defend this accused person, and it impacts on a number of issues at a trial.

Of course the equality of arms may mean different things to various tribunals, but for me equality of arms means being able to resource the Defence if the Court has determined to have a trial. That trial therefore must be one that is resourced even to the benefit of the accused to be able to muster the kind of defence that he is entitled under the regulations. And it is very important for the Defence that this trial be subjected to the highest standards ever. And it is left to you, the press and members of the Civil Society, as you watch the proceedings unfold, as you watch the process, to determine the fairness in relation to the provisions that we are governed by under the basic instruments of the Court. And it’s therefore my joy to be with you and to address specific issues that you may have from the perspective of the Defence, noting that of course there is a legal Defence team that has been put in place. I function as Principal Defender having oversight of the entire defence process from the point of view of administration and the point of view of facilitating and ensuring the provision of logistical resources, and engaging with the Registry to ensure that that happens. And of course I come from the rubric of knowing that the process is fair.

Now, a number of people have asked me questions to say, “oh, are you trying to say that this man is innocent? Are you trying to say that this man did not commit any offence? Are you trying to say that nothing happened”? It is not the role of the Principal Defender to say that something happened or something did not happen. It is the role of the Principal Defender to ensure that if you said something happened, and if you said there has to be a trial, if you said that the accused person has to go through a process of trial, that trial must be one that respects the fundamental rights of the accused, and therefore all things that are necessary to guarantee those rights are put in place. And we do engage with the Court.

Of course, it is not an easy task to engage with the Court in terms of the number of issues, in terms of resources, particularly in terms of presenting the views of the Defence team, in terms of what may impact the case of the accused person. And it becomes quite challenging when you have to deal with, if you like, three stakeholders: the Court itself represented by the Registry; the accused person himself, of course who has his own issues; and the Defence team as well, which also has its own issues relative to either the Court or the accused person. And you are the centre of it, to ensure that things are balanced in such a way so that both the basic interest of the Office of the Principal Defender being that the rights of the accused and the interests of the accused are respected, at the same time ensuring that the process is one that is reasonably conducted from the perspective of what is fair to the entire process. So it is my privilege to be with you and to answer whatever questions you may have in this regard.

But finally I would like to say that it is indeed an improvement in the international criminal justice mechanism to have created the Office of the Principal Defender. But again the point remains as to after the end of this process to evaluate how far the Office of the Principal Defender has added to the entire process, particularly in view of
whether or not the Court, in trying to achieve its aim in ensuring the rights of the accused has gone further than any other court, and if not, what could be done in the future should we have situations of this kind occur again.

We are hoping that that wouldn’t happen, because we have the ICC now being the only mechanism to have a permanent structure. But again, the politics of the ICC, or surrounding the ICC, will make it necessary that we have some kind of tribunals also of the future, but this we’ll talk about when things imply the circumstances that I envisage. Thank you very much for your attention, and I will welcome your questions.

BEN MALOR: Okay, I’ll be passing this mike to Peter in a second. As we usually do, just step up to the microphone. Keep your question short. Peter will direct the questions accordingly. So get to the mike, mention your name and your organisation and then ask your question please.

STAR RADIO: I don’t know if my questions are short, but I’d like to do it this way. We learned that you have some sealed indictments [unheard] Charles Taylor in Liberia. So maybe you can tell us, who are those individuals and how many sealed indictments you have. And I heard about Civil Society going to cover the trial. Who’s going to sponsor them when in fact journalists are not going to be sponsored by the Special Court? And the other one to that, the Defence counsel is sponsored by the Special Court, so how transparent would they be in the trial of Mr. Taylor. And another question is, did you come here to get witnesses as many people think you came to, or what?

ANDERSEN: I’d like to ask you to keep to one question, or maybe at least two related questions, because otherwise we’re going to have one person who’s going to ask all the questions and not give anybody else a chance. But from the practical point of view, it’s very difficult for us to remember all of the questions when there are four or five of them, and we may miss answering the one that’s important to you.

RAPP: Well let me answer the one that relates to the Office of the Prosecutor. There are no sealed indictments. There are no other individuals from Liberia that stand indicted. The Court has a limited mandate, we have a completion strategy that basically requires us to conclude all of our trials and all of our appeals by the end of 2009. So our capacity to pursue further cases at this point is very limited. And indeed, we’ve developed a budget for the people that we have in custody that we need to try. So no sealed indictments, no other Liberians to be charged.

VON HEBEL: In relation to the other questions, who from Civil Society and which journalists are going to attend the proceedings in The Hague, as far as the journalists are concerned, this is a programme which is run primarily by the BBC, and it is the BBC who will identify journalists and it’s their responsibility to make sure there is a distribution amongst journalists with different backgrounds, with different papers and different media. As far as Civil Society is concerned, we from the Special Court are in consultation with over 30 Civil Society organisations. But there again, we leave it to Civil Society organisations amongst themselves to identify the people that may go to The Hague in order to watch the proceedings for roughly about a week. It is not the intention from the Special Court to identify certain Civil Society groups that may be more or less positive about the Court. Of course what we want is a wide variety of all those organisations who may have a view on the proceedings.

And to defend the Principal Defender, I will also answer that question in relation to his role. The Principal Defender is indeed a staff member of the Special Court. He as such is not the counsel who represents the accused. The counsel representing the accused is Mr. Karim Khan. He has his own Defence team. The Principal Defender is there to provide the facilities in order to make sure that the Defence counsel himself, Karim Khan and his team, are able to do their job.

NMEHIELLE: Well if I may add to that, I got your specific question to be Defence counsel is sponsored by the Special Court: how transparent is the process? If I may address that issue, the Defence counsel is not sponsored by the Special Court if you want to put it that way. I know that the whole process is still very new in terms of a legal aid mechanism. I can also tell you that being the Principal Defender also has been misconceived by a number of individuals who have said, “oh, you are the Principal Defender responsible for coordinating the defence of all the accused. How are we sure that you are not being brought over to influence the case against the accused”? Of course, it is as a result of people’s naïveté in the process that such questions arise, and maybe because they’ve not seen it in the past. [Unheard] coming up with a system within the West African region that we have.
The point remains that the Principal Defender, if you like, is an in-house conscience of the Court in ensuring that the rights of the accused are respected, and mandated to appoint lawyers to defend the accused. Now, if an accused person in the particular case of Mr. Taylor tells the Principal Defender and undertakes within the procedure set out in place that he needs legal assistance because he is indigent. Now it falls on the Principal Defender to fall back on the regulatory mechanisms in terms of ensuring that the accused person is granted his request by providing a lawyer for the accused within the list kept in the Office of the Principal Defender.

Now, once the lawyer has been assigned to the accused person, the lawyer enters into a legal contract with the Court to provide legal services which is independent of the Court, which is independent of the Principal Defender except in relation to the rights of the accused and the obligations of the lawyer who has signed a contract to provide legal defence. Now in such a case, the lawyer is not being sponsored by the Court. The lawyer is under a contract to provide legal service for an indigent accused person, and is therefore under the contract required to perform to the highest level of the standards required, and must meet his ethical obligations under his Rule of Practice and under the Code of Conduct for Counsel that appear before the Special Court.

So it is not as simplistic as saying, “oh, the lawyer is being sponsored by the Court and therefore how transparent is the whole mechanism that is governed by rules and regulations, and that is governed by the highest standard of ethical requirements of the lawyer. And of course the Principal Defender watches over to ensure that those principles are met relative to the rights of the accused and relative to the obligations of the lawyer to the Special Court. And I hope that satisfies your question.

RAPP: There was a fourth question asked, and I think directed to the Prosecution; the statement that perhaps we came on this mission to persuade people to be witnesses. Understand, the Prosecution has listed its witnesses. We’ve listed 139 witnesses for the Prosecution who will testify to facts, and eleven who will be expert witnesses. Now they are listed at this point under pseudonyms because they are protected witnesses. We’ve also listed backup witnesses who could be called if those witnesses were not available. So at this point we’re not adding to our witness list. We’re here on an Outreach mission to explain how the Court is operating and what this trial is going to entail.

Keep in mind there is an ongoing issue always of witness protection. Almost all of the witnesses who testify from Liberia or from Sierra Leone, whether they’re Prosecution or Defence witnesses, will be protected in the sense that they will testify in a manner where their identities will not be known to the public. Why is that? Because they’ve told us that they fear that if their identities become known to the public there could be retribution against them or their families. It is however necessary for us to, at a particular point, six weeks before witnesses testify under the Court’s order, to give notice to the accused in the case of the Prosecution witnesses, what the identity of the witness is, and to provide the statement that was earlier provided in an edited form, in a complete form to the Defence. And that requires at that point witnesses to be protected. And so we’re always working with everyone that can assist us to make sure that witnesses can be protected, both before and during and after their testimony. But that’s done in a manner under the Rules of the Court, and by a neutral body, the Witness and Victims Section, that provides the services and the protection to both Prosecution and Defence witnesses.

STAR RADIO: A follow-up on this same witnesses issue. It has been alleged that in the past and recently you came to Liberia to secretly collect witnesses to testify against Charles Taylor. And how confirmed is that story? And in the meantime, if you are investigating Taylor for crimes committed in Sierra Leone, why did you come to Liberia to collect witnesses?

RAPP: Well, first of all the crimes committed by Charles Taylor, the actual crime in the sense of the victim being hurt, occurred in Sierra Leone, but it’s our allegation that the orders from Charles Taylor came from this country, both when he was a rebel leader and when he was president, and that a variety of things happened in this country, to train people who were Sierra Leone fighters, to arm them and provide them with arms that came from elsewhere, and also to receive diamonds here to buy those arms and to provide benefits to Taylor. That’s part of the allegation in the case. So we have to have evidence from people who were in Liberia. Certainly our witnesses include Liberians. They include Sierra Leoneans. They include people from other countries in the region. And the crucial evidence in this case at the end of the day will not be over whether crimes were committed in Sierra Leone. I think we all know the horrendous crimes that were committed there. But the crucial fighting issue will be the connection between Taylor and those crimes. And that requires witnesses from this country, and it requires people who were
former friends and supporters and insiders of Taylor to come forth, because when you’re talking about the person that’s at the very top of an organisation, they’re not the one that’s out there chopping off arms themselves. It’s others that are doing it. And so that requires insiders that can, in fact, be very fearful that retribution will be visited on them, and who cite to us allegations of Taylor earlier killing people who were former supporters of his because he thought they were disloyal. So that’s the challenge that we have.

Now we don’t want anyone to be a witness who is compelled to do so. We’re not getting subpoenas or compulsion against anyone. We’re not kidnapping anyone. We’re not putting them into any kind of situation where they’re intimidated or forced to testify. Anything that’s done is done in order to maintain their protection, and that can involve them being relocated before their testimony and before their identities are disclosed. It may involve them being relocated in the future because of the dangers they might have after they testify. The worst thing that can happen to a trial, and to a process of justice, is for the witnesses, on whom the Judges rely to make their decision, to be in danger or for someone to be injured. And so that’s what’s been done in this regard.

RADIO VERITAS: First to the Registrar. We heard that the Defence lawyers are not satisfied with the June fourth date. Can you be definitive and tell us whether the trial will indeed begin on the fourth? And you met President Sirleaf a few hours ago maybe. What did she tell you? And the condition of Mr. Taylor has been raised by his family members in Liberia – one of them the food, his diet. What is his condition as we speak? Have you changed his food to his local food, Liberian food, African food?

VON HEBEL: All right, I can again be very brief and straightforward on that. The date for the start of trial is set by the Judges in the first instance. They have set the date. Originally it was for the second of April. Then they postponed it on the basis of an application by the Defence which was not objected to by the Prosecution. At the moment the date of the fourth of June is the date of the start of the trial. There’s going to be a pre-trial conference which is standard procedure which sets out all the organisational matters for the start of the trial which will take place on Monday, seventh of May, so on Monday in a week’s time. If there are any requests or any issues as to the need for more preparations, this is the moment for any of the parties to raise those, and I think that this is the final decision by the Judges, just before or around that day of the seventh of May. If by the seventh of May the Judges stick to that date of the fourth of June, it’s going to be the fourth of June. But at the moment we all assume that the fourth of June is the day on which the trial against Charles Taylor will get started.

Yes indeed, we did meet with the President of Liberia this morning, and questions about the conditions of detention and issues of food, etc. have been discussed. I think that we can be very transparent about that. The detention takes place in accordance with the rules that the ICC does apply but which are practically identical to the ones that we apply for our accused in Freetown. There have been complaints about the food that he is getting. They have been looked into. We have adjusted the food to a certain extent. I think we also have to stress that he [problem with tape] buy food from a long list of [problem with tape] that basically can be shopped for him, and I think the shopping list is a very extensive one, and he has all the facilities of [problem with tape] no problem with the conditions of detention, including the food situation, etc. And whenever there is an issue that the accused or his Defence counsel wants to raise in relation to detention, we’re always willing to listen to that and see whether there’s any need for improvement. But so far we have been able to make sure that the detention is up to the maximum standards that we feel obliged to implement for Mr. Taylor.

BBC/ASSOCIATED PRESS: Just one question and a follow-up. The family members of Taylor have been asking lately for the intervention of the Court because some of them are on UN travel ban. They cannot go out of the country. They’ve been seeking the intervention of the Court to enable them to attend the trial in The Hague. Is that something that you are considering? The other one which is a follow-up is that you talk about Taylor when he was a rebel leader and then president vis-à-vis the war in Sierra Leone. And when he was rebel leader, of course so many people were with him, some of whom are even in the current government. If in the process some of these people are linked — maybe if Taylor comes out to say that “these people were with me when we were involved in Sierra Leone” — are you saying that it’s Taylor and not other Liberians [as heard]. But if Taylor links other Liberians directly, even those who are in government now, are you going to invite them to be involved in this process?
VON HEBEL: As to issues of family visits, we have elaborated a procedure with the Dutch authorities, and family members can simply apply for a visa and visit Mr. Taylor as much as they want. There have been I think about five or six requests so far of family members coming from this region. Those visas have been processed and they have been able to visit Mr. Taylor. In relation to those family members who may live under a travel ban, that of course is an issue that we as Special Court cannot deal with. The travel ban has been organised by the Security Council, has been imposed by the Security Council. It’s not for the Special Court to undermine or to change those travel bans. It may be for the Security Council to change that, but that is not something that we can do. So that is hopefully in response to your question, and I leave it for the Prosecutor to deal with the second part.

RAPP: As I indicated earlier, it’s not anticipated that we’re going to be prosecuting any other Liberians for the acts in Sierra Leone, nor other Sierra Leoneans. It was the mandate of this Court to prosecute those with the greatest responsibility. Now in Sierra Leone I often go out to public meetings and people say, “here’s an individual living in this district that’s responsible for hundreds of killings. Why aren’t you prosecuting him”? And our response to that is our duty, our mandate, is to go after the very top individuals that were responsible for these crimes, not necessarily their commanders or lieutenants. And in the case of Mr. Taylor, we made the determination that he bears responsibility at that level, and as far as others are concerned we’re not intending to prosecute those by the Court. Now what happens to other individuals in those categories is up very much to the people of Liberia. I’m very much familiar with your Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I met Jerome Verdier, the chairman, when I was here last month, and it’s obviously within that Commission to bring out the truth about what happened in this country, and one of the things that could follow from that would be decisions about prosecutions in Liberia. But that’s not my decision, that’s not an area of my responsibility. It’s a decision for the people of Liberia.

NMEHIELLE: I think it needs to be clarified that it’s because they’re not they’re not allowed to visit. It’s just that the visitation regime as established by the host government creates some practical difficulties for the family, particularly if the visit is such that it has to be one visit at a time. Two people cannot visit at the same time, and the visa has to be a single-entry visa, not a multiple visa. Those are practical difficulties that the families have experienced and have complained to my office, because we are also involved in ensuring the process of visitation in terms of clearance, to facilitate the clearance, to engage with the Registry, receive the applications and transmit them. Those are genuine concerns, and particularly now that we’re going to have the trial there may be the need for much more than one person to visit, the fact that members of Taylor’s family and friends may be required to see the trial in The Hague creates some difficulties. And there is therefore a need to engage with the Dutch authorities to maybe relax some of the possibly stringent or somewhat stringent requirements in terms of issuing visas, to enable, say, multiple visas or enable more than one person to visit at a particular time.

There are other members of Taylor’s family that may not require a visa to visit and therefore those are easily allowed to visit. They ask for permission to visit, they apply to the Registrar for a visit, sometimes through our office, sometimes directly, but mostly through our office. And that comes very easily and they can visit as soon as they are cleared based on the parameters set by the Registry.

But I think where we are trying as much as possible to engage the Dutch authorities who have the responsibility of setting their immigration laws the way they want. But in view of the Security Council resolution regarding access to this trial and ensuring that Taylor’s family have access to him, it may therefore be necessary that the regime should be looked at again to enable a good number of visitors to come and for multiple visas to be issued rather than in the restricted manner that it takes. I think that is the main concern. It is not that there is no visit whatsoever.

DAILY OBSERVER: My question goes to the Defence counsel. Few months ago, the Defence announced that it was not getting the necessary attention in terms of logistics, in terms of other things in order to enhance its work. I would like to know at this time as to whether the Defence for Mr. Taylor is adequately prepared now to shoulder the legal responsibility it has.

NMEHIELLE: I wouldn’t like you to go yet. [TAPE SKIPS] In terms of logistics, what in particular. Do you have any particular reference?

DAILY OBSERVER: If my memory can serve me well, I was privileged to listen to some statement from the Defence counsel suggesting some months ago that indeed there was no office space for the Defence team, and that logistics
that were necessary to enhance the work of the Defence team were not available, and so the counsel made an appeal for offices and other things to be created so as to enhance its capacity. Now I would like to know as the trial gradually approaches whether the Defence counsel now is adequately prepared to meet the tedious legal battle ahead.

NMEHIHELLE: Thank you very much for being very specific. It is always very good to be very specific than generalising, because it’s going to help us to address the issue.

Of course it was that for the main fact that the case was transferred from Freetown to The Hague created logistical problems. The Defence team had an office in Freetown. And the Court itself had no office in The Hague. So it needed some time to establish logistics in relation to the office. Of course as of today the Defence has been allocated an office just like every other section of the Court, allocated an office to enable them to prepare the case.

However, notwithstanding that they did not have an office did not mean they were not working and getting ready for the case. Of course it did impact on their ability to get ready first of all at the first date that was set for April second. One of the reasons why the Court considered the need to move the case forward was because of logistical problems because of lack of office space. And of course we had that initial teething problem in regard to office. That has been resolved. The Defence team has been allocated an office, and on a daily basis things are getting in and ensuring that things happen. The same thing with the Trial Chamber: they had no office prior to this time and things are being set. So the Defence team, I do not know as to the totality of the adequacy, but in the process of establishing a presence in The Hague, ultimately every section of the Court including the Defence teams will have every resource necessary.

The Defence always believes that the resources available to it are not adequate. It always believes that, and it’s an arguable belief at the end of the day whether the resources available to the Defence are entirely very adequate. What I want to say is I think we should be looking at whether or not the resources are reasonable for the Defence to operate. “Adequacy” is a very relative term to a particular situation and to a particular circumstance. It is my role as Principal Defender to ensure that adequate resources are provided by the Court. If the Court does provide it, well and good. If the Court doesn’t provide it, I do not have the ability to whip the Court for not providing it, but I will make sure within my role and duties to ensure that reasonably adequate resources are provided for the Defence, and if it is not I will make a case that it is not. And so far we are doing the best we can.

And mind you, the issue of resources is not determined by me. It is determined by the availability of resources to the entire Court. And the Court in question is one that is funded by voluntary contributions rather than by the regular budget of the United Nations. And of course there have been donors to the Court. And it may well be that depending on how the process lasts there could be donor fatigue whereby there is a tendency to flog a willing horse to death who is ready to give and give and give, but the time comes when the process, if it becomes long, they say “oh, what are you doing about this because the resources are supposed to be drawing down and you are supposed to be finishing”. Again, the amount of money we get is dependent on how willing those who donate to the Court are ready to donate more to the Court.

So the issue of adequacy of resources is quite relative. Logistically speaking, it’s work in progress. Offices have been provided, and we’re working towards ensuring that as much adequate as necessary resources are provided.

RAPP: Let me just add to that, I mean, from the Prosecution’s perspective. We want Mr. Taylor to have an effective defence, and when he moved for a delay in the trial from April we supported it in part. They’ve recently moved for a reconsideration of that and have asked that the trial date be delayed to September. We have said some delay may be merited, but not delay all the way to September. We want to make sure he has the absolutely best possible resources to deal with this case. And as Vincent indicated, we have this issue of voluntary contributions. We from the Prosecutor’s side are very actively involved in helping the Court raise funds, and going around the world and talking about the need to support this Court throughout its existence. You wouldn’t have a fair trial if the Prosecution was able to put on its case and then the money ran out. So it’s critical that we have the resources right to the very end.
That said, let’s keep in mind that – and on the whole issue of Taylor’s representation – he had an absolute right to essentially obtain his own attorney and pay for his own defence. He has basically said whatever his reputation to the contrary was, he doesn’t have available resources, and he’s put himself at the legal aid and the Court has provided him now with I think a chief counsel and an assistant counsel, two legal assistants who are lawyers, an international investigator and I think soon a national investigator, at public expense; an office now at The Hague, an office in Freetown, with the assistance of UNMIL an office in Monrovia. A lot is being done in that area at great expense to make sure that he can present the most effective case. That said, any Defence team that wants to fight the case will always say “it’s not adequate, give us more delay” or “this is a reason why things aren’t going as well as we’d like”. And at the end of the day, no legal system has unlimited resources, and I certainly know of no national system that provides anywhere near that level of essentially Court-paid legal assistance for an accused.

POWER TELEVISION: A court recently ruled in Liberia that properties that were taken from Mr. Taylor’s house after his departure by the Special Court, assisted by UNMIL, should be turned over to the family. Can we then say that the Special Court erred in that direction? “B” to that question, Karim Khan, one of Taylor’s lawyers, recently complained of monitor television in his conference room. Why is the Special Court being so critical about Taylor’s activities in the conference room? Do you still see him though in detention as a threat to The Hague?

RAPP: From the Prosecutor’s standpoint attorney for the Special Court, and everything was filed according to legal procedures. They were contested at the time, and I think the issue moved up to the Supreme Court and I do not recall any objection being raised in terms of their illegality that was sustained by the court. I understand that there’s recently been a Magistrate decision to the contrary by a lower court, but that decision has been stayed at the request of the Solicitor-General. We believe that everything in that search was completely appropriate and we were requesting the assistance of Liberian authorities under their law as is required by the Statute of the Special Court that countries should assist to obtain information that may be valuable for this Prosecution.

Now in regard to the video, understand there was a rule at The Hague with the ICC that their accused, when they conferred with attorneys, would be watched by a video camera, not heard by a video camera, but to prevent the passage of contraband or dangerous substances or illegal things back and forth. Our Court basically determined that that was not appropriate. That order was to be enforced by the ICC. There was a delay in the enforcement of that order I think of about 18 days which was very unfortunate, and we on the Prosecution side didn’t want that particular monitoring going on, and it benefited not one bit from any information gained by it. It is however under everybody’s rules that those conferences between attorneys and clients can be observed visually through a window on the door, but the video camera was viewed, and I think properly so, as more intrusive than an officer standing outside looking through the window.

NEW FOOTPRINT: My question has to do with the onset of the war, as December ’89, December 24, from the onset of the war from [not heard] and what not. It spread out until several thousands of Liberians were killed and maimed and raped. And the head of that revolution was Charles Taylor, which is NPFL. And then by 1990, I think Doe was killed September 9. Then eventually there was a war in Sierra Leone by RUF or what not. And thousands of Liberians died. Why is it that Taylor is not charged for the atrocities caused in Liberia, but in Sierra Leone? Is it because of this so-called blood diamond? They are talking about Taylor’s detention. If the House of Commons vetoes Taylor not to be jailed in Britain, where next?

VON HEBEL: In relation to your first question, I think we can be very brief. The Special Court was established as a cooperation between Sierra Leone and the United Nations for crimes committed on the territory of Sierra Leone. It is in that context that the Special Court investigates and prosecutes Charles Taylor in relation to crimes committed in Sierra Leone.

The question as to whether Mr. Taylor should in addition stand trial probably for crimes allegedly committed by him or on his behalf in Liberia is entirely for the Liberian society and the government to decide. We know that part of the TRC’s mandate is to discuss these matters. We know that those discussions are going on. It is for Liberia to decide whether in addition to the crimes committed in Sierra Leone for which Mr. Taylor is allegedly held responsible, he can also be held responsible for crimes committed in Liberia. But that is not our mandate. We are out of that discussion. That discussion has to take place here in Liberia and by the Liberian government.
As far as we know, there has been indeed a discussion now on the question of the costs for the detention of Mr. Taylor. We take it until now that the Government of the United Kingdom last year already made it quite clear that when Mr. Taylor was to come to The Hague, would have his trial, and if he were to be convicted by the end of the day, he would be going to the UK in order to see his sentence being implemented there. I know of the discussions internally, but we for the time being certainly stick to the decision and the public statement from the Government of the United Kingdom that they will ensure that if Charles Taylor is to be convicted that that sentence will be implemented in the UK.

ANDERSEN: I don’t want to disappoint those who are standing behind you, but I’m afraid that I’m going to have do today if we’re going to keep to time, and time is very much against us. So may I ask you to ask the last question?

ROYAL COMMUNICATIONS: What would the Court want to achieve at the end of the entire trial, and secondly, what mechanism have you put into place avoid reoccurring? For reoccurring of heinous crimes being committed by would-be troublemakers.

RAPP: Well in any case, we see this trial as very important for the rule of law internationally; that basically it will send a signal that a person no matter in what position, no matter how high, no matter how powerful, is subject to justice. And in the past in the world, if you killed one person you would certainly face justice, but if you killed tens of thousands you often escape justice, and that I think led to the perception that people could carry on as they did in this civil war in Liberia and in Sierra Leone, and the result was with the deaths of thousands and the injury to hundreds of thousands. And we think that this kind of trial at the end of the day will help send a message that people can’t do this in the future, and if they do they’ll face justice. And as a result people will live and prosper that otherwise would live in poverty and die. So that’s what we hope to accomplish, and we want to of course make sure that that message gets out and that we do it in a way that’s done at the highest standard possible, both through the respect for the victims and respect for the rights of the accused.
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