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[Open session]
[The accused present]
[Upon commencing at 9.30 a.m.]
PRESIDING JUDGE: Good morning. We will take appearances, please.

MS HOLLIS: Good morning, Madam President, your Honours, opposing counsel. This morning for the Prosecution, Brenda J Hollis, Mohamed A Bangura, Christopher Santora and our case manager, Maja Dimitrova.

MR GRIFFITHS: Good morning, Madam President, your Honours, counsel opposite. For the Defence today, myself Courtenay Griffiths, with me Mr Morris Anyah and Mr Terry Munyard of counsel.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Before we begin, Ms Hollis, I think on Tuesday you had undertaken to let the Court know how much Ionger cross examination would take. Have you been able to work something out yet?

MS HOLLIS: Yes, Madam President. Madam President, the Prosecution's estimate for the remaining cross-examination is seven to eight days. Of course, that is an estimate. We will try to be very efficient with our time. It will of course be dependent on how concise and direct the answers are to the questions that are asked. But that is our estimate, seven to eight days.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. Mr Griffiths, is that helpful?

MR GRIFFITHS: That is extremely hel pful, Madam President, and it will allow us now to organise ourselves in terms of the

|  | 1 | future progress of the trial |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. In which case, Mr Taylor, |
|  | 3 | good morning. I remind you, as we al ways do, of your declaration |
|  | 4 | to tell the truth. |
| 09:32:57 | 5 | DANKPANNAH DR CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR: |
|  | 6 | [On former affirmation] |
|  | 7 | CROSS-EXAMI NATI ON BY MS HOLLIS: [ Continued] |
|  | 8 | Q. Mr Taylor, you recall yesterday 1 was directing your |
|  | 9 | attention to questions and answers that had been elicited in and |
| 09:33:06 | 10 | provided on 16 November 2009. You recall that, Mr Taylor? |
|  | 11 | A. Yes, I do. |
|  | 12 | Q. And, just to remind ourselves, on 16 November 2009 the |
|  | 13 | questions relevant to yesterday were based on your testimony in |
|  | 14 | direct examination that during the time ECOMOG was in Liberia, |
| 09:33:34 | 15 | that force may have numbered as many as 18,000 or 20,000 troops. |
|  | 16 | That was a question that was put to you at page 31752 of 16 |
|  | 17 | November and you were asked if that was correct and you said: |
|  | 18 | "A. Yes, that is fair. At the height of the deployment we |
|  | 19 | were told - and military people may inflate or deflate. We |
| 09:34:02 | 20 | were told at the height of the deployment there were about |
|  | 21 | 18,000 troops. |
|  | 22 | Q. At one point you indicated perhaps a 20,000 figure |
|  | 23 | would be reflected ECOMOG and UN observers, is that right? |
|  | 24 | A. I want to stick closer to the 18 or 20, but that's a |
| 09:34:21 | 25 | reflection of all the military and other observers in the |
|  | 26 | country." |
|  | 27 | You remember that exchange back on 16 November, Mr Taylor? |
|  | 28 | A. I remember that exchange, yes, counsel. |
|  | 29 | Q. And you were also asked at that time that during your |

testimony on direct you talked with the judges about your recollection that at some point these 18,000 or so were deployed throughout your county and you said, "Yes, throughout, throughout." And then you were asked that you had indicated they were deployed throughout your country both before the elections and even after you had taken office and you said, "That is correct. Not throughout my presidency, but, yes, following my election after some months there was a draw down." Do you remember that, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Then it was put to you that the figures of 18 or 20,000 were not accurate, and also that most of the time they were not deployed throughout your country. Do you recall those points being put to you, Mr Taylor ..
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ on 16 November. Then from that flowed a series of questions about numbers relating to ECOMOG at various times and al so numbers relating to United Nations military observers. Mr Taylor, do you recall that beginning on 16 November 2009?
A. I don't recall the date, but $\mid$ recall the overall
discussions that you've described.
Q. And you recall at that time we did not have the benefit of documents to refer to during those questions and answers?
A. That is correct.
Q. And so now, Mr Taylor, we are returning to some of your answers on that topic now that we do have documents to refer to.

All right, Mr Taylor?
A. Okay.
Q. Now, you may recall, Mr Taylor, that on 17 November you
were unable to recall the numbers of Tanzanian and Ugandan troops that came to join ECOMOG by January 1994. Do you recall that, Mr Taylor?
A. That is correct.
Q. If we could please look back at what has now been marked MFI-376, ( believe; the document at tab 67 in annex 3, which is the second progress report of the United Nations Secretary-General on UNOMIL dated 14 February 1994. That is binder 3 of 3 for annex 3. Madam President, 1 believe 1 have that MFI number correct as 376?

PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes, you do.
MS HOLLIS:
Q. We see this second progress report and if we could turn to paragraph 24 of that report, please. That should be on page 5 . We see at paragraph 24, expansion of ECOMOG force, subpart (c) of paragraph 24:
"It will be recalled that, throughout the peace negotiations in Geneva and in Cotonou, the expansion of ECOMOG was viewed as a crucial prerequisite for the implementation of the peace agreement."

Then if we skip down a sentence:
"The battalions from the United Republic of Tanzania, consisting of 773 personnel, and Uganda, consisting of 796 personnel, arrived in Monrovia on 8 January and 28 January 1994 respectively. The Tanzanian battalion, located at Kakata, and the Ugandan battalion, located at Buchanan, are preparing for deployment to the northern and eastern regions of the country. Consultations with the government of Zimbabwe are continuing on the deployment of the third battalion of additional ECOMOG

```
troops."
    So, Mr Taylor, as of January there were 773 personnel from
Tanzania and 796 personnel from Uganda who had joined ECOMOG. Do
you recall that now, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I accept the Secretary-General's explanation.
Q. Mr Taylor, you recall that during these questions and
answers about the presence and numbers of ECOMOG in your country,
we had al so talked about the logistical and other difficulties
that ECOMOG had while they were in country. Do you recall that,
Mr Taylor?
    A. Yes, I do.
    Q. If we could look at paragraph 27, please. That is on page
    6. We see the first sentence:
    "The additional ECOMOG troops have not yet received the
logistic and maintenance support required for their deployment
throughout Liberia."
    And then the last sentence:
    "While | expect that this issue will be resolved shortly,
    ECOMOG is facing major financial difficulties, which are of great
    concern."
    Then if we could look at paragraph 29:
    "The existing ECOMOG troops are also facing difficulties in
    their own logistic support. It should be remembered that the
    present ECOMOG troops have been assisting the peace process in
    Liberia since 1990. This effort is taxing the budgets of the
    contributing countries."
    So, Mr Taylor, again this is a reflection of these
    continuing logistical and financial problems set out by the
    Secretary-General in this report. Yes, Mr Taylor?
```


Q. Now, Mr Taylor, Dr Adebajo goes on to say:
"Charles Taylor gave a hint of the difficult times ahead for the peacekeepers when he warned that only the Liberian National Transitional Government had the power to supervise disarmament. This was contrary to the terms of the Cotonou Agreement, which had given ECOMOG primary responsibility for di sarmament."

Mr Taylor, did you warn that only the Liberian National Transitional Government had the power to supervise disarmament? A. No. That - no. He incorrectly states my position at the time. My position at the time - there were discussions of first forced disarmament, and I said that from a legal standpoint only the government had the power to disarmits army - and I mean through the process of order - but that forced disarmament would not be the right way to go.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, if I could ask that this page be marked as 372 C.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Page 137 of Dr Adebajo's book is marked as MFI-372C.

MS HOLLIS:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, do you recall being asked about a January 1994 meeting in Gbarnga between yourself, the ECOMOG force commander, General Inienger and the Tanzanian army Chief of Staff, and this was at page 31826?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recall, Mr Taylor, also being asked if you recalled making a statement that you would not disarm to the Tanzanians or Ugandans until the transitional government had been installed? Do you recall being asked about that?

09:47:45
A. Yes.
Q. And also you were asked if you again called for a reduction of ECOMOG troops and heavy weapons, and you indicated that you did not recall making such a statement about not disarming to the Tanzanians or Ugandans until the transitional government had been installed, and you also said you did not recall again calling for a reduction of ECOMOG troops and heavy weapons. Do you remember that exchange, Mr Taylor?
A. Vaguely, yes.
Q. Now, if we could look again at number 21 - tab 21 in annex 3, this time at page 138. If we could look at the very top paragraph, please. You see, Mr Taylor, this very top paragraph talks about the ECOMOG field commander, General Mark Inienger, travelling to Gbarnga with Tanzanian chief of army staff General Ki wel u to discuss the disarmament requirements of the Cotonou Agreement with you.
"At this meeting, the NPFL warlord bluntly told both generals that he would not disarm his men to the newly arrived Tanzanian and Ugandan ECOMOG troops until the Liberian National Transitional Government had been installed. He al so continued to call for a reduction of $E C O M O G$ troops and heavy weapons."

Mr Taylor, do you now recall making those statements?
A. First of all, l would like some help, counsel. This
document, where is this from, Adebajo's book?
Q. This is still Dr Adebajo's book, yes, Mr Taylor.
A. Okay, just to be sure, okay. I am not sure if this is the meeting, but in all earnesty, 1 can remember making a statement that $I$ would not, in fact, disarm to ECOMOG until the LNTG was installed. Now, as to whether it is at this specific meeting, I
can't be sure. But I can recall making such a statement that until the transitional government has installed, that the NPFL would not disarm. So I am not sure if this is the meeting, but l can recall making such a statement.

```
Q. Do you recall again calling for a reduction of ECOMOG
```

troops and heavy weapons?
A. I recall making statements of reduction, but $I$ don't recall that it is at this specific meeting, because l made that statement several times. I do recall making that statement. I am just - my problem is this specificity of the date. I can't be sure of the date, but I did make both of those statements.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, would ask that this page 138 be marked as MFI-372D as in delta.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Page 138 is so marked.
MS HOLLIS:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, there were many pronouncements during the time that $E C O M O G$ was in your county to the effect that ECOMOG had insufficient financial support as well as insufficient logistical resources, isn't that correct, Mr Taylor?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And indeed, these problems of logistical and financial resources were echoed throughout the time that ECOMOG was in your country, isn't that correct, Mr Taylor?
A. I wouldn't put it - well, you see, when you say
"throughout" | would just differ a little. I know they were echoed at various points, but when you say "throughout", I can't be sure as to the continuity of such problems. But I do know that they were at different times. Depending on the situation, there were pronouncements of difficulties.

|  | 1 | Q. And those statements of concern about sufficient support |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | certainly were made in 1994; you recall that, yes, Mr Taylor? |
|  | 3 | A. Yes. 1994, yes. |
|  | 4 | Q. And also in 1995? |
| 09:52:46 | 5 | A. 1995? I could say yes. '95 we are about to set up the |
|  | 6 | transitional government. Yes, '95, yes. |
|  | 7 | Q. And indeed, there was a pronouncement that ECOMOG, which |
|  | 8 | had been entrusted with the primary responsibility for |
|  | 9 | supervising the implementation of the peace agreements in |
| 09:53:16 | 10 | Liberia, has been hampered in the performance of this complex |
|  | 11 | task by a lack of financial and logistical resources. That |
|  | 12 | concern was expressed in 1995, wasn't it, Mr Taylor? |
|  | 13 | A. I have just answered you and said yes. |
|  | 14 | Q. Thank you. Now, you will recall we also talked about a 7 |
| 09:53:38 | 15 | March 1994 agreement actually that came about as a result of |
|  | 16 | meetings in Monrovia. You recall us talking about that? That it |
|  | 17 | called for - actually, it wasn't - yes, it was dated 7 March and |
|  | 18 | it called for three things to happen simultaneously: The |
|  | 19 | installation of the Liberian National Transitional Government; |
| 09:54:05 | 20 | disarmament; and deployment of ECOMOG and UNOMIL peacekeepers to |
|  | 21 | all areas of Liberia. You recall we talked about that? |
|  | 22 | A. Yes, that had been my view, yes. |
|  | 23 | Q. And because of these three events agreed upon, it was |
|  | 24 | sometimes referred to as the Triple 7 Agreement, and you |
| 09:54:26 | 25 | indicated that you didn't recall it being known by that name? |
|  | 26 | A. That is correct. |
|  | 27 | Q. Yes? But you do recall that agreement with those three |
|  | 28 | things to occur simultaneously, yes? |
|  | 29 | A. Yes, that was the whole point of my - I do agree that - and |

this was the reason for your first question when 1 said that we would not disarm until a government is installed, then disarmament, and then that. That's correct, I recall that. Q. $\quad \mathrm{Mr}$ Taylor, we also talked about whether you had a recollection of the number of combatants who had been disarmed by mid-May 1994, and you indicated that you did not recall the number of combatants that were disarmed by that time. Do you recall how many had been disarmed as of June 1994?
A. No. It's very difficult now. I know some had been, but I don't know the specific number, counsel.
Q. And if we could perhaps assist in that by looking at MFI-276. That is DCT-184. This is ECOWAS official journal. If we could look at page 23, please. Indeed, perhaps let's look at page 22 first, and that will show us what this is in relation to. We see, Mr Taylor that there is a final report, the second meting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the ECOWAS Committee of Nine on the Liberian crisis at Tunis, Tunisia, 10 June 1994. And then if we look at the next page of this final report, and we see in subpart $I V$, "Report of the situation in Liberia since the signing of the Cotonou Accord", and if we look at paragraph 13:
"The field commander recalled that by the terms of the Cotonou Accord and the Monrovia Agreement of 15 February 1994 , disarmament and demobilisation of the waring factions were to start concomitantly with the installation of the transitional government. The disarmament process started on 8 March 1994 based on the schedule drawn out by ECOMOG and UNOMIL in accordance with Section K, Article 2 of the Cotonou Accord. Out of an estimated number of 60,000 combatants, only 3,000 had been disarmed and demobilised. Generally, the disarmament process,
which had started on a note, had virtually grounded to a halt."
Then at paragraph 14 the field commander gives reasons for the hampering of the disarmament process.

So, $\operatorname{Mr}$ Taylor, as of the time of this final report, 3,000 of the estimated number of 60,000 combatants had been disarmed and demobilised. Do you recall that now, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, now, if you are asking me if I - I agree with this report. As to recalling it - I agree with the report. And I smile because we were busy fighting at that time, dealing with the word concomitant and dealing with it. But $\mid$ know the particular situation, and accept what the ECOWAS report says here about the 3, 000. I still wouldn't be able to say l recall the number, but 1 agree with the 3,000. I agree with the report. Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. Perhaps we could also look at paragraph 8 on page 22, the previous page, at the bottom of that page where:
"The chairman recalled some of the major steps taken toward the i mplementation of the Cotonou Accord and indicates that although significant steps had been taken on the political front, he recounted regretfully that little had been achieved on the military aspects of the accord."

So, Mr Taylor, at this point this was the chairman expressing his regret that little had been achieved on the military aspects of the accord. Yes, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, again, l agree with the account as stated in the document here. I have no reason - this is a Foreign Ministers meeting, I was not there, but $I$ agree with the account.
Q. Then if we could alsolook at tab 68 in annex 3. If we could put the first page of the up, please, and show the very top

|  | 1 | of that page. We see that this is United Nations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Security Council S/1994/1006, dated 26 August 1994, Sixth |
|  | 3 | Progress Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations |
|  | 4 | Observer Mission in Liberia. If we could please look at |
| 10:02:12 | 5 | paragraph 17 of that report: |
|  | 6 | "As a result of the continued fighting and I ack of |
|  | 7 | security, the disarmament process has largely come to a halt. As |
|  | 8 | at 22 August 1994, 3, 612 combatants (out of an estimated total of |
|  | 9 | about 60, 000 ) had been disarmed and demobilised. My special |
| 10:02:52 | 10 | representative has reported that individual combatants have |
|  | 11 | indicated a willingness to disarm but that their leaders seem to |
|  | 12 | be halting the process. Since my last report, only 420 |
|  | 13 | combatants have been disarmed. Faction leaders have not been |
|  | 14 | willing to allow their combatants to disarm, owing to the |
| 10:03:12 | 15 | pervasive at mosphere of mistrust among them, exacerbated by LPC |
|  | 16 | attacks against NPFL." |
|  | 17 | Mr Taylor, as of 22 August 1994 do you accept this figure |
|  | 18 | that only 3,612 combatants had been disarmed and demobilised? |
|  | 19 | A. Yeah, I have no reason to doubt the Secretary-General's |
| 10:03:41 | 20 | report here. |
|  | 21 | Q. And, Mr Taylor, it is also correct, is it not, that you and |
|  | 22 | other leaders of the factions had been halting the disarmament |
|  | 23 | process? |
|  | 24 | A. But l can't speak for the other leaders. I know, because |
| 10:03:56 | 25 | of exactly what the Secretary-General says here, because of |
|  | 26 | attacks on the NPFL, we had shown some delays, but I can't |
|  | 27 | account for the other leaders. |
|  | 28 | Q. So you certainly are in agreement to the extent that |
|  | 29 | because of these attacks by the LPC you had been delaying the |

disarmament of your fighters. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right, Mr Taylor?
A. On my side, that is correct.

MS HOLLIS: If we could ask that this document be marked for identification.

PRESIDING JUDGE: The Si xth Progress Report of the Secretary-General on the UNOMIL, dated 26 August 1994, is marked MFI-377.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Mr Taylor, do you also recall on 17 November l asked you about the merchant ship MV Sea Rose being held in ECOMOG custody? Do you remember that, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes.
Q. That was at page 31854 and 31855 ?
A. Yes, | said | remember that.
Q. And 1 suggested to you, Mr Taylor, that the MV Sea Rose was held in ECOMOG custody because it was a ship that was bringing arms and war material to you, and you denied this. Do you remember that, Mr Taylor?
A. I remember that very well, yes.
Q. | also suggested to you that you were receiving arms and war material from outside Liberia during this time, and you also denied that. Do you recall that, Mr Taylor?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, if we could please look at tab 32 in annex 4, which is "ECOMOG: A Sub-Regional Experience", which was marked for purposes of these questions as MFI-371. If we could look at page 105, please?

PRESIDING JUDGE: For Mr Taylor's benefit, this is the book by Colonel Festus Aboagye.

MS HOLLIS:
Q. Mr Taylor, would you like to see the cover page of that book to remind yourself of it?
A. No, l believe what the President says.
Q. First of all, if we could look at the first paragraph under "Operation Octopus, October 1992":
"The peace process was to take a further dive in late 1992. Especially in September 1992, the NPFL received I arge shipments of weapons and equipment including four tanks, 20 armoured personnel carriers, tons of artillery pieces, anti-aircraft missiles, small arms, and a number of French as well as African mercenaries by both sea and air."

First of all, Mr Taylor, it is correct, is it not, that in September 1992 your NPFL received I arge shipments of weapons and equipment?
A. No.
Q. Mr Taylor, it is correct that you received those both by sea and air, is it not?
A. No. The NPFL throughout - from 1989 until I Ieft office, we never had a tank, we never had an armoured personnel carriage. Never, no. That's not true.
Q. Mr Taylor, do you agree that during that time, September 1992, you received tons of artillery pieces, anti-aircraft missiles, small arms, and a number of French as well as African mercenaries. Do you agree with that?
A. No, I disagree. I disagree. Artillery, we never ordered artillery. We seized all from the armed forces. No, I disagree

but it had no arms. In fact, the Sea Rose, if my recollection is correct, was a rubber - a ship that was being brought in by Firestone, if my recollection is correct, to transport rubber. There was no arms or ammunition on the boat and that whole matter fizzled out.
Q. Mr Taylor, we do see that there is a footnote for that last sentence, footnote 19. If we could look at page 109, please. If we could look at first at footnote 19:
"ECOMOG interceptions of ships with war-like materials or whose captains confessed to delivering such materials to the NPFL should have convinced ECOMOG that Taylor was arming for a major operation, which was bound to be launched in time. An Italian-registered ship flying the flag of Burkina Faso was intercepted in 1991. The captain disclosed that he had sailed from Tripoli with goods including arms and was sailing back to Libya with rubber."

Mr Taylor, that's the ship that you just referred to, is it not?
A. No, no.
Q. Mr Taylor, the foot note goes on:
"A truckload of arms labelled as foodstuffs from Burkina Faso was also detained on the Ivorian border in 1991."

So, Mr Taylor, indeed during this time you were receiving arms and war materiels from outside Liberia. Isn't this correct? A. Well, the way the question is posed, I have never denied that the NPFL received arms from outside of Liberia, small a mounts. Most of our arms were inside. But it's strange here if you look at that footnote, here is a ship - Burkina Faso is a I andlocked country. I don't see how a ship could have sailed to

Burkina Faso and load up and drive to Liberia. It's a Iandocked country, so -

```
    Q. Mr Taylor, it doesn't actually say that. Let's read it
``` again.
A. No, it doesn't, but .-
Q. "An ltalian"..

MR GRIFFITHS: Madam President, can I inquire, given the content of that footnote, whether this is being put forward for i mpeachment purposes or as proof of guilt?

PRESIDING JUDGE: Does it really matter? Does it matter?
MR GRIffITHS: In our submission, it does because if it is for the latter purpose then it seems to us that its incumbent on my learned friend to justify the use of that material.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Because, Mr Griffiths, the Chamber has consistently said in referring to passages in these document that really the intention or purpose for which a piece of a paragraph is read out is really immaterial when it comes to its use. That if you stand up and object in time to its use, the Chamber can consider those submi ssions regardless of the intention for which the paragraph is read. So when you ask what does the Prosecution intend to use it for, l think it's the wrong question. Are you objecting?

MR GRIFFITHS: Well, I am objecting, and the reason for the objection and the belated nature of my intervention is this: The footnote to which - I was not aware that my Iearned friend would be referring to footnote number 19 because it's not obvious on page 105.

PRESIDING JUDGE: But it is marked in the margin of this document.

MR GRIFFITHS: I know it's marked in the margin on page 109, but I wasn't aware that she would - my I earned friend would be referring to it in conjunction with this particular passage, otherwise \(l\) would have intervened at a much earlier stage. But it seems to us, given the content of that footnote, that we are here talking about material which goes to guilt, and in our submission, it is - my learned friend should justify its admission or use at this stage.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, would you like to respond, please?

MS HOLLIS: May I suggest that before | respond I actually be allowed to also go to footnote 18, which is what 1 was going to do next, because l believe they are the same issue, and so we could address both of them together.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Well, you can't. You can't go to use 18 unless we have settled the issue of footnote 19 . So please address me or respond to the objection in relation to footnote 19 first.

MS HOLLIS: All right. First of all, Madam President, we would suggest that the objection based on footnote 19 shows the difficulty of the situation because there has not yet been an objection to page 105, which talks about the seizure of the Sea Rose, a German ship believed to be ferrying to Gbarnga. So that also talks about supplies to Gbarnga, and al so the paragraph above talking about the shipment of weapons and equipment in September 1992. And I would suggest to your Honours that Defence counsel's initial question when he stood up is of significance in your determination on this matter, and that is, it is of significance when you are considering this matter to determine
the purpose for which this information will be asked to be used.
Now, we i n our marking have not indicated the letters I and G, and as we had explained in the disclosure cover letter, only those sections we would ask to be used for the purpose of both i mpeachment and guilt would be marked, and they would be marked " |" and "G". So the Prosecution's intended purpose for this footnote was for i mpeachment and we had made prior arguments, both as to the interest of justice and the right to fair trial, that materials that we are using for i mpeachment would not violate the accused's right to fair trial, and it is in the interest of justice to do so.

Those arguments are on the record. We would rely on those arguments, and we would suggest that indeed the purpose for which this information will be requested to be used should be a factor that your Honours consider when you are looking at this two-prong test about potential probative value. We are not asking that it be considered for guilt.

We believe that those are significant factors that would sway the balance i n favour of the use of these materials, both as in the interest of justice and as not violative of the rights of this accused to a fair trial. That would be my response, Madam President.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Pleaselet me confer with my colleagues on this.
[Trial Chamber conferred]
PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Griffiths, we are trying to understand your objection. When we look at the footnote, in i ight of the passage and our interpretation thereof, we are trying to understand how foot note 19 goes to guilt. Could you clarify that
for me, please?
MR GRIFFITHS: Well, we are here talking about the i mportation of arms at or about a time when, it is suggested by the Prosecution, this defendant was engaged in providing assistance to the RUF. And even though 1 note that it is not within the indictment period, nonetheless, much evidence has been called by the Prosecution in relation to that issue. So to that extent, in our submission, it's relevant to guilt.
[Trial Chamber conferred]
PRESIDING JUDGE: We've conferred. First of all, let me say this: In our decision of 30 November and in subsequent oral decisions, the Chamber has made it very clear that in determining objections based on the content of a document and its use in Court in cross-examination, the intention or purpose for which the Prosecution intends it is immaterial and irrelevant in our determination of whether the document will or will not be used.

What is relevant and what is important is whether potentially the passage contains material that is probative of guilt. It's not the intention for which it is meant, but rather the content.

Now, in this particular case, we are of the opinion that footnote 19, read together with the passage on page 105, is definitely capable of proving the guilt of the accused, and therefore footnote 19 cannot be used in this way. Because as far as we are concerned, the two-fold test in our decision of 30 November has not been illustrated by the Prosecution.

MS HOLLIS:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, if we go back to page 105, the first part of the paragraph under "Operation Octopus", October 1992, and we
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & see the sixth line down also gives us a footnote 18. Do you see \\
\hline & 2 & that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 3 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. If we could go back to page 109 to foot note 18, which is \\
\hline 10:26:03 & 5 & referred to in reference to these large shipments of weapons by \\
\hline & 6 & sea and air. We see footnote 18: \\
\hline & 7 & "An unmarked Russian plane arrived at Robertsfield with six \\
\hline & 8 & French and these weapons on 25 August 1992 prior to a shipment of \\
\hline & 9 & the four tanks and anti-aircraft missiles".. \\
\hline 10:26:32 & 10 & MR GRIFFITHS: I am sorry \\
\hline & 11 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Griffiths. \\
\hline & 12 & MR GRIFFITHS: Madam President, can I indicate that my \\
\hline & 13 & objection to footnote 19 equally applies to my objection to \\
\hline & 14 & footnote 18. Note the date August 1992, at a time when, \\
\hline 10:26:57 & 15 & according to this Prosecution, this defendant was earnestly, to \\
\hline & 16 & borrow a word, engaged in supporting the RUF. In our submission, \\
\hline & 17 & this too potentially goes to guilt, and in our submission, it \\
\hline & 18 & behoves the Prosecution to justify their use of this material. \\
\hline & 19 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, do you have anything \\
\hline 10:27:21 & 20 & additional to respond? \\
\hline & 21 & MS HOLLIS: No, Madam President, we would rely on our \\
\hline & 22 & previous arguments. \\
\hline & 23 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. \\
\hline & 24 & [Trial Chamber confers] \\
\hline 10:27:37 & 25 & PRESIDING JUDGE: By a majority on the Bench, we disallow \\
\hline & 26 & the use of footnote 18 for the same reasons \\
\hline & 27 & MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I would ask that you mark page \\
\hline & 28 & 105. \\
\hline & 29 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Page 105 of Mr Aboagye's book is marked \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MFI-371B.
MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, going back to the number of military observers in your country. It is correct, is it not, that by mi d-September 1995, only about 52 United Nations military observers were in the country, isn't that correct?
A. Counsel, l will rely on all the evidence that \(\mid\) have given regarding these numbers. I have no way of confirming or denying the proposition put because 1 don't recall or 1 am not on top of the internal United Nations activities. But I admit, if there is a United Nations document that shows that, I will have no reason to dispute it. But \(I\) personally cannot recall the exact numbers. Q. Could we please look at tab 184 in annex 1, again being mindful that, since the tab sheets only go up to 100 , it will be marked as 84 in binder 3 of annex 1 . This will be the Twelfth Progress Report, dated 13 September 1995. If we see, this is United Nations Security Council S/1995 ..

PRESIDING JUDGE: Could you please hold on while we find our way there.

MS HOLLIS: Sorry, Madam President. This would be binder 3 in annex 1. It should be marked as 84 inside the binder as the tab numbers do not go above 100 .

PRESIDING JUDGE: I am afraid we don't appear to have that particular folder. Could our legal officers search for binder 3 of 3 , please?

MS HOLLIS: It would be binder 3 for annex 1.
PRESIDING JUDGE: Is it possible for the Presiding Judge to have a physical copy?

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, if they can't find it we do
```

have a clean copy we can provide you.
PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, we found the document. Please
proceed.
MS HOLLIS: Thank you:
Q. We see the first page, "United Nations Security Council
S/1995/781, 13 September 1995, Twelfth Progress Report of the
Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in
Liberia." If we could please first go to paragraph 15. We see
paragraph 15:
"In section VII of my last report (S/1995/473), I informed
the Security Council of my intention to withdraw those UNOMIL
military observers who, in the absence of a ceasefire and the
resumption of disarmament, could not perform their monitoring
functions effectively."
And then if we could look at annex 2 of this report, which
should be at page 13, and if we could have the top portion of
that as well, we see the composition of military component of
UNOMIL as at 31 August 1995 and in the far right column we see
total 52, and under observers we see 45. So, Mr Taylor, do you
accept as of 31 August 1995 there were a total of the military
component of UNOMIL of 52 in Liberia?
A. Based on this annex l have no reason to dispute the
Secretary-General's report on this issue.
Q. And of that 52, 45 were observers and seven were personnel
fulfilling other duties?
A. Well, it says "others" here, so l will just stick with what
the Secretary-General says.
Q. All right. Now, if we could also look at paragraph 43 of
this report:

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & "ECOMOG, which has been entrusted with the primary \\
\hline & 2 & responsibility for supervising the implementation of the peace \\
\hline & 3 & agreements in Liberia, has been hampered in the performance of \\
\hline & 4 & this complexion task by a lack of financial and logistical \\
\hline 10:38:08 & 5 & resources. Such resources are necessary if ECOMOG is to deploy \\
\hline & 6 & across the country, ensuring respect for various aspects of the \\
\hline & 7 & Abuja Agreement." \\
\hline & 8 & So, Mr Taylor, again we see on the part of the \\
\hline & 9 & Secretary-General this expression of concern about the lack of \\
\hline 10:38:28 & 10 & financial and logistical resources for ECOMOG, correct? \\
\hline & 11 & A. That is correct in this paragraph, yes. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. And that such resources are necessary if ECOMOG is to \\
\hline & 13 & deploy across the country. The Secretary-General also expresses \\
\hline & 14 & that concern, yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 10:38:46 & 15 & A. As expressed here, that is correct. \\
\hline & 16 & Q. Now, Mr Taylor, if we could alsolook at paragraph 10 of \\
\hline & 17 & this report which indicates that the new Council of State was \\
\hline & 18 & i naugurated on 1 September in Monrovia. Was that the date that \\
\hline & 19 & the new Council of State was inaugurated in 1995, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 10:39:25 & 20 & A. I have no reason to doubt this. I don't have - I don't \\
\hline & 21 & specifically remember the date, but I have no reason at this \\
\hline & 22 & point to doubt what the secretary-General says here. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Thank you. Finally, if we could look at paragraph 16 of \\
\hline & 24 & this report, which would be on page 4, and we see, this is the \\
\hline 10:40:03 & 25 & premise: \\
\hline & 26 & "In accordance with the Cotonou Peace Agreement and \\
\hline & 27 & exchange of letters, ECOMOG is responsible for providing security \\
\hline & 28 & to unarmed United Nations military observers and civilian staff. \\
\hline & 29 & This remains the basic premise for all United Nations operations \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & in Liberia. Hence, the proposed deployment of additional UNOMIL \\
\hline & 2 & personnel will depend on ECOMOG's ability to guarantee and \\
\hline & 3 & provide effective security for these personnel." \\
\hline & 4 & So here, Mr Taylor, the Secretary-General is reiterating \\
\hline 10:40:41 & 5 & that their ability to deploy additional personnel would depend on \\
\hline & 6 & ECOMOG's ability to guarantee and provide effective security, \\
\hline & 7 & yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 8 & A. I agree with that assessment, yeah. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. And that was true throughout the relationship that existed \\
\hline 10:41:00 & 10 & in Liberia between the UN military observers and ECOMOG. Is \({ }^{\prime}\) 't \\
\hline & 11 & that correct? \\
\hline & 12 & A. No, I can't say that with certainty. I'mresponding to \\
\hline & 13 & this particular passage. I cannot say with certainty that this \\
\hline & 14 & was true throughout. I cannot say that with certainty. \\
\hline 10:41:22 & 15 & MS HOLLIS: Madam President, could I ask that this document \\
\hline & 16 & be marked for identification. \\
\hline & 17 & PRESI DING JUDGE: The Secretary-General's Twelfth Progress \\
\hline & 18 & Report on UNOMIL, dated 13 September 1995, is marked MFI-378. \\
\hline & 19 & MS HOLLIS: \\
\hline 10:41:55 & 20 & Q. Now, Mr Taylor, you may recall that on 17 November 1 also \\
\hline & 21 & asked you about the agreement that ECOMOG strength would be \\
\hline & 22 & increased up to 12,000, the mi ni mum number they said they \\
\hline & 23 & required. Do you recall that? \\
\hline & 24 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 10:42:14 & 25 & Q. And also that by October 1995 UNOMIL had only about 50 \\
\hline & 26 & mil itary observers in county, and you indicated you could not \\
\hline & 27 & recall the number. Do you remember that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 28 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. Now if we could look at tab 69 in annex 3. We see on the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & screen, "United Nations Security Council S/1995/881, dated 23 \\
\hline & 2 & October 1995, Thirteenth Progress Report of the Secretary-General \\
\hline & 3 & on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia." And if we \\
\hline & 4 & could please look at page 6 of this document we see under subpart \\
\hline 10:44:21 & 5 & \(V\), concept of operations \\
\hline & 6 & "(a) Deployment of the Economic Community of West African \\
\hline & 7 & States Monitoring Group and the United Nations Observer Mission \\
\hline & 8 & in Liberia." \\
\hline & 9 & And if we look at paragraph 25: \\
\hline 10:44:37 & 10 & "In order to fulfil these tasks, ECOMOG plans to increase \\
\hline & 11 & its strength to 12,000 all ranks and to deploy its forces to nine \\
\hline & 12 & safe havens (6, 600 all ranks), 10 to 13 assembly sites ( 3,400 all \\
\hline & 13 & ranks), and at 14 border crossing points (2000 all ranks)." \\
\hline & 14 & So this is indicating that ECOMOG planned to increase its \\
\hline 10:45:13 & 15 & strength to 12, 000 , correct, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 16 & A. That's what, yeah - that's what they are saying in this \\
\hline & 17 & paragraph, yes. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. And it gives the various strengths at various locations. \\
\hline & 19 & Do you accept these numbers as set out by the Secretary-General, \\
\hline 10:45:32 & 20 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 21 & A. I have no reason to doubt them. \\
\hline & 22 & Q. Now if we look at paragraph 27: \\
\hline & 23 & "In order to implement this concept of operations, it is \\
\hline & 24 & estimated that approximately 160 military observers will be \\
\hline 10:45:50 & 25 & needed." \\
\hline & 26 & So at this point in time, Mr Taylor, the United Nations is \\
\hline & 27 & determining that 160 military observers will be needed. Do you \\
\hline & 28 & see that? \\
\hline & 29 & A. Yes, I see what the Secretary-General says here. It's \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & still internal to them, that's what l'm saying. Yes, I see that. \\
\hline & 2 & Q. And you remember yesterday in relation to an earlier \\
\hline & 3 & document it had been estimated that 303 military observers would \\
\hline & 4 & be required; you remember that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 10:46:21 & 5 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. And then if we look at page 8, paragraph 35, under \\
\hline & 7 & "Resource requirements of the Economic Community of West African \\
\hline & 8 & States Monitoring Group": \\
\hline & 9 & "ECOMOG has estimated that it would require some 12,000 \\
\hline 10:46:48 & 10 & troops to carry out its concept of operations. Its current \\
\hline & 11 & strength is 7, 269 all ranks. It will therefore require an \\
\hline & 12 & additional 4,731 troops." \\
\hline & 13 & So, Mr Taylor, do you accept that as of the 23 October \\
\hline & 14 & 1995, ECOMOG had estimated it would require some 12,000 troops to \\
\hline 10:47:17 & 15 & carry out its concept of operations? \\
\hline & 16 & A. Yes, I see what the Secretary-General says. I will believe \\
\hline & 17 & him. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. And do you accept that the current strength of ECOMOG at \\
\hline & 19 & that time was 7, 269 all ranks? \\
\hline 10:47:31 & 20 & A. If that's what he says, I agree. \\
\hline & 21 & Q. Meaning that ECOMOG would require an additional 4,731 \\
\hline & 22 & troops? \\
\hline & 23 & A. I think it's an operational decision, so l agree with his \\
\hline & 24 & report. I have no reason to doubt what he is saying. \\
\hline 10:47:48 & 25 & Q. And if we could, please, look at paragraph 37. \\
\hline & 26 & "It will be recalled that a severe shortage of logistic \\
\hline & 27 & support was a main reason for the inability of ECOMOG to carry \\
\hline & 28 & out its task under the cotonou Agreement. As the chairman of \\
\hline & 29 & ECOWAS and I have stated repeatedly, it is imperative to the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. You may recall that on 17 November I also asked you that if you remember that as of mid-December of the same year, 1995, you did not yet have a full deployment for the UNOMIL observers, and you responded that you could not remember whether there was a full deployment at that time or not. Do you remember that .. A. Yes, I do.
Q. \(\quad .-\mathrm{Mr}\) Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And if we could please look at tab 8 in annex 3 . It should be S/1995/1042.

PRESIDING JUDGE: I have this as marked MFI-329. It's marked MFI-329.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Now, if we could please look at this document. If we could just first put the first page on so that we are sure of what we are looking at. Again, that is S/1995/1042, 18 December 1995, "Fourteenth Progress Report of the Secretary-General". If we could look at paragraph 13, please, under "Deployment of UNOMI L and ECOMOG":
"Major General Mahmoud Tal ha, Egypt, assumed the duties of Chief Military Observer of UNOMIL on 7 December 1995. In its resolution 1020 (1995), the Security Council authorised a maximum deployment of 160 military observers. The total military strength of UNOMI L is currently 71 observers (see annex)."

And then it indicates that recently arrived observers have enabled UNOMIL to strengthen its presence at the field stations in Buchanan and Kakata and to create mobile teams for Monrovia and Tubmanburg.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & It further indicates that the Monrovia team has started \\
\hline & 2 & operating; the Tubman team has not yet been deployed, and it \\
\hline & 3 & talks about - the final sentence: \\
\hline & 4 & "Further deployment of UNOMIL military observers will \\
\hline 10:55:05 & 5 & depend on the deployment of ECOMOG troops and progress in the \\
\hline & 6 & peace process." \\
\hline & 7 & So, Mr Taylor, do you accept that as of the date of this \\
\hline & 8 & report there were currently 71 observers in country in Liberia? \\
\hline & 9 & A. I have no reason to doubt it, so l accept what the \\
\hline 10:55:27 & 10 & Secretary-General says. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. And then if we look at paragraph 14: \\
\hline & 12 & "In accordance with the schedule of implementation of the \\
\hline & 13 & Abuja Agreement, the deployment of ECOMOG and UNOMIL was to have \\
\hline & 14 & commenced on 2 October and to have been completed by 14 December \\
\hline 10:55:48 & 15 & 1995. Owing to the lack of logistic resources, ECOMOG troops \\
\hline & 16 & were not able to deploy beyond their present area." \\
\hline & 17 & So, Mr Taylor, again noting that lack of Iogistic resources \\
\hline & 18 & was preventing ECOMOG troops from further deploying; correct, \\
\hline & 19 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 10:56:12 & 20 & A. Well, 1 wouldn't put it quite that way based on your \\
\hline & 21 & proposition. I think what the Secretary-General is saying here, \\
\hline & 22 & that ECOMOG troops could not deploy beyond their present areas. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Correct. \\
\hline & 24 & A. Now, l would have to know what their present areas are to \\
\hline 10:56:28 & 25 & agree with your proposition. So l would want to just stick with \\
\hline & 26 & the l anguage of what the Secretary-General is saying, because the \\
\hline & 27 & areas - I see two areas mentioned here, but in a previous report \\
\hline & 28 & that carried a number a little higher than this, l just observe \\
\hline & 29 & that this is still, what, the \(14 t h\) or 15 th report. But the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & report previous to this had another number that al so named \\
\hline & 2 & another area. So I am not sure of the areas the \\
\hline & 3 & Secretary-General is referring to here, but l take his word that \\
\hline & 4 & they cannot be deployed beyond their present areas, not knowing \\
\hline 10:57:13 & 5 & the specific areas he is referring to. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. And, Mr Taylor, if we look up at paragraph 10: \\
\hline & 7 & "Although the ceasefire has generally held and no \\
\hline & 8 & widespread or protracted fighting has been reported, recurrent \\
\hline & 9 & skirmishes were reported between NPFL and ULIMO-K in the areas \\
\hline 10:57:39 & 10 & around Suakoko, Gbarnga and Saint Paul River bridge in October." \\
\hline & 11 & Do you remember those skirmishes in October 1995, \\
\hline & 12 & Mr Taylor, between your forces and ULIMO-K? \\
\hline & 13 & A. Yes, there were al ways little skirmishes around, yeah. \\
\hline & 14 & Q. "Since the signing of the memorandum of understanding \\
\hline 10:58:03 & 15 & between Mr Taylor and Mr Kromah on 30 November, hostilities \\
\hline & 16 & between the factions have reportedly ceased." \\
\hline & 17 & And this report, as we said, Mr Taylor, is as of 18 \\
\hline & 18 & December 1995, so some short time after your memorandum of \\
\hline & 19 & understanding between yourself and Mr Kromah, yes? \\
\hline 10:58:29 & 20 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 21 & Q. And if we could please turn to the annex at page 8. We \\
\hline & 22 & see, "Composition of military component of the United Nations \\
\hline & 23 & Observer Mission in Liberia as at 15 December 1995", and under \\
\hline & 24 & the Total column we see 71 total personnel, under the Observers \\
\hline 10:58:59 & 25 & we see 64. Do you accept those figures, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 26 & A. Yes, I have no reason not to. I do. \\
\hline & 27 & Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. Now, Mr Taylor, on 17 November we \\
\hline & 28 & also talked about an increase in UNOMIL strength as of \\
\hline & 29 & mid-January 1996 and you were asked if you recall that as of \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & January 1996 UNOMI L strength had increased to about 82 people and \\
\hline & 2 & you indicated you could not recall. Do you remember that \\
\hline & 3 & exchange, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 4 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline 10:59:42 & 5 & Q. If we could please look at tab 45 in annex 3. This is \\
\hline & 6 & S/1996/232. We see, "United Nations Security Council S/1996/232, \\
\hline & 7 & 1 April 1996, Sixteenth Progress Report of the Secretary-General \\
\hline & 8 & on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia" and if we \\
\hline & 9 & could look at paragraph 25, please. Under paragraph 25 we note \\
\hline 11:01:42 & 10 & that: \\
\hline & 11 & "UNOMI L currently has a total strength of 93 military \\
\hline & 12 & observers. The UNOMIL disarmament team withdrew from Tubmanburg \\
\hline & 13 & on 30 December 1995 because of fighting between ECOMOG and \\
\hline & 14 & ULIMO-J. It was redeployed to that area on 31 January but was \\
\hline 11:02:09 & 15 & withdrawn a second time, on 2 March, following the withdrawal of \\
\hline & 16 & ECOMOG troops the previous day without prior notice to UNOMIL. \\
\hline & 17 & The UNOMI L mobile and disarmament teams which withdrew from \\
\hline & 18 & Kakata on 8 March because of fighting between NPFL and ULIMO-J \\
\hline & 19 & were redeployed there on 23 March." \\
\hline 11:02:32 & 20 & Mr Taylor, do you accept that as of this report UNOMIL had \\
\hline & 21 & a total strength of 93 in country? \\
\hline & 22 & A. Yes, I accept what the Secretary-General says here. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. And do you recall the withdrawal of the UNOMIL disarmament \\
\hline & 24 & team from Tubmanburg because of the fighting between ECOMOG and \\
\hline 11:02:59 & 25 & ULIMO-J? \\
\hline & 26 & A. Yes, I do. I don't recall the date, but I do recall the \\
\hline & 27 & incident, yes. \\
\hline & 28 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, it wasn't between ECOMOG an \\
\hline & 29 & ULIMO-J. It was between NPFL and ULIMO-J \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & THE WITNESS: No, your Honour. It's between - there was \\
\hline & 2 & fighting between ECOMOG and ULIMO-J. \\
\hline & 3 & MS HOLLIS: Fighting between ECOMOG and ULIMO-J. I am \\
\hline & 4 & l ooking at paragraph 25, they withdrew from Tubmanburg on 30 \\
\hline 11:03:31 & 5 & December because of fighting between ECOMOG and ULIMO-J. \\
\hline & 6 & PRESIDING JUDGE: That's the earlier part of that \\
\hline & 7 & paragraph. I was referring to the latter part of the paragraph. \\
\hline & 8 & MS HOLLIS: Yes and I was about to ask about that: \\
\hline & 9 & Q. Do you recall, Mr Taylor, the military observers \\
\hline 11:03:53 & 10 & withdrawing from that area a second time on 2 March because of \\
\hline & 11 & the withdrawal of ECOMOG troops from that area? Do you recall \\
\hline & 12 & that? \\
\hline & 13 & A. You are saying 2 March? \\
\hline & 14 & Q. "It was redeployed to the area on 31 January 1996 but was \\
\hline 11:04:14 & 15 & withdrawn a second time, on 2 March, following the withdrawal of \\
\hline & 16 & ECOMOG troops the previous day." \\
\hline & 17 & Do you recall the UN observers withdrawing from Tubmanburg \\
\hline & 18 & a second time because ECOMOG had also withdrawn from that area? \\
\hline & 19 & A. Yes. The date l'm not sure, but there was a second \\
\hline 11:04:34 & 20 & withdrawal, yes \\
\hline & 21 & Q. And you also accept the UNOMIL mobile and disarmament teams \\
\hline & 22 & withdrawing from Kakata on 8 March because of fighting between \\
\hline & 23 & NPFL and ULIMO-J? \\
\hline & 24 & A. I don't remember the exact date, but there is evidenceled \\
\hline 11:04:54 & 25 & here substantially on this. The NPFL, because of the obstruction \\
\hline & 26 & of ULIMO-J, moved into Kakata, expelled them and asked the \\
\hline & 27 & peacekeepers to redeploy. I amvery aware of this. The date, I \\
\hline & 28 & don't recall the date, but l recall the incident. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. And you recall the UNOMIL mobile and disarmament teams then \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & redeploying to that area later in March? \\
\hline & 2 & A. Yes, about 10 to 14 days later they - we turned the place \\
\hline & 3 & over to them, yes. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. And we see in paragraph 26, "UNOMIL is currently deployed \\
\hline 11:05:32 & 5 & in Monrovia, Buchanan" - and how do you pronounce this last one, \\
\hline & 6 & Mr Taylor, S-U-E-H-N? \\
\hline & 7 & A. Suehn. \\
\hline & 8 & Q. Suehn is in what county? \\
\hline & 9 & A. It's in Montserrado County. Well, I guess l could be \\
\hline 11:05:52 & 10 & wrong. No, I'm sorry. It's in Bomi County just on the border \\
\hline & 11 & between Bomi and Montserrado. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. And do you accept that as of the time of this report they \\
\hline & 13 & were deployed in Monrovia, Buchanan and Suehn? \\
\hline & 14 & A. Yes, l agree. \\
\hline 11:06:11 & 15 & Q. "Regular patrolling, investigations of ceasefire violations \\
\hline & 16 & and monitoring of the overall military and security situation \\
\hline & 17 & remain the main tasks of the military observers." \\
\hline & 18 & And indeed that was their main task in country, isn't that \\
\hline & 19 & correct, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 11:06:28 & 20 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 21 & Q. "UNOMIL will redeploy to Tubmanburg as soon as the security \\
\hline & 22 & situation stabilis ses. Deployment to Greenville is expect to take \\
\hline & 23 & place shortly, as soon as logistic requirements have been moved \\
\hline & 24 & by ship to the area. UNOMIL deployment in other areas is \\
\hline 11:06:46 & 25 & contingent upon ECOMOG deployment, as well as the security \\
\hline & 26 & situation. It should be noted, however, that LNTG has insisted \\
\hline & 27 & on clearing UNOMI L's deployments and has not al ways provided the \\
\hline & 28 & cooperation required on a timely basis." \\
\hline & 29 & And it is correct, is it not, Mr Taylor, that LNTG had \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & insisted on clearing UNOMI L's deployments? \\
\hline & 2 & A. Yes \\
\hline & 3 & Q. Indeed it would be fair to say that LNTG had not al ways \\
\hline & 4 & provided the cooperation that was required on a timely basis. \\
\hline 11:07:25 & 5 & That would be fair to say at that time, isn't that correct, \\
\hline & 6 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 7 & A. Well, this is a subjective thing, but l wouldn't argue with \\
\hline & 8 & the Secretary-General, but timely is a question, but l wouldn't \\
\hline & 9 & disagree with him. \\
\hline 11:07:40 & 10 & Q. Then if we could please look at the annex on page 11. Here \\
\hline & 11 & we see, "Composition of the military component of UNOMIL as at 25 \\
\hline & 12 & March 1996" and under the Total column we see 93 and then under \\
\hline & 13 & the Observer column we see 86. Yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 14 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline 11:08:17 & 15 & Q. Before we move on from this document, if we could move back \\
\hline & 16 & to page 5, paragraph 24, please. We see here this paragraph is \\
\hline & 17 & talking about deployment of ECOMOG as of the time of this report \\
\hline & 18 & and it says: \\
\hline & 19 & "At present, ECOMOG is deployed in Monrovia, Gbarnga, \\
\hline 11:08:53 & 20 & Buchanan, Greenville, Kakata, Suehn and Konola. ECOMOG has \\
\hline & 21 & received an additional infantry battalion from Nigeria, \\
\hline & 22 & increasing its total strength from approximately 7,000 to 7, 500 \\
\hline & 23 & troops, as well as three helicopters and 20 trucks as part of the \\
\hline & 24 & Iogistic assistance pledged by the United States of America." \\
\hline 11:09:22 & 25 & So, Mr Taylor, do you accept that as of the time of this \\
\hline & 26 & report ECOMOG's total strength had grown to 7, 500 troops? \\
\hline & 27 & A. I have no reason - I don't know the details, but I have no \\
\hline & 28 & reason to doubt what the Secretary-General says here. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. This would still, of course, leave them understrength by \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

reduced, but you did not know the numbers. Correct, Mr Taylor? A. That is correct. Q. You also indicated, Mr Taylor, that most of the looting in Monrovia in your view was carried out by civilians, correct? A. Well, I am not sure if I said "most". I could have said "most", but civilians carried out a lot of looting, yeah. Q. If we could please look at tab 6 in annex 3, Liberian TRC final report. Yesterday, for purposes of these questions, we l believe had that marked MFI-373?

PRESIDING JUDGE: That's the correct MFI.
MS HOLLIS:
Q. If we could look, please, at page 129. If we could please I ook at the bottom of that page, the ninth line down in the last paragraph with the sentence that begins, "Factional fighting which erupted in Monrovia on April 6." Do you see that, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes.
Q. \(\quad\) Factional fighting which erupted in Monrovia on April 6, 1996, proved very destructive as Taylor, Kromah, and ECOMOG battled to subdue former ULIMO-J Ieader, Roosevelt Johnson, in a power play bordering on revenge and the guise of enforcing the rule of law. The 100-day fighting was notorious for its bloody i mpact, economic devastation, and the resultant humanitarian disaster with over 80,000 internally displaced people seeking refuge at the US Greystone compound in Mamba Point, Monrovia. The unresolved cross-factional issues of Kromah, combined with Taylor's political mischief, and the miscalculation of Johnson's resistance, which, when combined with the support from the LPC and the remnants of the AFL soldiers in the BTC, proved most
formidable for the big two and their accomplices. The untold suffering, property damage and death toll devastated Monrovia and collapsed LNTG II. This was, perhaps, the worst fighting in three years. Death toll was high as all civil society activists in Monrovia went underground to protect themselves. The prison was broken into as newspaper offices were burned. Monrovia was massively looted by all factions, and the warehouses and offices of international relief organisations and the \(U N\) were not spared. A total of 489 vehicles commandeered from the United Nations and other aid agencies at value put at US \$8.2 million, constraining further assistance to a population desperately in need."

So, Mr Taylor, that is an accurate depiction of the results of the fighting that began on 6 April 1996, is it not, Mr Taylor? A. That is a very mischievous lie. I could say to you, counsel - I could put it this way: There are about 25 different issues l could deal with in this paragraph, but because you have couched it as one, I disagree with that paragraph.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I would ask that this page be marked for identification, and l believe we are at \(B\) as in bravo. This is page 129.

PRESIDING JUDGE: The TRC report on Liberia, pages 129 and 130, are marked for identification MFI-373B.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, also in relation to these events and the consequences of these events, if we could look at tab 70 in annex 3, please. This should be \(5 / 1996 / 362\). If I said 70 , I misspoke. It should be - may I consult for a moment, Madam President? 362 is number 71.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes, we found the document.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam Presiden \\
\hline & 2 & Q. And we see this is United Nations Security Council \\
\hline & 3 & S/1996/362, dated 21 May 1996, "Seventeenth Progress Report of \\
\hline & 4 & the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in \\
\hline 11:19:43 & 5 & Liberia", and if we could look at, initially, paragraph 2: \\
\hline & 6 & "The deterioration of the peace process in Liberia \\
\hline & 7 & throughout the first months of the year, as described in my last \\
\hline & 8 & report, culminated on 6 April in the eruption of fighting in \\
\hline & 9 & Monrovia. In my letter to the President of the security council \\
\hline 11:20:14 & 10 & dated 22 April (S/1996/312), । described the widespread looting \\
\hline & 11 & and complete breakdown of I aw and order which ensued. Despite a \\
\hline & 12 & short lull, hostilities have continued since 6 April, seriously \\
\hline & 13 & jeopardising the Abuja peace process." \\
\hline & 14 & Mr Taylor, at paragraph 3 it describes the genesis of the \\
\hline 11:20:45 & 15 & crisis, indicating it was sparked off by the attempted arrest of \\
\hline & 16 & General Roosevelt Johnson, the leader of the ULIMO-J, but \\
\hline & 17 & indicates that the underlying causes are much deeper. It talks \\
\hline & 18 & about skirmishes between Alhaji Kromah's and General Johnson's \\
\hline & 19 & wi ngs of ULIMO and between the National Patriotic Front of \\
\hline 11:21:13 & 20 & Liberia (NPFL) and the Liberian Peace Council (LPC) have recently \\
\hline & 21 & created discord among members of the Council of State. \\
\hline & 22 & "As I arge number of fighters came into Monrovia, \\
\hline & 23 & purportedly to protect their leaders, security in the city \\
\hline & 24 & deteriorated." \\
\hline 11:21:31 & 25 & Now, Mr Taylor, it is correct, is it not, that large \\
\hline & 26 & numbers of fighters came into Monrovia around the time of the \\
\hline & 27 & 6 April commencement of fighting purportedly to protect you and \\
\hline & 28 & other faction leaders? \\
\hline & 29 & A. Well, l wouldn't say so. For me, the - I did order NPFL \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & forces to assist ECOMOG in trying to arrest Johnson, not \\
\hline & 2 & specifically to protect me. So this, "as purportedly to \\
\hline & 3 & protect", that was not my intent at the time. I did order forces \\
\hline & 4 & to combat Johnson forces and to arrest him, but not to protect \\
\hline 11:22:23 & 5 & me. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. Mr Taylor, l believe you have told the judges about that \\
\hline & 7 & before. Who did you bring into Monrovia to do this? \\
\hline & 8 & A. The NPFL forces. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. Do you remember which of those force you brought in? \\
\hline 11:22:34 & 10 & A. I brought a combination of different units. The Marines \\
\hline & 11 & division came in. We brought in, I think, some individuals from \\
\hline & 12 & the army division and probably the navy division. \\
\hline & 13 & Q. And how many personnel did you bring in? \\
\hline & 14 & A. I could have brought as many as 5,000 men into \\
\hline 11:23:05 & 15 & Q. And you brought them in from what bases or locations? \\
\hline & 16 & A. From the Kakata area, from the Buchanan area, and the \\
\hline & 17 & general Gbarnga area. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. So it talks about the large number of fighters came into \\
\hline & 19 & Monrovia. \\
\hline 11:23:36 & 20 & "At the same time the Council of State seemed determined to \\
\hline & 21 & assert itself in ways contrary to the spirit of the Abuja \\
\hline & 22 & Agreement, reportedly against the advice of some of its own \\
\hline & 23 & members. It adopted protocols under which the transitional \\
\hline & 24 & government would be called the 'the Government of Liberia' and \\
\hline 11:23:55 & 25 & the Council of State the 'collective presidency'." \\
\hline & 26 & And indeed, the transitional government did adopt such \\
\hline & 27 & protocols, yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 28 & A. Which protocols now? \\
\hline & 29 & Q. The protocols under which the transitional government would \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & be called "the Government of Liberia" and the Council of State \\
\hline & 2 & "the collective presidency"? \\
\hline & 3 & A. Yes, that is correct. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. "Mr Taylor and Al haji Kromah begin referring to their \\
\hline 11:24:25 & 5 & forces as government forces as they went into the ULIMO-J \\
\hline & 6 & strongholds of Kakata and Tubmanburg in mid-March, asserting that \\
\hline & 7 & they were hel ping the ECOMOG to maintain security in those \\
\hline & 8 & areas." \\
\hline & 9 & And indeed, it is correct, Mr Taylor, is it not, that you \\
\hline 11:24:41 & 10 & referred to your forces that you were using for this purpose as \\
\hline & 11 & government forces? \\
\hline & 12 & A. Well, they were no longer my forces. They were government \\
\hline & 13 & forces. I am a member of the council. And counsel, may j just \\
\hline & 14 & add: In a previous question that you asked - and these things \\
\hline 11:25:01 & 15 & come back to bite - when you read a paragraph and l said there \\
\hline & 16 & were so many things, but because you couched it in words, I would \\
\hline & 17 & say no. Now, l would like for you to know and the Bench to know \\
\hline & 18 & that within that paragraph there are some factual things in that \\
\hline & 19 & paragraph, and I don't want to mislead the Court when I said I \\
\hline 11:25:24 & 20 & disagree because of the way you couched it. But since you didn't \\
\hline & 21 & get into details \\
\hline & 22 & Q. This, Mr Taylor, was the \\
\hline & 23 & A. It's passed now. I'm just reminding \\
\hline & 24 &  \\
\hline 11:25:38 & 25 & A. That is correct, yes, for the record. \\
\hline & 26 & Q. Pages 129 to 130? \\
\hline & 27 & A. I guess that's it. When I said to you, I said the way you \\
\hline & 28 & couched it, I have to disagree. Now, I don't want this to come \\
\hline & 29 & back later and say, well - because there are some factual things \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
in there, but there are so many things and there were so many issues. So, generally - but there are some factual points, if you had broken them down. I just wanted that for the record. Q. Mr Taylor, perhaps before the morning break we could go back to be sure that we are clear and we would go back to the Liberian TRC, pages 129 to 130. That should be at tab 6 in annex 3. It has been marked as 373B.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, are we done with this document?

MS HOLLIS: No, but since Mr Taylor has gone back to this other, I thought perhaps we would clear this up before we moved on.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Perhaps at this moment it is proper for me to mention, Ms Hollis, as we proceed in this manner, we are spending a lot of time finding files, documents, jumping fromone file to another, cumulatively we are spending a lot of unnecessary time this way. But this is compounded by the way questions are asked in a compounded manner, as Mr Taylor has now shown, that when you compound a question with so many statements, we are now going back and forth. What would help is if when you bring out a document, you ask questions that are not compounded, a single question relating to a single fact. I remember he did raise this objection back and you just passed it by and now we are spending time finding our way back into these volumes. Please proceed.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, we are now again on page 129 of the Liberian TRC final report, volume 2, and you recall we had begun at the bottom paragraph with the "factional fighting which

Q. Mr Taylor, at the break we were looking at page 129 of the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission final report, volume 2. If we could have that put on the screen again, and if you would also please bring page 130.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, just remind me of the tab.
MS HOLLIS: Sorry, Madam President. This is tab 6 of annex 3, and we're looking at pages 129 and 130. It has been previously been marked as MFI-373B. If we could look at the bot 0 om of that page, please:
Q. At the break we had just finished talking about the statement of over 80,000 internally displaced people seeking refuge at the Greystone compound. Remember, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I remember that.
Q. The next sentence:
"The unresolved cross-factional issues of Kromah, combined with Taylor's political mischief and miscalculation of Johnson's resistance, which, when combined with support from the LPC and remnants of \(A F L\) soldiers in the BTC, proved most formidable for the big two and their accomplices."

First of all, do you know anything about what they're referring to here, "The unresolved cross-factional issues of Kromah"?
A. No, I don't. I don't know.
Q. And do you agree with this statement, "combined with

Taylor's political mischief"?
A. I disagree with that. "Combined with Taylor's mischief," ।
disagree with that.
Q. Do you agree there was a miscalculation of Johnson's resistance?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & A. That's an opinion that - to an extent I can agree - there \\
\hline & 2 & were - yes, l could agree with the miscalculation of his \\
\hline & 3 & resistance. I can agree with that part. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. "And the miscalculation of Johnson's resistance, combined \\
\hline 12:04:49 & 5 & with support from the LPC and remnants of AFL soldiers in the \\
\hline & 6 & BTC". So, Mr Taylor, did the LPC support Johnson? \\
\hline & 7 & A. Yes, the LPC did. \\
\hline & 8 & Q. And remnants of AFL soldiers in the BTC, did they also \\
\hline & 9 & support him? \\
\hline 12:05:06 & 10 & A. Well, the AFL did. I would disagree with "remnants", but \\
\hline & 11 & the AFL did. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. "Proved most formidable for the big two and their \\
\hline & 13 & accomplices." It's talking about you Al haji Kromah, I believe, \\
\hline & 14 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:05:20 & 15 & A. No, l think they are tal king about more than that, counsel. \\
\hline & 16 & Q. What "big two" do you think they're talking about? \\
\hline & 17 & A. They'retalking about Kromah and Taylor, but their \\
\hline & 18 & accomplices, you know, is the part that you didn't \\
\hline & 19 & Q. Do you agree that this combination we've just mentioned of \\
\hline 12:05:35 & 20 & Johnson, LPC, AFL proved formidable? \\
\hline & 21 & A. I would agree with that part. The accomplices here l think \\
\hline & 22 & would be ECOMOG. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. \(\quad\) The untold suffering, property damage and death toll \\
\hline & 24 & devastated Monrovia." Do you agree with that? \\
\hline 12:05:54 & 25 & A. Well, no. The way it's put, l would disagree. If it was \\
\hline & 26 & put to me like the untold suffering caused some damages. When it \\
\hline & 27 & says "devastated Monrovia", that's also subjective. I would have \\
\hline & 28 & - I don't know the interpretation of what they mean "devastated". \\
\hline & 29 & Whether it's total, in part, or what, they didn't state. So l \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
have some disagreement with the way it is put.
Q. And did this lead to the collapse of LNTG I।?
A. No, it did not at all.
Q. "This was perhaps the worst fighting in three years." Do you agree with that?
A. No, I wouldn't agree. I wouldn't agree.
Q. "The death toll was high, as all civil society activists in Monrovia went underground to protect themselves." Do you agree with the death toll was high?
A. Again, yeah, l would say. There were a lot of deaths. I can't get specifics. | think when we started this a couple of days ago numbers came up, if l'm right about this. But there was a high death toll.
Q. Do you agree that all civil society activists in Monrovia went underground to protect themselves?
A. No, that's not true.
Q. "The prison was broken into"; do you agree with that?
A. I'm not sure, excuse me, because the prison is in the Barclay Training Centre, the BTC. The prison is within that, and that's where the barracks is. The Armed Forces of Liberia, the prison is in their barracks, so cannot say with any certainty that it was broken into.
Q. "As newspaper offices were burned"; do you agree with that?
A. Well, again, l - there were a few offices that may have been burned. I don't have any knowledge of the specific ones, but again l'm more concerned about how these things come out at the end when you lawyers begin to argue. When it says "newspaper offices were burnt" without specifying which offices, for me this is almost total, which is not the case. If you say "some offices
were burned", I would agree.
Q. "Monrovia was massively looted by all factions"; do you agree with that?
A. I would agree.
Q. "And the warehouses and offices of international relief organisations and the \(U N\) were not spared"?
A. I would agree.
Q. "A total of 489 vehicles commandeered from the UN and other aid agencies at a value put at US \$8.2 million"?
 the exact quantities.
Q. And the taking of these vehicles constrained further assistance to a population desperately in need. Do you agree with that?
A. That assessment, I think, is - one can accept that, yes.

MS HOLLIS: Now, Madam President, at the risk of incurring your wrath, I would ask that your Honours go back to tab 71 in annex 3, \(\quad\) / \(1996 / 362\).

PRESIDING JUDGE: This is the Seventeenth Progress Report of the Secretary-General?

MS HOLLIS: That is correct, Madam President, dated 21 May 1996, S/1996/362:
Q. If we could please move to paragraph 19, "Deployment of UNOMI L":
```

"Prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Monrovia, UNOMIL

```
mi I itary personnel were deployed in Monrovia, Buchanan, Kakata and Suehn. See annex lV. Following the outbreak of fighting, 88 of the mi ssion's 93 mi litary observers were relocated to freetown and Dakar with the assistance of the United States government. The military observers deployed to the field stations at kakata and Suehn were escorted by ECOMOG to Monrovia on 13 April."

Now, Mr Taylor, do you recall as a result of the outbreak of this fighting 88 of the mission's 93 military observers being relocated out of Liberia?
A. No, I don't know the specifics but I - this l can accept from the Secretary-General about the inner workings and their number and dates and places. I don't have a quarrel with that. Q. And the military observes deployed to the field stations at Kakata and Suehn being escorted by ECOMOG to Monrovia on 13 April, do you accept that?
A. I will accept that. I don't know the [overlapping speakers].
Q. \(\quad\) Those at Buchanan returned to Monrovia by sea on 14 April on board an ECOMOG ship." Do you accept that?
A. I will accept what he says. I don't knowit is as a fact, I mean, as it occurred, but a acept what the secretary-General says.
Q. "Most of these military observers have now been repatriated. However, 10 remai \(n\) on standby in Freetown and wil। return to Monrovia as soon as conditions permit."

Mr Taylor, do you accept that number and that they are on standby i \(n\) Freetown as of this report?
A. \(\quad\) accept his explanation.
Q. \(\quad\) "Five military observers (including the chief military
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & observer) remain in Monrovia." Do you accept that? \\
\hline & 2 & A. I would accept that. \\
\hline & 3 & Q. And then we look at "Deployment of the Economic Community \\
\hline & 4 & of West African States Monitoring Group" and at paragraph 20: \\
\hline 12:13:12 & 5 & "ECOMOG was not able to halt the hostilities when they \\
\hline & 6 & er upted on 6 April. It maintained that the fighting was a matter \\
\hline & 7 & between the factions and that it could not intervene in view of \\
\hline & 8 & its limited manpower and resources, as well as the nature of its \\
\hline & 9 & mandate as a peacekeeping force. Given these constraints, ECOMOG \\
\hline 12:13:31 & 10 & was also unable to provide protection for United Nations \\
\hline & 11 & personnel and property." \\
\hline & 12 & Now, Mr Taylor, it is correct, is it not, that ECOMOG was \\
\hline & 13 & unable to halt the hostilities commencing on 6 April? \\
\hline & 14 & A. Well, the way the Secretary-General puts it here, 1 \\
\hline 12:13:51 & 15 & disagree with the Secretary-General because ECOMOG was a part of \\
\hline & 16 & the fighting. So to say that they were fighting - helping to \\
\hline & 17 & arrest Johnson, and by the same token saying that they were \\
\hline & 18 & unable to stop it, l think is a misnomer. So l would disagree \\
\hline & 19 & with what the Secretary-General says here. \\
\hline 12:14:08 & 20 & Q. Mr Taylor, they are talking about the hostilities \\
\hline & 21 & commencing on 6 April. You see that, yes? \\
\hline & 22 & A. Yes. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. And it's also true, is it not, Mr Taylor, that ECOMOG \\
\hline & 24 & maintained the fighting was a matter between the factions and \\
\hline 12:14:21 & 25 & that it, ECOMOG, could not intervene in view of its limited \\
\hline & 26 & manpower and resources. \\
\hline & 27 & A. I disagree. \\
\hline & 28 & Q. That was their position, was it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 29 & A. No, no, I'm not - no, it's impossible. ECOMOG was a part \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & of a fighting on the 6th. So to say here that they had Ii mited \\
\hline & 2 & and they could not maintain, ECOMOG, the NPFL and ULIMO-K were \\
\hline & 3 & the forces that were ordered by the council to arrest johnson. \\
\hline & 4 & So I disagree with what the Secretary-General says here. \\
\hline 12:14:53 & 5 & Q. Mr Taylor, it's also correct, is it not, that given these \\
\hline & 6 & constraints, ECOMOG was unable to provide protection for united \\
\hline & 7 & Nations personnel and property? \\
\hline & 8 & A. Well, I can't speak to that. I can't speak to that. If \\
\hline & 9 & the Secretary-General feels that there were constraints that they \\
\hline 12:15:12 & 10 & could not - I was not a ware of ECOMOG's inability to providing \\
\hline & 11 & protection for the United Nations personnel and property in \\
\hline & 12 & Monrovia. \\
\hline & 13 & Q. Mr Taylor, if we look at paragraph 21, the very bottom line \\
\hline & 14 & of the paragraph on that page speaking of ECOMOG: \\
\hline 12:15:35 & 15 & "It has not been able to deter the massive movement of \\
\hline & 16 & fighters in and out of the city centre from other areas." \\
\hline & 17 & That was correct, was it not; ECOMOG was unable to deter \\
\hline & 18 & this movement of fighters? \\
\hline & 19 & A. As the Secretary-General puts it here, it's a bit \\
\hline 12:15:51 & 20 & confusing, sol have to disagree. I have to disagree because \\
\hline & 21 & this also suggests again that ECOMOG is probably not a part of \\
\hline & 22 & the fighting, and so l would disagree. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Indeed, Mr Taylor, they were not part of the fighting, were \\
\hline & 24 & they? \\
\hline 12:16:07 & 25 & A. They were. You just read a previous statement where it \\
\hline & 26 & says that ECOMOG, ULIMO-K and the NPFL were involved in that, in \\
\hline & 27 & a previous statement, which l agreed with. \\
\hline & 28 & Q. Now, Mr Taylor, if we can look at continue with this \\
\hline & 29 & paragraph on page 6: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & "ECOMOG deployed in central Monrovia as fighters started to \\
\hline & 2 & withdraw from the city, establishing checkpoints and undertaking \\
\hline & 3 & patrols." \\
\hline & 4 & That was correct, was it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:16:34 & 5 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. "Fighters continued to move freely, however, and when the \\
\hline & 7 & ceasefire broke down on 29 April, ECOMOG withdrew to specific \\
\hline & 8 & Iocations in sufficient numbers to deter attack from the \\
\hline & 9 & factions." \\
\hline 12:16:49 & 10 & So, first of all, even after ECOMOG had established \\
\hline & 11 & checkpoints and undertaken patrols, fighters continued to move \\
\hline & 12 & freely, did they not? \\
\hline & 13 & A. After the ceasefire, l would disagree with that. After the \\
\hline & 14 & ceasefire, I was in Monrovia. The ceasefire occurred. I would \\
\hline 12:17:06 & 15 & disagree with that \\
\hline & 16 & Q. And the ceasefire broke down on 29 April. Isn't that \\
\hline & 17 & correct? \\
\hline & 18 & A. No, l would disagree. \\
\hline & 19 & Q. And at that time ECOMOG withdrew to specific locations in \\
\hline 12:17:16 & 20 & sufficient numbers to deter attack from the factions. Isn't that \\
\hline & 21 & correct? \\
\hline & 22 & A. No. To the best of my recollection, once we had a \\
\hline & 23 & ceasefire, that remained in place. I was about the only council \\
\hline & 24 & person left in Monrovia with the chairman of the council. So \\
\hline 12:17:31 & 25 & there was a ceasefire and it stayed in place. \\
\hline & 26 & Q. Mr Taylor, at the time of this report, ECOMOG was deployed \\
\hline & 27 & on Bushrod Island and maintained a presence at the \\
\hline & 28 & telecommunications headquarters. Isn't that correct? \\
\hline & 29 & A. At the time of the report? I don't understand the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & question, but let me just say \\
\hline & 2 & Q. Well, at the time of this report, which was 21 May 1996. \\
\hline & 3 & A. Yes, in a way. ECOMOG was al ways deployed on Bushrod \\
\hline & 4 & Island. That was their headquarters, yes. \\
\hline 12:18:02 & 5 & Q. And they also had a presence on the two bridges l eading to \\
\hline & 6 & the north and at the airport? \\
\hline & 7 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 8 & Q. And they also maintained a presence at the seaport and \\
\hline & 9 & around the Riverview compound? \\
\hline 12:18:13 & 10 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. What was the Riverview compound? \\
\hline & 12 & A. Riverview compound was where United Nations personnel \\
\hline & 13 & l ived. That was a United Nations personnel Iodging headquarters, \\
\hline & 14 & so they remained around there because they had to provide \\
\hline 12:18:33 & 15 & protection at Riverview. That's out at the OAU area in Virginia. \\
\hline & 16 & Q. Mr Taylor, if we look at paragraph 22: \\
\hline & 17 & "Outside Monrovia, ECOMOG has continued to maintain its \\
\hline & 18 & presence in Buchanan and Kakata." \\
\hline & 19 & That was correct, was it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:18:55 & 20 & A. I would agree, yes. \\
\hline & 21 & Q. "However, ECOMOG has completely withdrawn from Gbarnga, Bo, \\
\hline & 22 & Tiene and Sinje." That was correct as well, yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 23 & A. From Gbarnga, I can say yes. Bo, Tiene and Sinje, I would \\
\hline & 24 & just have to take the Secretary-General's word for it because \\
\hline 12:19:08 & 25 & that's ULIMO-J area, so l'm not aware of what they are doing on \\
\hline & 26 & that side, but I would have to accept what the Secretary-General \\
\hline & 27 & says. As to my knowledge, I can account for Gbarnga, Kakata and \\
\hline & 28 & Buchanan. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. And ECOMOG had reduced its strength in Buchanan and Kakata \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & to provide reinforcements for Monrovia? \\
\hline & 2 & A. I would agree. I would agree. \\
\hline & 3 & Q. Now, if we could look at paragraph 28, please. It is under \\
\hline & 4 & the caption "Looting of United Nations Equipment": \\
\hline 12:19:47 & 5 & "As noted above, UNOMI L and all United Nations agencies \\
\hline & 6 & have been systematically looted by fighters from all factions \\
\hline & 7 & since 6 April." \\
\hline & 8 & That was correct, was it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 9 & A. I agree. That's correct. \\
\hline 12:19:59 & 10 & Q. And that included your NPFL? \\
\hline & 11 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. "Fighters cleaned out all the United Nations offices, \\
\hline & 13 & damaged the buildings and looted United Nations warehouses." And \\
\hline & 14 & that was correct as well, yes? \\
\hline 12:20:12 & 15 & A. I would say yes, partly correct. I would maybe - you know, \\
\hline & 16 & the Secretary-General would add civilians, but it's not just done \\
\hline & 17 & by fighters, would just be a comment, but l agree with what he \\
\hline & 18 & says, that there is looting. \\
\hline & 19 & Q. "Some 80 per cent of UNOMIL vehicles were taken and many \\
\hline 12:20:32 & 20 & were destroyed." That was correct as well, yes? \\
\hline & 21 & A. I don't know that as a fact. There were United Nations \\
\hline & 22 & vehicles that were taken. Whether it was 80 per cent, I have no \\
\hline & 23 & knowledge of that. \\
\hline & 24 & Q. "A large number of accoutrements bearing the United Nations \\
\hline 12:20:49 & 25 & insignia were stolen by fighters who took to wearing the blue \\
\hline & 26 & berets and other United Nations emblems." \\
\hline & 27 & That's correct, is it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 28 & A. Yes, I remember seeing a few and they really got dealt with \\
\hline & 29 & for doing that, yes. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Q. UUNOMIL telephones, computers, photocopiers, communications \\
\hline & 2 & equipment and general consumable items, including goods related \\
\hline & 3 & to demobilis sation were all | ooted." \\
\hline & 4 & Correct, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:21:16 & 5 & A. I would say yes. There was massive looting, yes. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. "UNOMIL is currently estimating the value of looted goods \\
\hline & 7 & and equipment. At least three months would be required to \\
\hline & 8 & rebuild the mission's logistic base." \\
\hline & 9 & Do you accept that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:21:33 & 10 & A. I accept his - yes. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. "My special representative has urged the faction leaders to \\
\hline & 12 & ensure that the vehicles and equipment looted from UNOMIL, the \\
\hline & 13 & United Nations agencies and non-governmental organisations are \\
\hline & 14 & returned." \\
\hline 12:21:51 & 15 & And, indeed, the special representative did urge you to do \\
\hline & 16 & that, as well as the other faction leaders, yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 17 & A. I speak for me. I know I was told. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. "The faction leaders have asserted that it would be \\
\hline & 19 & difficult to retrieve the loot from the fighters." That's \\
\hline 12:22:06 & 20 & correct, is it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 21 & A. No, well, l would say, on my side, we did retrieve some \\
\hline & 22 & vehicles, sol cannot speak for the other leaders. But the NPFL \\
\hline & 23 & did retrieve a lot of UN property and returned it. \\
\hline & 24 & Q. And then at the very last sentence: "It is unlikely, \\
\hline 12:22:29 & 25 & however, that a substantial amount of equipment will be \\
\hline & 26 & returned." \\
\hline & 27 & A. But he did say just above that that subsequently some \\
\hline & 28 & equipment, marketable items and other things, were retrieved. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. And that was because they were loaded - they learned they \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
were I oaded on ships destined for certain West African ports, correct?
A. Well, not exactly.
Q. That's what they say.
A. Well, not exactly because l did return a lot of the things.
Q. "Even so, after UNOMIL received information that some United Nations equipment was loaded on to ships destined for certain West African ports, it requested the concerned governments to assist the United Nations in retrieving the goods. Subsequently some equipment, mostly small marketable items, was retrieved."

That's what it says there, yes, Mr Taylor?
A. That's what it says. What he fails to say, that it was in fact, those things were looted by ECOMOG. It was a Nigerian ship carrying those things that were seized.
Q. And if we could look, please, at page 10, paragraph 45:
"At their recent meeting at Accra, the ECOWAS Foreign Mi nisters reaffirmed the Abuja Agreement as the only basis for peace in Liberia and agreed upon a number of steps necessary to resume its implementation."

Mr Taylor, did you have representatives at this meeting?
A. Yes, the transitional government, yes. Yes.
Q. "ECOWAS warned the faction leaders that if they did not i mplement those steps it would reconsider its involvement in Liberia at its next summit meeting scheduled for early August 1996."

And that indeed was a warning that was given, correct,
Mr Taylor?
A. That is correct.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Q. "The withdrawal of ECOMOG from Liberia could be \\
\hline & 2 & catastrophic not only for the country but also as for the \\
\hline & 3 & sub-region as a whole. \\
\hline & 4 & 46. Should ECOWAS be compelled to take the decision to \\
\hline 12:24:54 & 5 & disengage from Liberia and withdraw ECOMOG, UNOMIL would have no \\
\hline & 6 & choice but to do the same. Therefore l strongly urge the \\
\hline & 7 & Liberian faction leaders to consider carefully the wide ranging \\
\hline & 8 & consequences that their actions during the next two months will \\
\hline & 9 & have and in this light to implement immediately the measures \\
\hline 12:25:10 & 10 & agreed upon by ECOWAS at Accra." \\
\hline & 11 & Now, Mr Taylor, at page 11, paragraph 49, we see the \\
\hline & 12 & mandate for UNOMI L, but the note that, "In the present insecure \\
\hline & 13 & and unstable conditions that prevail in Monrovia and throughout \\
\hline & 14 & Liberia, there is little that UNOMIL can accomplish with respect \\
\hline 12:25:56 & 15 & to these objectives." So, Mr Taylor, you see this being voiced \\
\hline & 16 & by the Secretary-General that at this time there is little that \\
\hline & 17 & UNOMI L could accomplish in support of those objectives? \\
\hline & 18 & A. Yeah, but 1 think this is in consonance with the previous \\
\hline & 19 & paragraph where everyone agreed that a situation had to prevail \\
\hline 12:26:25 & 20 & where peace would come. Now, I think this is being shown as \\
\hline & 21 & and I don't want to predict what the Secretary-General is \\
\hline & 22 & referring to here, but he could be referring to the period of \\
\hline & 23 & 6 April into the ceasefire. I'm projecting. But beyond that, I \\
\hline & 24 & have said to this Court that stability prevailed and that's what \\
\hline 12:26:51 & 25 & led to the elections. \\
\hline & 26 & Q. Indeed, Mr Taylor, if we look at paragraph 53, which \\
\hline & 27 & discusses - this is on page 12 - the involvement of UNOMIL: \\
\hline & 28 & "I have stressed from the very beginning that the role \\
\hline & 29 & foreseen for UNOMIL in Liberia was predicated upon the assumption \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & that ECOMOG would be in a position to perform the wide ranging \\
\hline & 2 & task entrusted to it. Unfortunately, ECOMOG never received the \\
\hline & 3 & manpower and resources necessary to enable it to carry out its \\
\hline & 4 & responsibilities effectively. It would be an illusion to think \\
\hline 12:27:33 & 5 & that this innovative model of peacekeeping will be able to \\
\hline & 6 & succeed in Liberia, especially under current conditions, unless \\
\hline & 7 & sufficient and reliable sources of funding are provided to \\
\hline & 8 & ECOMOG, and unless the force is strengthened and structured in a \\
\hline & 9 & manner that will enable it to carry out its task as a \\
\hline 12:27:54 & 10 & professional peacekeeping force." \\
\hline & 11 & Do you, Mr Taylor, accept those comments by the \\
\hline & 12 & Secretary-General? \\
\hline & 13 & A. Yes, in a way l can agree with him. And l think that was \\
\hline & 14 & done. \\
\hline 12:28:05 & 15 & Q. And if we could please look at annex 2 at page 15. And we \\
\hline & 16 & see "Composition of the Military Component of the United Nations \\
\hline & 17 & Observer Mission in Liberia". At 5 April 1996, it shows 93 as a \\
\hline & 18 & total. At 15 May 1996 in Monrovia it shows 5 as a total and on \\
\hline & 19 & standby in Freetown it shows 10 as a total. Do you accept those \\
\hline 12:28:44 & 20 & figures, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 21 & A. Yes, with a little addition for the court. I think this \\
\hline & 22 & reflects from 5 April. The fighting starts on - this reflects \\
\hline & 23 & the period of the fighting, really. At the beginning, before the \\
\hline & 24 & fighting starts, and at the end. I agree with that \\
\hline 12:29:03 & 25 & MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I would ask that this document \\
\hline & 26 & be marked for identification. \\
\hline & 27 & PRESI DING JUDGE: The Seventeenth Progress Report of the \\
\hline & 28 & Secretary-General, dated 21 May '96, is marked MFI-381. \\
\hline & 29 & MS HOLLIS: Thank you: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, in relation to the damage done to the media facilities, could we please look at tab 32 in annex 4. This is again the ECOMOG book at pages 124 and 125 . If we look at the bottom of page 124, about mi dway down we see the caption "The 6 April 1996 mayhem in Monrovia". Do you see that, Mr Taylor, just for a frame of reference?
A. Yes, I do see that. I'm sorry, I keep bothering you about the source of this document. Which area is this from now? Q. This one is not Dr Adebajo. Instead, it is Lieutenant Colonel Aboagye.
A. Okay, just for the record, okay.
Q. That book "ECOMOG: A Sub-Regional Experience in Conflict Resolution".
A. Okay.
Q. Yes, Mr Taylor? Now if we would turn, please, to page 125, and if we would look at the last sentence of the paragraph that is continued at the top of that page:
"Additionally, all the media facilities, except the NPFL-controlled Kiss FM radio station, were vandalised."

That is correct, is it not, Mr Taylor?
A. No, that is totally, totally incorrect. No.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, if I could ask that this be marked for identification, and this book, l believe it would be 371 C .

PRESIDING JUDGE: Right. Aboagye's book at page 125 is marked 371 C .

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, \(\quad\) would ask that you include page 124 simply to show the "6 April 1996" heading.

PRESIDING JUDGE: So that would be pages 124 to 125 of this
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & 1 & book is marked MFI-371C. \\
\hline & 2 & MS HOLLIS: Thank you: \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{12:32:54} & 3 & Q. Mr Taylor, you may recall that on 17 November we also \\
\hline & 4 & discussed the strengthening of ECOMOG and UNOMIL after the 6 \\
\hline & 5 & April fighting, and I suggested to you that by October 1996 \\
\hline & 6 & ECOMOG had some 7, 500 troops in Liberia. Do you remember that, \\
\hline & 7 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{12:33:31} & 8 & A. Yes, I can remember questions along those lines, yes. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. And that by November the number remained less than the \\
\hline & 10 & 12,000. Do you remember that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 11 & A. Yes, vaguely, yes, I remember that. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. And 1 also suggested to you that about 10 UNOMIL military \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{12:33:58} & 13 & observers were in Liberia as of October 1996 and some 24 \\
\hline & 14 & additional observers were expected to arrive. Do you recall \\
\hline & 15 & that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 16 & A. Yes. \\
\hline & 17 & Q. And perhaps we could look at tab 72 in annex 3, the \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{12:35:30} & 18 & Nineteenth Progress Report of the United Nations \\
\hline & 19 & Secretary-General. This is dated 17 October 1996. \\
\hline & 20 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Please proceed. \\
\hline & 21 & MS HOLLIS: \\
\hline & 22 & Q. We see this is United Nations Security Council S/1996/858 \\
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{12:35:51} & 23 & dated 17 October 1996, Ni neteenth Progress Report of the \\
\hline & 24 & Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in \\
\hline & 25 & Liberia. Then if we could please to page 4, paragraph 19, and we \\
\hline & 26 & see this paragraph is under "Deployment of ECOMOG and UNOMIL": \\
\hline & 27 & "The current force strength of ECOMOG is estimated at some \\
\hline & 28 & 7,500 all ranks ..." Mr Taylor, would you accept that figure as \\
\hline & 29 & of the date of this report? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & A. I would accept what the Secretary-General says, but \\
\hline & 2 & counsel, let's just - for the record now, l'm sure this is being \\
\hline & 3 & done to impeach something that I said, but you've stated to me in \\
\hline & 4 & this Court your questions. I haven't heard my response, but if I \\
\hline 12:36:43 & 5 & recall, my response was that l did not know the inner workings \\
\hline & 6 & and had no specific knowledge of the exact numbers. \\
\hline & 7 & Q. I think indeed that was your general response \\
\hline & 8 & A. Very well. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. \(\quad . \quad\) to those questions, that you didn't know these numbers \\
\hline 12:36:59 & 10 & A. Okay. Very well. But I accept what the Secretary-General \\
\hline & 11 & says here. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. \(\quad\)... 7,500 all ranks and is deployed in Monrovia, Kakata \\
\hline & 13 & and Buchanan and the Po River area". Do you accept that, \\
\hline & 14 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:37:19 & 15 & A. I would accept that \\
\hline & 16 & Q. And if we look at paragraph 21: \\
\hline & 17 & "UNOMI L's current military strength consists of 10 military \\
\hline & 18 & observers who perform the following duties in pursuance of their \\
\hline & 19 & mandate ..." \\
\hline 12:37:35 & 20 & And it lists the duties. But would you accept the numbers, \\
\hline & 21 & Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 22 & A. Yes. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Ten military observers? \\
\hline & 24 & A. Yes, 1 think the Secretary-General had said in a previous \\
\hline 12:37:44 & 25 & statement that a few people remained in Monrovia while others \\
\hline & 26 & were sent to - yeah, I accept what he says here. \\
\hline & 27 & Q. Mr Taylor, if we look at paragraph 28 on page 6, where it \\
\hline & 28 & is tal king about the mandate and ECOMOG's revised concept of \\
\hline & 29 & operations and goes on to estimate what UNOMIL would require. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The last two sentences:
"The final composition of UNOMI L's military component would be dependent on ECOMOG's deployment but would not exceed a total of 92 military observers. This would represent a reduction of some 68 military observers from the total strength of 160 authorised under resol ution 1020 (1995)."

So do you accept that the final strength of the UNOMI L's mi I itary component would not exceed 92 military observers under a revised concept of operations?
A. Well, I accept what the Secretary-General says in this - in the sentence you read. I accept what he says. Q. And indeed, this would be a reduction of some 68 military observers from the total strength of 160 which had been authorised under resolution 1020. Yes, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, |'ll have to do some quick math, but \(I\) don't have a problem with that.
Q. Then if we could look at the annex at page 14 , please. "Composition"..

PRESIDING JUDGE: I don't have an annex, and it appears I ike Court Management doesn't have an annex either.

MS HOLLIS: Then we will certainly not refer to that, Madam President, and l would ask that you mark for identification this document.

PRESIDING JUDGE: This is the Nineteenth Progress Report of the Secretary-General on UNOMIL, dated 17 October ' \(96 . \quad\) It's marked MFI-382.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, we also talked about the numbers of ECOMOG that were present in early 1997, and 1 put to you that the ECOMOG
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & numbers remained at about 7, 500, and you indicated that you did \\
\hline & 2 & not recall those numbers. Yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 3 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. And also l put to you that the UNOMIL strength had been \\
\hline 12:41:03 & 5 & increased up to about 71 military observers, and you indicated \\
\hline & 6 & that you did not recall that that was the number by the end of \\
\hline & 7 & J anuary 1997. Do you recall that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 8 & A. That sounds right, yes. \\
\hline & 9 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Madam Court Manager, the LiveNote seems \\
\hline 12:41:22 & 10 & to have frozen. At least on the Bench anyway. What is going on? \\
\hline & 11 & MS I RURA: Your Honour, I will broadcast my Livenote for \\
\hline & 12 & purposes of continuing the trial. We could be experiencing a \\
\hline & 13 & problem with the internet \\
\hline & 14 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Shall I give you a moment to do that so \\
\hline 12:41:56 & 15 & that we can follow? \\
\hline & 16 & MS I RURA: Please press the button "PC-1" on your panel to \\
\hline & 17 & be able to view the Livenote. \\
\hline & 18 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Please continue, Ms Hollis. \\
\hline & 19 & MS HOLLIS: I would ask that we look at tab number 73 in \\
\hline 12:42:45 & 20 & annex 3. If we could bring that down so that we can see that \\
\hline & 21 & "United States Security Council S/1997/90, 29 January 1997, \\
\hline & 22 & Twenty-First Progress Report of the Secretary-General on the \\
\hline & 23 & United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia". And if we could \\
\hline & 24 & please turn to page 3 of the document at paragraph 8 under the \\
\hline 12:44:19 & 25 & heading "Deployment of the Economic Community of West African \\
\hline & 26 & States Monitoring Group and the United Nations Observer Mission \\
\hline & 27 & in Liberia." \\
\hline & 28 & Q. Under paragraph 8, "The force strength of ECOMOG remains at \\
\hline & 29 & 7,500 all ranks". Do you accept that statement by the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SCSL - TRIAL CHAMBER II
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Secretary-General, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 2 & A. I have no reason to doubt it. \\
\hline & 3 & Q. "To date the additional troops pledged for ECOMOG have not \\
\hline & 4 & arrived in Liberia, though some of the support pledged by donor \\
\hline 12:44:51 & 5 & countries is now becoming available. The force commander has \\
\hline & 6 & deployed into the interior of Liberia in support of the \\
\hline & 7 & disarmament process, while retaining a force of sufficient \\
\hline & 8 & strength in Monrovia to assist in maintaining its safe haven \\
\hline & 9 & status. ECOMOG deployed initially at the designated disarmament \\
\hline 12:45:14 & 10 & sites of the Barclay Training Centre, Camp Schefflein, \\
\hline & 11 & Tubmanburg, Bo Waterside, Kakata, Voinjama, Buchanan, Camp Naama \\
\hline & 12 & and Zwedru and subsequently at three additional sites at Tappita, \\
\hline & 13 & Greenville and Harper." \\
\hline & 14 & Do you agree with that statement of deployment, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline 12:45:38 & 15 & A. I would agree with him. \\
\hline & 16 & Q. Under paragraph 9: \\
\hline & 17 & "ECOMOG has also established buffer zones between ULIMO-J \\
\hline & 18 & and ULIMO-K in Bomi and Grand Cape Mount counties as well as \\
\hline & 19 & between the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) and the \\
\hline 12:46:03 & 20 & Liberian Peace Council (LPC) in Grand Gedeh County. The creation \\
\hline & 21 & of a similar buffer between the NPFL and ULIMO-K in Bong and Lofa \\
\hline & 22 & Counties and between NPFL and LPC in Sinoe, Maryland and Grand \\
\hline & 23 & Kru Counties is also being contemplated but ECOMOG considers it \\
\hline & 24 & would require additional troops and logistic support for such a \\
\hline 12:46:31 & 25 & deployment." \\
\hline & 26 & So, Mr Taylor, at this time do you agree that ECOMOG had \\
\hline & 27 & established buffer zones between your NPFL and the LPC in Grand \\
\hline & 28 & Gedeh County? \\
\hline & 29 & A. Yes, I agree. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q. And that a similar buffer zone between your NPFL and ULIMO-K in Bong and Lofa Counties ..
A. I would agree.
Q. \(\quad .-\quad\) was being contemplated?
A. Well, they did deploy. I cannot speak about the contemplation, but afterward, they did deploy. So they contemplated, but ..
Q. And a similar buffer zone between your NPFL and the LPC in Sinoe, Maryland and Grand Kru Counties was al so being contemplated. Do you accept that as of the time of this report? A. I would say - I take his word for it, yes. Q. But that ECOMOG considered that they would need additional troops and logistic support for such a deployment. Do you accept that statement?
A. I accept the statement, yes.
Q. And then if we look at paragraph 11:
"The new chief military observer of UNOMIL, Major General Sikandar Shami, assumed his functions on 16 December 1996. As of 28 January 1997, the military strength of UNOMIL stood at 78 observers ..."

Do you accept that number, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. "... who are deployed at the disarmament sites at Bo

Waterside, Tubmanburg, Kakata, Camp Naama, Voinjama, Zwedru,
Tappita and the Barclay Training Centre, Greenville, Camp Schefflein and Buchanan."

Do you accept the Secretary-General's statement about the deployment areas?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Monitoring teams are also deployed at James Spriggs Payne Airport and at the seaport in Monrovia. Do you accept that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then if we do look at page 12, annex 1, and this should be included, for your Honours, in this document. "Composition of the military component of UNOMI L as of 26 January 1997". Mr Taylor, you see under "Total" 78 and under "Military observers" 71?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you accept those numbers, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I would ask that you mark this document for identification.

PRESIDING JUDGE: The Twenty-First Progress Report of the Secretary-General on UNOMIL, dated 29 January '97, is marked MFI-383.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Mr Taylor, when you were asked about an increase of ECOMOG troops by mid-March of 1997, you indicated that you can sense the increase in the troops but you were not aware that the numbers were up to 10, 000. Do you remember saying that, Mr Taylor? A. Yes.
Q. If we could please look tab 74 in annex 3. This should be S/1997/237, "Twenty-Second Progress Report", and we see on the screen "United Nations Security Council S/1997/237, 19 March 1997, Twenty-Second Progress Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia". If we could please look at page 4 of that document.

MS I RURA: Your Honour, the LiveNote service seems to have


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & receive considerable reinforcements. In April, 320 troops from \\
\hline & 2 & Burkina Faso, 321 from Niger and a \(35-\mathrm{man}\) medical team from Cote \\
\hline & 3 & d'Ivoire arrived, with a further 250 troops from Benin joining \\
\hline & 4 & ECOMOG in May. These reinforcements have brought ECOMOG strength \\
\hline 12:58:05 & 5 & to approximately 11,000 troops deployed at 48 different \\
\hline & 6 & locations." \\
\hline & 7 & Do you agree with that statement of numbers, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 8 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. And do you agree with the statement that the sum \\
\hline 12:58:28 & 10 & approximately 11, 000 troops have deployed at 48 different \\
\hline & 11 & locations? \\
\hline & 12 & A. Yes, I have no reason to dispute the secretary-General. \\
\hline & 13 & Q. And the next sentence: \\
\hline & 14 & "Although some ECOMOG troops have been redeployed to Sierra \\
\hline 12:58:42 & 15 & Leone in connection with the crisis in that country, my special \\
\hline & 16 & representative and the chief military observer believe that \\
\hline & 17 & ECOMOG at present retains sufficient capability to ensure \\
\hline & 18 & security for the forthcoming elections in Liberia." \\
\hline & 19 & So, Mr Taylor, do you accept the Secretary-General's \\
\hline 12:59:02 & 20 & statement that as of the date of this report some ECOMOG troops \\
\hline & 21 & had been redeployed to Sierra Leone? \\
\hline & 22 & A. I accept what he says. I don't know the details, but if he \\
\hline & 23 & says so, I have no reason to disagree. \\
\hline & 24 & Q. And if we look at paragraph 19: \\
\hline 12:59:23 & 25 & " UNOMI L has completed its planned deployment at 16 sites, \\
\hline & 26 & covering all the 13 counties of Liberia." \\
\hline & 27 & Do you accept that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 28 & A. Yes, I do. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. If we look at the annex on page 15, we see a total for the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

A. Yes.
Q. And then if we go down three lines from there:
"At the same time, Nigerians in Liberia, including Nigerian ECOMOG troops, were being increasingly maltreated by the

Liberians."
Now, that was a correct statement, was it not, Mr Taylor? A. I would still say incorrect. You say that Liberians - by "the Liberians", l would disagree. He is not referring to militias, so he said by ordinary citizens. I would disagree.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, we have dealt with this page before in relation to information that was not allowed to be used. We would ask, however, that we be allowed to have this page 270 marked for consideration of the two words "I ate 1997"in the second full paragraph and consideration of the sentence:
"At the same time, Nigerians in Liberia, including Nigerian ECOMOG troops, were being increasingly maltreated by Liberians."

For that specific portion only, we would ask that this page be marked for identification.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Page 270 as referred to by counsel is marked MFI-371D.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you, Madam President:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, on 18 November l asked you if you recalled that at the point of the elections, ECOMOG had begun to reduce their forces quite significantly, as had the UNOMI L mission in Liberia. You stated that you didn't recall it in that way, that they had reduced significantly prior to elections. Now, Mr Taylor, perhaps we have a communication difficulty here, so let me be specific

You have said you did not recall a significant reduction
```

prior to elections, yes, Mr Taylor?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you recall a significant reduction immediately after
elections?
A. Significant reduction immedi ately after elections?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I don't.
Q. If we could again look at tab 32, the ECOMOG book, in annex
4, and this time at page 267, please.
PRESIDING JUDGE: Again this is Aboagye's book?
MS HOLLIS: Yes, Madam President:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, if we look at this page we see,
"Post-electoral concept of deployment and operations." Just to
give us a reference: "Immediately after the electoral process,
ECOMOG reviewed its concept of operations and deployment." Then,
Mr Taylor, if we look at "Scaling down of forces" at the bottom
of the page:
"The force level was drastically reduced with the
withdrawal of several national contingents after the successful
peace process. Nigeria repatriated a few of its battalions and
redeployed a significant force to Sierra Leone."
PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, please pause.
MR GRIFFITHS: Can I just object to the premi se upon which
this question is based. The question which prompted reference to
this passage was: Do you recall after the elections the ECOMOG
contingents being drastically reduced? That was the question
which prompted reference to this passage.
Now, the point is this: When we look at this passage, we
see on line 1 "Immediately after the electoral process", but then

```
when we go to the next paragraph upon which emphasis is made, we see "After the successful peace process". So is after the election and after the successful process one and the same thing?

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, do you wish to respond? MS HOLLIS: If I'm allowed to continue, I think that we will clear this up. I don't understand the objection. I was not able to finish reading and then put my question to Mr Taylor.

PRESIDING JUDGE: The objection is the earlier question refers to certain time frame, that is, immediately after the election. Now the part that you are now reading, which begins "The forces level was drastically reduced", deals with a different time frame, that is, after the successful peace process. And the question is: Are the two time frames the same? That is the question to which 1 would appreciate if you responded before you proceed.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, that is a matter of interpretation and 1 was going to explore that with Mr Taylor. Because 1 am not the author of this book, in fairness put it in context with the i mmediately after the electoral process ECOMOG reviewing its concept of operations and deployment, and then went down to "Scaling of the forces" and read what was there, and I was about to then put the question to Mr Taylor in a two-phased manner: First of all as to the scaling down; and secondly, as to the time frame.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Okay, Ms Hollis, I think |'।l |et you continue.

MS HOLLIS: Thank you: Now if I can find where l left off reading.

PRESIDING JUDGE: I think you had better repeat that
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & passage. \\
\hline & 2 & MS HOLLIS: Thank you: \\
\hline & 3 & Q. Mr Taylor, under "Scaling down of forces": \\
\hline & 4 & "The force level was drastically reduced with the \\
\hline 13:10:30 & 5 & withdrawal of several national contingents after the successful \\
\hline & 6 & peace process. Nigeria repatriated a few of its battalions and \\
\hline & 7 & redeployed a significant force to Sierra Leone. Ghana \\
\hline & 8 & repatriated one of its battalions, leaving one in the mission \\
\hline & 9 & area. Benin, Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea pulled out completely, \\
\hline 13:10:48 & 10 & while Burkina Faso and Niger both left token forces behind." \\
\hline & 11 & Now, first of all, Mr Taylor, do you agree - and we will \\
\hline & 12 & discuss time period in a moment, but that - and we'll use this \\
\hline & 13 & I anguage: "After the successful peace process, Nigeria \\
\hline & 14 & repatriated a few of its battalions." Do you agree with that? \\
\hline 13:11:17 & 15 & A. Well, again it raises a question here for me even in my \\
\hline & 16 & mind as to whether the election is equated with the successful \\
\hline & 17 & peace. I would say that the peace process doesn't end with the \\
\hline & 18 & election. \\
\hline & 19 & Q. Let's try it a different way then. Mr Taylor, do you \\
\hline 13:11:39 & 20 & recall after the election at some point Nigeria repatriating a \\
\hline & 21 & few of its battalions from Liberia? \\
\hline & 22 & A. Well, yes, some time after the election. That's later in \\
\hline & 23 & the year. \\
\hline & 24 & Q. In your recollection, when was that? \\
\hline 13:11:52 & 25 & A. I would put it to about the - around the end of 1997, given \\
\hline & 26 & the fact that me, as President, I was not asked or consulted \\
\hline & 27 & whenever units were being moved, maybe for tactical or security \\
\hline & 28 & purposes. But I would say around the end of 1997 we .. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. This is a repatriation of a few of its battalions, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Mr Taylor, yes? \\
\hline & 2 & A. I'm looking at repatriation as moving them out of Liberia. \\
\hline & 3 & Q. In addition, do you recall, at some point after the \\
\hline & 4 & elections, Nigeria redeploying a significant number of its force \\
\hline 13:12:36 & 5 & to Sierra Leone? \\
\hline & 6 & A. No, l wouldn't know the significance of - when you say \\
\hline & 1 & "significant" force, "significant" \({ }^{\prime}\) 'minterpreting as being a \\
\hline & 8 & I arge force. I don't know that as a fact. I know Nigeria, by \\
\hline & 9 & the end of the year, removes some forces. I don't know as to \\
\hline 13:12:56 & 10 & whether it is a significant force. I can't say that. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. Mr Taylor, after your election do you recall Ghana \\
\hline & 12 & repatriating one of its battalions? \\
\hline & 13 & A. Ghana did, to the best of my recollection, remove one of \\
\hline & 14 & its battalions. \\
\hline 13:13:16 & 15 & Q. And what is your recollection as to when that occurred? \\
\hline & 16 & A. All of these are happening - I would put it to about the \\
\hline & 17 & end - going towards the last quarter of 1997, or thereabout. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. And is it your recollection that Ghana left one battalion \\
\hline & 19 & in Liberia? \\
\hline 13:13:36 & 20 & A. That is correct \\
\hline & 21 & Q. And also is it your recollection that after the election, \\
\hline & 22 & Benin pulled out completely? \\
\hline & 23 & A. I don't know. I was not told that \\
\hline & 24 & Q. I s it your recollection that they remained, or you have no \\
\hline 13:13:57 & 25 & recollection of what happened with them? \\
\hline & 26 & A. I have no recollection of what happened. The system was \\
\hline & 27 & not set up that ECOMOG had to report to the Government of Liberia \\
\hline & 28 & how it managed the forces at its disposal. In fact, a lot of the \\
\hline & 29 & thing l'm talking about here are things that our people would \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
pick up and say: Well, there's a unit moving here or there. So । don't recall what - the Benin situation. Ghana \(\mid\) remember quite well because Rawlings, you know, and I are friends and, you know, Ghana would tell me directly, but not from the ECOMOG side. Q. And, Mr Taylor, do you recall Cote d'Ivoire pulling out completely after your election?
A. Some time after. And 1 know this because most of the cote d'Ivoire people are medical type people, and so as they're I eaving the hospitals, the Minister of Health, I can remember, did say that some of the medical individuals from la Cote d'Ivoire were I eaving. Q. Do you remember about when that was?
A. No, counsel, can't. They did not leave in a hurry like the rest of these people, so l would late 1997 going to the beginning of 1998, there are still a few lvorians, medical personnel, there.
Q. And do you recall Guinea pulling out completely?
A. Not precisely. The Guinean situation is more complex. Guinea did pull out, but 1 don't remember exactly when they pulled out.
Q. Do you recall that Burkina Faso and Niger Ieft only token forces behind?
A. I'm aware of that. The two Presidents at the time, I'm in very good relationship with them, so l get to know from them, yes.
Q. Thank you for that, Mr Taylor. Now, Mr Taylor, you will recall that on 18 November we also talked about conflicts that occurred between you and General Mal u, and we talked about - or I put to you that General Malu's insistence that ECOMOG be the one

and your government. I sn't that correct?
A. That's very general though. That's a wide brush. If we break that down, I would say that's a component, but that's a very wide brush, counsel.
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, it actually revolved around the interaction of ECOMOG with your government. I sn't that right?
A. Interaction, okay, yes, I can put it. Yeah, I will say interaction, yes. Generally, yes.
Q. And indeed it had to do with your plan to put ECOMOG under your own command. I sn't that correct?
A. No, that's totally incorrect. No. Never a plan, never anticipated, no.
Q. And the second major part of that again was General Malu's insistence that it would be ECOMOG who would restructure

Liberia's army. Isn't that correct?
A. I wouldn't say that is totally incorrect. That was a part of General Malu's argument, but that was not the total argument, but \(I\) would say that was a part of the argument, but there is a disagreement as to - in your first question when you talk about the interaction and understanding from our position on the issue of sovereignty and what we saw an ECOWAS force to be, in total, that's it, l would say. But that was a part of General Malu's argument.
Q. Mr Taylor, perhaps if we could look again at tab 21 in annex 3. This is Dr Adebajo's book.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, do l take it that you didn't want to mark for identification the last page, 267?

MS HOLLIS: That is correct. I did not wish to have that marked:
Q. This is tab 21 in annex 3. Perhaps we could put the cover page on just to - no, we need tab 21, which would be Dr Adebajo's book, the Liberian civil war.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, do you have a page in this book?

MS HOLLIS: The pages that we will refer to are initially pages 233 and 234 and then page 239:
Q. \(\quad\) Mr Taylor, again we're tal king about Dr Adebajo's book.
A. Okay.
Q. If we could initially look at page 233, please, and show the bottom of the page. If we look at the third line up from the bottom:
"Taylor successfully pressured Abacha to remove ECOMOG force commander Victor Malu who had resisted Taylor's plans to bring ECOMOG under his own command and insisted forcefully that ECOMOG restructure Liberia's army."

Now, that is correct, is it not, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, in that particular sentence there's some part right and there's some part incorrect.
Q. Tell us what part you say is right?
A. Taylor pressured Abacha to remove Malu, that is correct. On the assumption that Taylor wanted to bring ECOMOG under his own command, it's totally false and erroneous. I understood ECOWAS - the command of ECOMOG was al ways the command of the chairman of ECOWAS and the inner workings with the secretariat. That was not the issue. Adebajo is wrong 100 per cent on this. Q. And, Mr Taylor, we see, "And insisted" - and he's referring back to General Malu - "forcefully that ECOMOG restructure Liberia's army." Is that part correct in your view?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & page, please. If we look at the last paragraph on that page, \\
\hline & 2 & seven lines up: \\
\hline & 3 & "No sooner a disagreement arose between President Taylor \\
\hline & 4 & and ECOMOG commander Victor Malu" - it says here "Marlu" - "over \\
\hline 13:28:08 & 5 & Taylor's strategy for reconstructing the army. Malu argued that \\
\hline & 6 & under the peace accord it was the responsibility of ECOMOG to \\
\hline & 7 & build the new army in an open and transparent manner." \\
\hline & 8 & Now, Mr Taylor, l believe we have covered the - well, first \\
\hline & 9 & of all, do you agree with the statement that there was a \\
\hline 13:28:30 & 10 & disagreement between you and Victor Malu over your strategy for \\
\hline & 11 & reconstructing the army? \\
\hline & 12 & A. Well, l wouldn't call it a disagreement, but l agree, like \\
\hline & 13 & I said, that Malu did state that it was ECOMOG's responsibility. \\
\hline & 14 & Q. And do you agree that Malu also argued that it was ECOMOG's \\
\hline 13:28:51 & 15 & responsibility to build the new army in an open and transparent \\
\hline & 16 & manner? \\
\hline & 17 & A. I don't know if that was his argument, but I think it was \\
\hline & 18 & I think Malu didn't understand what was going on. He did state \\
\hline & 19 & that, in all earnesty; Victor is still a good friend of mine. \\
\hline 13:29:09 & 20 & But he did not understand maybe as a military man the \\
\hline & 21 & constitutional and legal issues that were being raised by my \\
\hline & 22 & government. But he did state that it was their responsibility to \\
\hline & 23 & build a new army and l told him that under the constitution of \\
\hline & 24 & Liberia, where the constitution was in force it is the \\
\hline 13:29:32 & 25 & I egis lature of Liberia under our constitution that builds an \\
\hline & 26 & army. So that was the disagreement really. \\
\hline & 27 & MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I would ask that this page 133 \\
\hline & 28 & be marked next in order, MFI-373C. \\
\hline & 29 & PRESIDING JUDGE: That is correct. The page is so marked \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MS HOLLIS:
Q. Mr Taylor, also on 18 November - your Honour, I don't think I'm going to be able to get through this before the I uncheon break, the next reference.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes, I think there's not enough or sufficient time to look at another passage. We will adjourn until 2.30.
[Lunch break taken at 1.30 p.m.]
[Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.]
PRESIDING JUDGE: Good afternoon. Ms Hollis, please continue.

MS HOLLIS: Madam President, I should note for the record that Mr Santora is no longer at the Prosecution table:
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, 1 would like to turn to another topic. Mr Taylor, you recall that during the direct examination, your counsel discussed with you the testimony of many of the Prosecution witnesses. Do you recall that, yes, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Mr Taylor, please understand that it is the Prosecution's submission to you that during the Defence counsel's questions to you about the testimony of these Prosecution witnesses, that Defence counsel and you yourself consistently misstated the Prosecution evidence. I want you to understand that, Mr Taylor. And that is correct, is it not, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, it depends on what you are talking about. I totally disagree that there were any attempts on my part or counsel's part to consistently mi sinterpret the words you used of any evidence before this Court. I think that's totally incorrect. Q. And, \(\operatorname{Mr}\) Taylor, 1 et's 1 ook at 6 August 2009 at page 26213,
where your counsel begins to put to you some questions relating to the testimony of Al mamy Bobson Sesay, TF1-334. This is 6 August, 26213. Now, we have this page before us, and if we could please look at - beginning at line 12 of that page. Your counsel is putting this to you, Mr Taylor:
"Q. Now, Mr Taylor, another direct allegation that \(I\) want to give you an opportunity to deal with. On 24 April 2008 another Prosecution witness, Alimamy Bobson Sesay, TF1-334, to which pages 8515 of the transcript refers, said to you said that you, Charles Taylor, gave \(\$ 15,000\) and said it was support for Johnny Paul Koroma's men whilst they wait for Foday Sankoh to arrive, and you did that in May 1998. What do you say about that?
A. I think he made a mistake. I think he made a great, great mistake, because the incident that he is referring to, if it's anything, it must be May of 1999. If he said 1998, it's a blatant lie. He must be - maybe he made a mi stake, but that's for him to correct, because the period in question in dealing with Johnny Paul, we have al ready brought Johnny Paul Koroma to Liberia and he is waiting for Foday Sankoh to - no, no, no. May of - no, no, no, no, no, no. I thought that was in 1999. No, that is not true." You remember that exchange with your counsel, correct,

Mr Taylor?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. So he is putting to you that Al imamy Bobson Sesay at page 8515 indicated that he received \(\$ 15,000\) - or that you gave \(\$ 15,000\) and you did that in May 1998, and you're saying, no, that's not true. Now, you go on, Mr Taylor, to say:
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & ourselves and buy things. He said we should feel free and buy \\
\hline & 2 & things in Monrovia until we a wait the arrival of Foday Saybana \\
\hline & 3 & Sankoh who had left Lome for Ghana and that he was on his way to \\
\hline & 4 & come - he was on his way to Liberia." \\
\hline 14:44:42 & 5 & So, Mr Taylor, it's in the context of your meeting in \\
\hline & 6 & August 1999 that this witness says that you gave this \$15,000, \\
\hline & 7 & and that is correct, is it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 8 & A. I'm not sure if it's in the context, but I don't understand \\
\hline & 9 & - if your questions are premised on your introduction, then l'm \\
\hline 14:45:07 & 10 & responding to an issue put before me by counsel and I'm saying \\
\hline & 11 & that the money issue occurs in August. So if your quarrel is \\
\hline & 12 & that counsel made an error, l'm sure that's a different matter, \\
\hline & 13 & but I think l have done my part to say to counsel that if he says \\
\hline & 14 & it is not May, it is in August. So \\
\hline 14:45:30 & 15 & Q. Mr Taylor, looking at page 8504 and then 8506, this witness \\
\hline & 16 & is saying that \(\$ 15,000\) was given during this August meeting. And \\
\hline & 17 & it was given during this August meeting, was it not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 18 & A. That's what the witness is saying. I agree it was given \\
\hline & 19 & money was given during the August meeting, that is correct. \\
\hline 14:45:54 & 20 & Q. And that is August 1999, correct? \\
\hline & 21 & A. It's August 1999, that is correct \\
\hline & 22 & Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. Now, Mr Taylor, if we could look at \\
\hline & 23 & some of the documents that have been marked for identification by \\
\hline & 24 & your counsel. If we could first, please, look at MFI-296. This \\
\hline 14:46:41 & 25 & was DCT-255, tab 128 in binder 3 of 4 for week 33. MFI-296, do \\
\hline & 26 & your Honours have it before you? \\
\hline & 27 & PRESIDING JUDGE: What's on the overhead is different. \\
\hline & 28 & MFI-296, according to our records, or my records, is the outgoing \\
\hline & 29 & code cable to Prendergast of 14 April. Is that the document \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
you're referring to?
    MS HOLLIS: No, that is not what we have as MFI-296.
    MR GRIFFITHS: That's what 1 have as MFI-296, an outgoing
    code cable dated 14 April from Downes-Thomas to Miyet at the UN.
    That's 296, and it's also DCT-296.
    MS HOLLIS: DCT-255.
    MS I RURA: Your Honour, what we have as MFI-296 is Ietter
    from President of Liberia, which is DCT-255.
    JUDGE DOHERTY: To confuse things further, that's what I
have in my personal notes.
    MS HOLLIS: The Ietter to President George Bush. I have
    that as DCT-255. Obviously there's some clarification that's
    required for the MFI number, but the document I wish to look at
    is the letter to George W Bush, 16 June 2003.
    PRESIDING JUDGE: Just give us a moment until we locate
    this. I think in order to save time we'll just go by the
    document that is displayed on the overhead. We'll sort out the
    MFIs I ater.
    MS HOLLIS: Madam President, just to assist perhaps in the
        ultimate resolution, we have this being marked and referred to on
        10 November at page 31513, just for your assistance, the document
        we have marked as MFI-296:
    Q. Mr Taylor, you see this letter before you?
    A. Yes, I do.
    Q. And at the bottom of the letter, "Dankpannah Dr Charles
    Ghankay Taylor." Mr Taylor, did you not keep a signed copy of
    this letter?
    A. Normally these letters would be - the signed copy would go
    out to the individual receiving it. There would only be initial
copies that would be kept by government.
Q. Mr Taylor, is this initialled in some location on this
Ietter? \(\mid\) don't see it.
A. Then l can't see the ..

MS HOLLIS: Could you raise it up so that Mr Taylor could see the rest of the letter.

THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know if the reproduction - but this is my letter. I remember it. I know it. I wrote it to Bush.

MS HOLLIS:
Q. Mr Taylor, it is dated 16 June 2003. Is that the date that you actually forwarded it or sent it on to President Bush? A. It could be on that day, it could be a day or two later, depending on the routing at the presidency. I don't know - once I signed the letter, I don't know, one would assume it would go out but normally it could take - it could be the same day or the next.
Q. And in what archive would they have the copy that was actually signed by you, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, there should still be copies at the mansion. I had copies. I had copies in my own personal archives, but there could be copies still at the mansion.
Q. And this letter before us as it is, this is the copy that you had in your archive?
A. This is a copy of the letter, yes, that \(\mid\) kept.
Q. Mr Taylor, is this one of the documents that you had collected and put in your archive before you left Liberia?
A. This is one of the documents that l had before l Ieft Liberia, yes.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Q. If we look at the third paragraph where it talks about \\
\hline & 2 & peace talks sponsored by the International Contact Group on \\
\hline & 3 & Liberia, you talk about instructing your - you have instructed \\
\hline & 4 & your negotiating team to sign a ceasefire agreement drafted by \\
\hline 14:52:45 & 5 & experts under the auspices of the ICGL. Mr Taylor, these \\
\hline & 6 & experts, who were they, do you recall? \\
\hline & 7 & A. No, they were teams from different - from the United \\
\hline & 8 & Nations. Different people were present. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. Then, Mr Taylor, you in the next paragraph indicate that \\
\hline 14:53:03 & 10 & you have offered to consider recusing yourself from the political \\
\hline & 11 & process at the end of your first term next January. And you're \\
\hline & 12 & indicating that to President Bush in this letter, that you have \\
\hline & 13 & offered to consider recusing yourself, yes? \\
\hline & 14 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline 14:53:24 & 15 & Q. And that was your position at that time, that you were \\
\hline & 16 & offering that you would consider recusing yourself? \\
\hline & 17 & A. I don't understand your question now. What is it ? \\
\hline & 18 & Q. Well, your position at this time was that you were offering \\
\hline & 19 & that you would consider recusing yourself from the political \\
\hline 14:53:43 & 20 & process at the end of your first term? \\
\hline & 21 & A. Well, the way how, if l'm hearing your question, you asked \\
\hline & 22 & me if I had offered - what the document said, I'm saying here l \\
\hline & 23 & have offered to consider - that's the I anguage there - recusing \\
\hline & 24 & myself. \\
\hline 14:54:06 & 25 & Q. Mr Taylor, you indicate that you envisaged, for example, \\
\hline & 26 & the immediate deployment of a unit of American forces giving \\
\hline & 27 & I ogistics and administrative support to a contingent of West \\
\hline & 28 & African peacekeepers sanctioned by the United Nations? \\
\hline & 29 & A. What part are you reading? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q. I'm sorry. This is the second paragraph from the bottom:
"It is in this regard that my government again requests the United States to play a leading role in the restoration of peace and stability in Liberia."

Yes, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you go on to indicate that you envision, for example, the i mmediate deployment of a unit of American armed forces giving logistics and administrative support to a contingent of West African peacekeepers sanctioned by the United Nations. So that was part of the role you envisioned the United States would play at that time?
A. Because these were - yes. These were discussions that the United States had said they would play a role, yes.
Q. Those are all the questions I have for that document. If we could please look at MFI-285. According to our records, this should be DCT-354, tab 6 in the binder for week 38. MFI-285. It is a BBC news report. Mr Taylor, we see in this report that it is dated Monday, 4 February 2002, and the caption, "Liberia struggling to defeat rebels." Yes, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes.
Q. If we look at page 2 of this document and if we look at the second paragraph from the bottom of that page:
"Tubmanburg mayor Gbeley Karnley said that civilians and government soldiers had looted goods belonging to the fieeing refugees."

So, Mr Taylor, this is a report that government soldiers were among those who had looted goods belonging to fleeing refugees. Were you aware of that fact, Mr Taylor?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & A. No, I was not made aware. This is the mayor of Tubmanburg \\
\hline & 2 & and at the time this report is made 1 do not see how he can refer \\
\hline & 3 & to government soldiers because that part of the country - I would \\
\hline & 4 & disagree with whoever this person is because the Government of \\
\hline 14:57:11 & 5 & Liberia soldiers are not in Tubmanburg at this time. So l would \\
\hline & 6 & disagree. \\
\hline & 7 & Q. By the way, did you know this man? \\
\hline & 8 & A. No, no, no. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. Gbeley Karnley, did you know him? \\
\hline 14:57:23 & 10 & A. No. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. If we look at the next paragraph: \\
\hline & 12 & "The military authorities in the town have warned that any \\
\hline & 13 & soldiers found guilty of looting will be punished." \\
\hline & 14 & So, Mr Taylor, when he refers to military authorities in \\
\hline 14:57:35 & 15 & the town he is referring to your military, is he not, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 16 & A. No, he must be referring to LURD. This is Tubmanburg, Bomi \\
\hline & 17 & Hills and LURD - it's got to be LURD. It cannot be our forces. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. So the LURD authorities in the town have warned that any \\
\hline & 19 & soldiers found guilty of looting will be punished? \\
\hline 14:57:52 & 20 & A. That's possible, yeah. I'm saying, you know, we are not \\
\hline & 21 & there. \\
\hline & 22 & Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. Now if we could also look at \\
\hline & 23 & MFI-288. This was DCT-365, which was tab 1 in binder 39. \\
\hline & 24 & Mr Taylor, we see that this is a Ministry of Information, \\
\hline 14:58:39 & 25 & Monrovia, Liberia, press release, 7 January 2003. Mr Taylor, do \\
\hline & 26 & you know who it was who wrote this press release? \\
\hline & 27 & A. No, I do not. \\
\hline & 28 & Q. Did you review this press release before it was in fact \\
\hline & 29 & released? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

14:59:14 5
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you provide any inputs into this press release?
Q. I'm talking about you personally, Mr Taylor
A. Okay, very good. No, the President wouldn't get involved in that. There are people that do that.
Q. And the Government of Liberia constructive engagement policy which is referred to here, who would have prepared that Government of Libera constructive engagement policy?
A. That policy will be a result of wide-ranging debate across government over a period of time and then a policy would be drafted. So it would be across many agencies of government to come up with a policy.
Q. Would you be the one who would ultimately approve this policy?
A. Yes, with the national security council, l would finally approve it, yes.
Q. And at what point in time did the Government of Liberia i mplement this constructive engagement policy?
A. From almost - well, again, now, don't know as to whether it would be i mportant for you. What is the constructive engagement? You don't want to know what it is.
Q. No, I think it explains it, but what 1 am asking you, Mr Taylor, is when.
A. I would say the policy took shape somewhere - I would say about the - during the beginning of my administration.
Q. So this is just a restatement of that policy. Is that what this is?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & any minister. \\
\hline & 2 & Q. Mr Taylor, if we could look at page 4 of this document. If \\
\hline & 3 & we could look at number 2, the paragraph, where you are talking - \\
\hline & 4 & where this is tal king about another key demand of the US Security \\
\hline 15:03:10 & 5 & Council - and here it says, "US Security Council resolution \\
\hline & 6 & 1408". You mean there UN Security Council resolution, Mr Taylor, \\
\hline & 7 & or is that intentionally listed as US? \\
\hline & 8 & A. I'm sure they - you are saying "you" again. I'm sure that \\
\hline & 9 & they meant UN. That's an error. \\
\hline 15:03:29 & 10 & Q. And then you say: \\
\hline & 11 & "Initially the United States State Department tried to \\
\hline & 12 & coerce the Liberian government to use a hand-picked audit firm, \\
\hline & 13 & the Crown Agents." \\
\hline & 14 & Can you tell us what this firm was, the Crown Agents? \\
\hline 15:03:43 & 15 & A. I have no idea who they were. That's what we said, no, we \\
\hline & 16 & will get one of the top ten internationally known accounting \\
\hline & 17 & firms. I don't know who these Crown Agents were. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. To your knowledge, were they a top firm - accounting firm? \\
\hline & 19 & A. Well, they very well could have been, but they were not \\
\hline 15:04:07 & 20 & amongst what is known as the international top ten accounting \\
\hline & 21 & firms, CPA firms, like Price Waterhouse and all of that. To my \\
\hline & 22 & knowledge, they were not one of those from my information. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Now, Mr Taylor, if we look further down the page, the \\
\hline & 24 & International Contact Group on Liberia, ICGL: \\
\hline 15:04:30 & 25 & "The International Contact Group on Liberia is a group of \\
\hline & 26 & self-appointed mediators whose stated intent is to help resolve \\
\hline & 27 & the Liberian crisis with LURD." \\
\hline & 28 & Mr Taylor, the International Contact Group on Liberia was \\
\hline & 29 & actually invited in to take part in the peace efforts. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


would be an Executive Mansion copy, I would suppose.
Q. And you may very well know that, but the way that's written, do you recognise that writing as a file copy that you would keep at the Executive Mansion, the way that word is written there?
A. Now, Iet me understand your question.
Q. Or do you recognise this writing?
A. Well, you asked me to give - and l'm saying it looks like "file", like somebody writing, but this, it looks like to me, l recognise it as "file".
Q. But you don't recognise the writing per se, the handwriting?
A. Now, that question means as to mabe who could have written it?
Q. Yes.
A. No, no, no, l wouldn't know.
Q. Mr Taylor, was this one of the documents that you had gathered up before you left Liberia?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. If we could please look at MFI-282. And we see this is "Liberia's diamond links, dated 18 July 2000 , BBC West Africa correspondent Mark Doyle reports from Monrovia on the Iinks between diamond smugling and Liberia's backing of Sierra Leone rebels." Mr Taylor, did you have any input into this article?
A. Did 1 have an input into this article?
Q. You yourself.
A. No, I don't work for the BBC.
Q. Were you interviewed in connection with this article at

```

ref|ecting recent reports carried by the Washington Post," and he

```
indicates:
"My main interest in the report relates to the alleged movement of arms into Sierra Leone territory which our intelligence agencies have been noticing."

Mr Taylor, it indicates here that he is sharing with you, "in accordance with the agreement between us, information contained in the attached documents reflecting recent reports carried by the Washington Post." Mr Taylor, do you remember what those documents were that were attached to his letter?
A. No, but I think it's very clear here. Yes, I remember.

All he is talking about is a copy of the post that he sent. That's all he sent.
Q. He indicates "attached documents". Do you recall how many documents were attached?
A. No. Only l think there were two pages or more of the Washington Post. That was all.
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, the second page of this MFI, DCT-165, that we have is at the top MFA/8, there's a paragraph 14, done in Bamako on March 2, 2000 and there are various names and signatures here?
A. Excuse me, I don't see what you are tal king about, counsel.

PRESIDING JUDGE: What are you referring to, Ms Hollis?
MS HOLLIS: I'm referring to the second page that we have.
PRESIDING JUDGE: Which is not part of the MFI.
MS HOLLIS: DCT-165.
PRESIDING JUDGE: It's not part of the MFI.
MR GRIFFITHS: It's not part of the MFI because this, you will see, is a document which was disclosed to us by the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & 1 & Prosecution and only one page was disclosed to us, and it's only \\
\hline & 2 & that page which was marked for identification. There was never a \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{15:15:53} & 3 & page 2 in our possession which we marked. \\
\hline & 4 & MS HOLLIS: But there was a page 2 to the DCT-165, yes? \\
\hline & 5 & Are we incorrect about that? \\
\hline & 6 & MR GRIfFITHS: I think you are incorrect about that, \\
\hline & 7 & because we in wrote fact to your case manager asking for the \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{15:16:06} & 8 & second page of this letter. We were told that there was no such \\
\hline & 9 & second page in existence. \\
\hline & 10 & MS HOLLIS: And we do not have a second page, but we were \\
\hline & 11 & given the DCT-165 as two pages with a second page with the \\
\hline & 12 & heading "MFA/8". \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{15:16:26} & 13 & PRESIDING JUDGE: You were given it by who? \\
\hline & 14 & MS HOLLIS: The Defence disclosure. It was at tab 59 in \\
\hline & 15 & binder 2. \\
\hline & 16 & PRESIDING JUDGE: How could they disclose to you what they \\
\hline & 17 & don't have? \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{15:16:35} & 18 & MS HOLLIS: It's not a signature page for this letter. \\
\hline & 19 & That's the point. It's some other document. \\
\hline & 20 & MR GRIFFITHS: I clearly recall this letter because when we \\
\hline & 21 & were thinking of disclosing it to the Prosecution, my case \\
\hline & 22 & manager actually wrote to Ms Dimitrova and asked where is the \\
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{15:17:00} & 23 & remainder of this letter, because it had originally been \\
\hline & 24 & disclosed by the Prosecution, and we were told that's the only \\
\hline & 25 & page and that's the only page as far as l understand that we \\
\hline & 26 & disclosed as part of our disclosure. \\
\hline & 27 & PRESIDING JUDGE: Let me get it straight. This letter in \\
\hline & 28 & MFI-281 is originally a Prosecution document disclosed to the \\
\hline & 29 & Defence. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MS HOLLIS: This page. It has our ERN number at the top.
PRESIDING JUDGE: And the Defence says that at the time they received your disclosure of MFI-281, it was only this one page that we see and that they requested for a second page, which your case manager indicated did not exist.

MS HOLLIS: That we did not have, yes.
PRESIDING JUDGE: So where has the second page come from? MS HOLLIS: When we were given DCT-165, it was a two-page document and the second page was MFA/8. That was in the binders of disclosure that we were given when the Defence was providing the information. Perhaps this could just be shown to the Defence so they know what I'm talking about. It was in tab 59 , binder 2 for week 33, DCT-165. This was not a signature page for this I etter, but this was the second page that was given to us as DCT-165.

MR GRIFFITHS: I think there must be an error here, because my tab 59 of binder 2 is only a one-page document. So there has to be some confusion here.

MS HOLLIS: All right. I will move on from that then. PRESIDING JUDGE: Is the Defence disowning this second page?

MR GRIFFITHS: I don't know whether to own or disown it,
Madam President, because \(I\) haven't got a clue where it comes from. It may well have been disclosed in error in the copy given to the Prosecution. That's all I can assume.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Is it part of DCT-165?
MS HOLLIS: It was in the DCT-165 that was given to us. PRESIDING JUDGE: I n your assessment is it part of - does it logically follow?

MS HOLLIS: Not at all, and that's why we wanted to ask about it.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Then in that event I think you just discard it.

MS HOLLIS: If we could please look at DCT-278.
PRESIDING JUDGE: Does it have an MFI number?
MS HOLLIS: I'm sorry, it is MFI-278, DCT-104, which was tab 69 in binder 2 of 4 for week 33:
Q. Mr Taylor, you see this is an article by Edward Epstein, "UN is diamond cartel's best friend." Mr Taylor, was this one of the documents that you included in your archive before you left Liberia?
A. There were thousands of documents. I can't be too sure whether this is collection on the part of the general Defence team. I'm sorry, I may not be able to remember specifically every one of the thousands of documents. This looks like a newspaper report to me that could have been put together also by the Defence team. I don't recall specifics, whether it came from - in my archives. It could be, but ..
Q. We see at the bottom in handwriting, "August 3, 2000, page A14". Is that your handwriting, Mr Taylor? So you can see that on the right on the bottom?
A. No, it doesn't look like my handwriting.
Q. And the author, Mr Epstein. Were you interviewed by Mr Epstein before he wrote this article?
A. I don't recall ever being interviewed by Mr Epstein.
Q. Do you know if any of your representatives were interviewed
by \(M r\) Epstein before he wrote this article?
A. When you say any of my representatives, is that to be
```

1 equated with any official of my government?
2 Q. Anyone acting on your behalf, Mr Taylor?
3 A. No, I'm not aware that anyone acting on my behalf was
4 interviewed by Mr Epstein. It very well could have been, but ..
15:23:00 5
Q. Mr Taylor, do you know if, before he wrote this article,
Mr Epstein interviewed any of the civilians in Sierra Leone who
were mining diamonds?
A. | don't know. | don't know if he did.
Q. Do you know what sources Mr Epstein relied on to write this
article?
A. No.
Q. And I understand you may not remember but, if you do, could
you tell me when do you recall first seeing this article?
A. Oh, l would say over the past maybe four years. Four or
15:23:47 15 five years. Four years, I would say.
Q. 2006, is that what we're talking about?
A. That is correct.
Q. That's your best recollection of when you first saw it?
A. That is correct.
Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. If we could please look at MFI-274, which was DCT-210. This was tab 2 in the materials for week 29. Mr Taylor, we see this is a l January 1990 statement by Charles Ghankay Taylor, I eader of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia. Do you remember talking about this statement with your counsel -.
A. That is correct.
Q. $\quad .-1 n$ direct examination, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes.
Q. If we could look down at the fourth paragraph that begins,

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & "Having exhausted." Do you see that, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 2 & A. Yes, l see it \\
\hline & 3 & Q. Your Defence counsel read this document including this \\
\hline & 4 & paragraph: \\
\hline 15:26:14 & 5 & "Having exhausted every possible avenue of reason and \\
\hline & 6 & having seen every effort to peacefully effect a change of \\
\hline & 7 & governance by constitutional means crushed by the harshest use of \\
\hline & 8 & force, we the members of the National Patriotic Front under the \\
\hline & 9 & I eadership of Charles Ghankay Taylor feel it is our right and \\
\hline 15:26:41 & 10 & bounded duty to rid the people of Liberia of this cancerous \\
\hline & 11 & despotism by whatever means at our disposal with the following \\
\hline & 12 & objectives." \\
\hline & 13 & Then you list the various objectives. Mr Taylor, you \\
\hline & 14 & remember the Defence counsel asking you what you meant by this \\
\hline 15:26:58 & 15 & I anguage, "Having exhausted every possible avenue of reason and \\
\hline & 16 & having seen every effort to peacefully effect a change of \\
\hline & 17 & governance by constitutional means crushed." Do you remember \\
\hline & 18 & being asked what that meant, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 19 & A. Not offhand. \\
\hline 15:27:14 & 20 & Q. This was on 16 July and, Mr Taylor, do you remember telling \\
\hline & 21 & the court that what you meant by that was that you had tried to \\
\hline & 22 & get the Doe regime to accept Jackson F Doe as President but that \\
\hline & 23 & you were unsuccessful in doing that? \\
\hline & 24 & A. Yes, what's your question. \\
\hline 15:27:48 & 25 & Q. Do you recall telling the judges? \\
\hline & 26 & A. If it's in the records, yes. \\
\hline & 27 & Q. That is what you meant by that; that you had tried to get \\
\hline & 28 & Jackson F Doe accepted as President? \\
\hline & 29 & A. | said l had tried? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q. You, the NPFL, but you. It says here, "Having exhausted every possible avenue of reason and having seen every effort to peacefully effect a change of government by constitutional means crushed." Do you remember saying that what you meant there was that you, either you individually or collectively the NPFL, had tried to get the Doe regime to accept Jackson F Doe as President? A. But, counsel, please help me. I mean, the transcript uses "you" or I say "we". What is my evidence? Q. Let's take a look at that and perhaps that will help us all. 16 July 2009.
A. Yes.
Q. That would be page 24633 to page 24636 where this is
discussed. You are talking about these statements - this statement, and if we could move down the page please. It's dated 1 January 1990 and it's headed "Statement by Charles Ghankay Taylor". So we're talking about this statement, yes, Mr Taylor, this statement we have before us, 1 January 1990?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could move on to the next page, please, and if we could keep going so that we move down to the I anguage of the fourth paragraph. If we could stop there. In fact, if we could go back up a bit, please, where you are talking about the bloody military coup, ten years of oppression, and then they ask whose assessment that is. And then we go down about October 1985, the Liberian people turning out in massive numbers at the polls seeing the electoral process subverted, and then you are asked to what you are adverting there, and you say that you explained to the Court yesterday the elections held in Liberia in 1985:
"A vast majority of the citizens believed that the
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elections was won by 1 mentioned on yesterday Jackson Doe, \(N\) Doe, but Samuel Doe claimed to have won with a margin of 50.9 per cent."

If we could go on, please, to the next page. Here we have, starting at line 11, please, the fourth paragraph, "Having exhausted every possible avenue of reason..." Then the question: "It says on the first line of that paragraph, having exhausted every possible avenue of reason. What were they?
A. Not just Charles Taylor but the Liberian people had asked Doe to step aside and turn the Presidency over to the individual that, for the most part, even the international community agreed had won the election. That was Jackson \(F\) Doe."

So this I anguage in the first part of paragraph 4 you explain was that, not just you but the Liberian people had tried to get Master Sergeant Doe to step down and turn the presidency over to Jackson Doe. Correct, Mr Taylor?
A. Yes. And you have to understand the context of your question being asked. When 1 said not just me, \({ }^{\prime}\) m not in Liberia in 1985, so l'm saying not just me. I'moutside, but I'm al so considering what is going on. But the Liberian people are also interested. Yes. That's my - that's my evidence here.
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, when you prefaced your statement that the National Patriotic Front under the I eadership of Charles Ghankay Taylor feel it is your right and bounded duty to rid the people of Liberia of this cancerous despotism by whatever means at our disposal, you prefaced that on the fact that you had exhausted every possible avenue of reason and had seen every effort to peacefully effect a change of governance by constitutional means
crushed. And one of those explanations as to what you were trying to do was that you were trying to get Jackson Doe. Jackson \(F\) Doe to take the presidency?
A. No, no, no. No, you're - no, I can't accept the proposition as you put it. I'm not in Liberia in 1985. I'm in a diaspora, but 1 have interests. But in 1985, for the benefit of the Court, there's a National Patriotic Front. Our front is the second front. So what is being - they do not - if you look at this letter in the context of talking about it in 1990, 1'm giving a history of what led to it, including myself.
Q. The point that we have looked at here is when you said "having exhausted every possible avenue of reason".
A. Yes.
Q. That you were talking about the attempts to get Jackson \(F\) Doe instated as President of Liberia, correct?
A. No, no, no. At the time that this document, the National Patriotic Front here, this is in 1990, okay, but you are referring - this document does not say here that the National Patriotic Front under me in 1985 is trying to get Jackson Doe in. It's the National Patriotic Front that comes up at that time under General Quiwonkpa that resists. They are two different things.
Q. Mr Taylor, I'm simply going back to your evidence where your Defence counsel asked you about this I anguage, so perhaps we could look again at the transcript. And if we could go to the top of that page so 1 can see what page we're on here, please. We're on page 24635, and at line 11 we have your counsel reading paragraph 4. And if we go down from there, beginning at line 19, we have your counsel saying:
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A. No, no, no. I'm not going to argue about that. The 1985 operation, l've told the Court on records here, even though l'm not there, \({ }^{\prime}\) 'min touch with General Qui wonkpa. So l'm a part of the process. So in this statement of 1990, I'm saying that even - this is one of the reasons that the Liberian people before, including myself, because \({ }^{\prime}\) 'm part of General Qui wonkpa, I have told this Court that General Qui wonkpa was in touch with me before he came to West Africa. Okay? I'm not there for this thing in 1985.
Q. I'm not saying you are, Mr Taylor.
A. But in following it up in 1990, all ।'m doing is giving a historical perspective in adding on to one of the causes. Here is the situation in 1985 where Jackson Doe is not given the presidency and continuing on. That's what l'm doing.
Q. Mr Taylor, Jackson \(F\) Doe, who is the one seen by most

Liberians to have won the elections, after Master Sergeant Doe is killed in September 1991, you could have made Jackson F Doe the President, could you not, Mr Taylor?
A. No, the circumstances at the time was different. No, I could not.
Q. And that would have been acting according to the will of the people of Liberia, wouldn't it, Mr Taylor?
A. No, no, l would disagree with you as you put it. We're talking about many years after that situation, political situation, social situation. We were not an army for Jackson Doe, so l would disagree.
Q. Mr Taylor, Jackson \(F\) Doe was still alive in September 1991, wasn't he?
A. To the best of my recollection, he was in Monrovia and 1 -
but we were not an army for Jackson Doe. We did not Iaunch the revolution to put Jackson Doe in the presidency. We put it in.. Q. Indeed you did not, did you, Mr Taylor? You didn't I aunch it to put Mr Jackson Doe in the presidency, did you?
A. We were not Jackson Doe's army.
Q. But if you were acting to meet the will of the Liberian people, you could have made Jackson F Doe the President in 1991. Couldn't you?
A. No, that question is one that suggests something that I think 1 would consider an unfair question. The Liberian people did not vote in 1995 and say, "At whatever cost in some future years, Jackson Doe must take the presidency." So that question is erroneous.
Q. Indeed, Mr Taylor, if you had put Jackson F Doe in the presidency in 1991, he would have been supported by these people in Liberia who thought he had won the election, wouldn't he?
A. Well, I don't have a crystal ball. \(\quad\) can't answer that question. That's speculative
Q. He was still a very popular figure in 1991, wasn't he?
A. I have no idea if Jackson Doe was a popular figure in 1991.

I have no idea.
Q. He was still a very respected figure in 1991 by the great majority of Liberians, wasn't he, Mr Taylor?
A. Well, I wouldn't make - I wouldn't make a blanket statement

I ike that. I would say that Jackson Doe was a respected figure. Now, as to whether he was respected by a vast majority of Liberian people, \(\quad\) can't say that.
Q. Mr Taylor, this paragraph 4 that attempts to explain why you and the National Patriotic Front felt that it was your right
and bounded duty to rid the people of Liberia of the despotism by whatever means at your disposal wasn't really a true statement, was it, Mr Taylor? You wanted to rid Liberia of Master Sergeant Doe because you wanted to be in power in Liberia?
A. Counsel, well, you can draw your own conclusion. I
disagree.
Q. Mr Taylor, had you, after Master Sergeant Doe's death in 1991, made Jackson F Doe President, then your years of civil war wouldn't have occurred, would they?
A. I don't know the basis of your conclusion. Maybe from some expertise, but l'\| disagree with your conclusion or your as sumptions, your speculations. I cannot comment on speculations. We have serious disagreement with that.
Q. Mr Taylor, this statement is basically a public relations effort on your part at the beginning of your attack on Liberia, isn't it?
A. Well, to be very, very fair, it is a part of a public relations campaign, but it's more than that. Not just that. It is proper to identify to the world immediately upon setting out with such a situation to identify to the world exactly who you are and what you are doing. So, yes, there are some public relations values in it, but that was not the objective.
Q. And it was basically a propaganda statement on your part, wasn't it, Mr Taylor?
A. That \(\mid\) totally reject.
Q. If we look down at the objectives and we look at paragraph 4, saying that "the National Patriotic Front is not beholden to any foreign group or power," Mr Taylor, you included this I anguage because you wanted to win over the United States. Isn't

Q. And the assistance from la Cote d'Ivoire included giving you the right to travel through that country freely. Isn't that right?
A. Well, in earnesty, at some later state. Now, if we divide it into time, at the beginning of this situation la Cote d'Ivoire made every, every attempt to have any Liberian crossing into Liberia from la Cote d'Ivoire arrested, so l would say that. At some later stage about 1 would say - about a year or so later, once we started talking in peace, we were given access to move in Ia Cote d'Ivoire.
Q. And you were given access to move and to take arms and war materials through Cote d'Ivoire to Liberia. That's correct, is it not?
A. No, the Ivorian government never, ever - I will not lie on the I ate President Houphouet-Boigny. Never, ever authorised the movement of arms and ammuition through la Cote d'Ivoire.
Q. It's correct, is it not, that subordinates within his government did allow to you to do that?
A. Initially one gentleman - and this was all private. That's why we must distinguish. I said the Ivorian government never did. Because of the tribal links between the Yacoubas and the Gios in Liberia on at least one occasion during the early part of 1990 we were able to sneak things through la Cote d'Ivoire.
Q. And those things were arms and war materials, isn't that correct?
A. Well, that's too general. I can be specific. There were some communication and small amounts of ammunition that had been given by Burkina Faso at the time, communication equipment.
Q. And this use of la Cote d'Ivoire as a traverse for these

A. No, l wouldn't say that is correct.
Q. And Robert Guei was involved very early on in this movement of arms and war materiel to you from Ivory Coast. Isn't that correct?
A. Totally incorrect. Totally incorrect.
Q. And indeed, Mr Taylor, Iater on, after you were President, Robert Guei continued to be conduit for your ability to bring arms from outside of Liberia. Isn't that correct?
A. Totally, totally incorrect. Totally incorrect.
Q. Mr Taylor, we see here, "January 1, 1990 , the National Patriotic Front." When do you say that this became known as the National Patriotic Front for Liberia?
A. |'m not sure । understand.
Q. Well, we have National Patriotic Front, NPF. Is that being used as the same as NPFL?
A. NPFL, the L is Liberia, the National Patriotic Front of Liberia, but when you put the acronym you say NPFL.
Q. So this means the same thing, NPFL?
A. That is correct.
Q. When you are talking about National Patriotic Front?
A. Of Liberia, that is correct.
Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. Now if we could also look at MFI-6, please, which was the analytic chronology. This was DCT-43, which was tab 3 in the binder of additional documents for week 30. If we could put the first page of that document up, please. Mr Taylor, as we look at the top of this page, it appears that there was a line or there was something at the very top above "Preface." Do you see the markings there where there is a heavy black line to the left and then what appears to be a broken line?

be some official document. I don't know what happened to the other pages.
Q. And it sets out the three texts to be derived fromit in this first paragraph:
"The sections titled 'Introduction' and 'Descriptions of the humanitarian conflict situation in Liberia' constitute one text, a background text on the ECOWAS peace plan. This text comprises paragraphs 1 through 18 and is entitled 'Humanitarian conflict situation on the eve of the Banjul ECOWAS meting in \(1990^{\prime}\).

Do you have any idea who wrote this preface, Mr Taylor? A. No, I don't.
Q. And then it indicates that:
"The second text is the analytic chronology of various proposals, ideals and activities which were developed or partially implemented within the framework of Yamoussoukro and Cotonou Accords."

Then it talks about the third text which it says presents ITIP/IA suggestions for ways forward:
"It is a text that can be appreciated against the background of either of the first two texts. The entire document will be useful for non-governmental organisations interested in the peace process in Liberia. The third text is titled 'Analysis and proposals for advancing the peace efforts in Liberia'."

Mr Taylor, do you know these three different sections, if you will, of this document - do you know were they written by the same person or people?
A. Oh, I don't - l would presume that they are written by the same people because one - this looks like something that is work
being done by a group, at least an organisation.
Q. But you don't know if it's the same or different people?
A. I don't know.
Q. And, Mr Taylor, if we look at page 4, which is entitled "Introduction", and if we look at paragraph 4, "The structure of this policy review paper is as follows." Do you have any idea who prepared the policy review paper?
A. No, l don't know who prepared the policy review paper.
Q. Mr Taylor, if we look at page 6, "Description of the humanitarian conflict situation in Liberia on the eve of the Banjul ECOWAS meeting in 1990," and we see paragraph 5. And we see:
"While pressures for change in the conduct and governance of President Doe's government had been mounting in the years preceding the invasion of Liberia by the forces of the National Patriotic front of Liberia in 1989, the mounting of that invasion marked the shift of the struggle of state power contestation in Liberia from constitutional politics to that of national security politics."

Mr Taylor, do you have any idea who was writing this description?
A. The think l word there, counsel, I may have mi sheard you, I think it's "constitutionalist policies".
Q. "State power contestation in Liberia from constitutionalist politics to that of national security politics." If 1 misread that, I apologise. You say you have no idea who was writing this?
A. This organisation appears to be very professional. I really don't know who wrote that.
Q. But you've had no contacts or you haven't heard of ITIP.IA?
A. No, \(\quad\) can't recall this acronym. No, 1 can't recall it, but it looks very professional to me and it was used widely. Q. Mr Taylor, do you recall when you first received this document?
A. Oh, as to the year, I don't recall when 1 first received this document.
Q. Do you recall any events that were occurring about the time you first received this document, to help place it?
A. Not particularly.
Q. Were you, do you recall, a member of the Council of State by the time you received this document?
A. Your question is do 1 remember any members of the council of State?
Q. No, do you remember if you were a member of the Council of State at the time you first received this document?
A. Oh, counsel, |'m sorry, \(\quad\) can't recall if \(\mid\) was a member of the Council of State. I really can't recall.
Q. Mr Taylor, was this document among the documents that you had placed in your archive before you left Liberia?
A. This could be - remember the archives are three sets of documents. I'm not sure if this is from one of those sets. |'ve got documents that 1 put together, l've got documents that other people put together. This could be from one of the groups. I'm not too certain.
Q. But you have no recollection as to whether this document was part of the archive you had put together before you left. You have no recollection as to whether that's true?
A. It could very well have been, but - it could very well have
been.
Q. Mr Taylor, you said that you have three sets of documents:

Documents you put together - and, Mr Taylor, these were the documents you had put together before you left Liberia. I think you've told the Court about that, yes?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then you indicated that you had documents that other people put together. Who were these other people who put together documents?
A. Oh, former ministers and other aides to me at the time.
Q. When did they do that?
A. Way back when 1 was in office, too. Minister - and even some of those documents were given - when l went into exile, l received some additional documents from them.
Q. So the documents that were put together by the mi nisters, who decided what documents that they would select and put together?
A. Oh, these are professionals. In fact, I could remember I got a lot of documents from the then Ministry of Information. I got documents from the Mi nister of State. So they made their decisions on what they felt was very important.
Q. Then they gave you these documents before you left Liberia?
A. Some of them before; some after.
Q. And when they gave you the documents after, you were where when they gave you those documents?
A. Nigeria.
Q. And they brought the documents to you?
A. Their documents, they were sent to me. My share of documents were stored in Monrovia, okay. But while l was out,

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & down to Monrovia. \\
\hline & 2 & Q. And to whom did you have them sent in Monrovia? \\
\hline & 3 & A. To the individuals that were keeping the first set of \\
\hline & 4 & documents that I I eft with them. \\
\hline 16:03:11 & 5 & Q. And who was that? \\
\hline & 6 & A. It was a younger cousin of mind called Bracewell, John. \\
\hline & 7 & Q. And, Mr Taylor, there were also documents that were \\
\hline & 8 & collected by your Defence team. Isn't that correct? \\
\hline & 9 & A. Yes, investigators. That's the third set. Investigators \\
\hline 16:03:37 & 10 & collected documents. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. And beginning when, do you know, did investigators collect \\
\hline & 12 & documents? \\
\hline & 13 & A. I would say almost from the very beginning of my arrest in \\
\hline & 14 & - what is it? 2006. \\
\hline 16:03:53 & 15 & Q. And do you know where those documents were kept? \\
\hline & 16 & A. Well, l don't know where the Defence material - where they \\
\hline & 17 & kept their material? \\
\hline & 18 & Q. The investigators, the members of your Defence who \\
\hline & 19 & collected these materials, do you know where they kept them? \\
\hline 16:04:17 & 20 & A. I have no idea. I would assume at the - first the sierra \\
\hline & 21 & Leone Defence office in Freetown, and then l would assume here in \\
\hline & 22 & The Hague. The material that was collected by the second team, \\
\hline & 23 & if any, would be kept by them in their offices, l would assume. \\
\hline & 24 & I don't know. \\
\hline 16:04:41 & 25 & Q. Thank you, Mr Taylor. If we could please look at MFI-198, \\
\hline & 26 & please. That is DCT-135. If we could see the first page of this \\
\hline & 27 & document. You see, Mr Taylor, it is entitled "Motive and \\
\hline & 28 & opportunity for UN panel of experts recommended sanctions against \\
\hline & 29 & Liberia". And if we look at the last page of the document, at \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & least my last page appears to be a blank page with some smudging \\
\hline & 2 & on the bottom. Is that the - and then if we look at the page \\
\hline & 3 & before that, page 19, this appears to be the last page of text, \\
\hline & 4 & and, at least on my copy, there is no signature of any kind. \\
\hline 16:07:10 & 5 & Correct, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 6 & A. Could you go again? \\
\hline & 7 & Q. There is no signature of any kind on page 19, is there? \\
\hline & 8 & A. I can't see the end of the page. I'mtrying to get it up. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. Could you move that down? \\
\hline 16:07:26 & 10 & A. I don't see any signature on this page \\
\hline & 11 & Q. And, Mr Taylor, if we go back to page 1. \\
\hline & 12 & A. But a document like this, counsel, would not carry a \\
\hline & 13 & signature though. \\
\hline & 14 & Q. If we go back to page 1, please. And if we could look at \\
\hline 16:07:45 & 15 & that page there, there is not a signature on this page either; \\
\hline & 16 & yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 17 & A. No, there is not one there. \\
\hline & 18 & Q. Who prepared this document? \\
\hline & 19 & A. This document was prepared again by national security \\
\hline 16:07:59 & 20 & \(s t a f f\). \\
\hline & 21 & Q. Who was it who prepared it; do you know? \\
\hline & 22 & A. I don't know the individual, but the national security \\
\hline & 23 & council staff would prepare such a - this is - you know, this is \\
\hline & 24 & an official government document, so it would not necessarily \\
\hline 16:08:14 & 25 & carry a signature, but this is an official government document. \\
\hline & 26 & Q. Is there another copy of this that would have any official \\
\hline & 27 & government l etterhead or anything on the top? \\
\hline & 28 & A. No, this is the - this is the copy. \\
\hline & 29 & Q. And you said that your national security council staff \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & prepared this. Who directed them to do so? \\
\hline & 2 & A. Oh, it would be l guess with my authorisation, with my \\
\hline & 3 & approval. \\
\hline & 4 & Q. Was it with your authorisation and approval? Or did you \\
\hline 16:08:47 & 5 & direct that it be done? \\
\hline & 6 & A. Well, it's with my - it's with my authorisation and \\
\hline & 7 & approval. I mean, it is based on our determination that such a \\
\hline & 8 & document should be done, so l decided that I would approve it and \\
\hline & 9 & get it done. \\
\hline 16:09:04 & 10 & Q. When you say "approve it", do you mean that you yourself \\
\hline & 11 & directed that it be created? \\
\hline & 12 & A. I would approve the creation of such a document as \\
\hline & 13 & recommended by the council. \\
\hline & 14 & Q. Who recommended - who was it who recommended to you that \\
\hline 16:09:19 & 15 & this document be created? \\
\hline & 16 & A. It would be the council. The national security adviser \\
\hline & 17 & would bring a recommendation based on the prevailing situation \\
\hline & 18 & and say that it is the view of the council that a response be \\
\hline & 19 & made to the prevailing situation, and then l would say, well, \\
\hline 16:09:40 & 20 & then go ahead and prepare the response \\
\hline & 21 & Q. And when was this document prepared? \\
\hline & 22 & A. This document, I would put it to - 1 would put it to around \\
\hline & 23 & 19-1 would put it about ' 98 or thereabouts. \\
\hline & 24 & Q. Do you have a specific recollection of when it was \\
\hline 16:10:08 & 25 & prepared, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 26 & A. Well, you know, as l'm looking at the document, yes, I \\
\hline & 27 & would say this is - this is about - I can see here, Cl inton is \\
\hline & 28 & still in office, so it's about 1998. It's all of the crisis \\
\hline & 29 & going on and the accusations and crisis and machinations, so l \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & would put this is to about '98. \\
\hline & 2 & Q. And at that time when this document was prepared, who was \\
\hline & 3 & your national security adviser? \\
\hline & 4 & A. 1998, if | recall, it was Lewis Brown. |f | recall \\
\hline 16:10:50 & 5 & properly. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. And do you recall any of the members of your national \\
\hline & 7 & security council at that time? \\
\hline & 8 & A. Whoever was Defence Minister, Foreign Minister, National \\
\hline & 9 & Security Minister, all of those individuals were on the council. \\
\hline 16:11:06 & 10 & Q. Who would have been your Foreign Minister at that time? \\
\hline & 11 & A. Monie Captan was Foreign Minister. \\
\hline & 12 & Q. And when you say National Security Minister, do you mean \\
\hline & 13 & your national security adviser? \\
\hline & 14 & A. No, no, no. In Liberia there is a Ministry of National \\
\hline 16:11:21 & 15 & Security and there is a national security adviser. \\
\hline & 16 & Q. Who was your Minister of National Security at the time that \\
\hline & 17 & this document was prepared? \\
\hline & 18 & A. My recollection, that would have been General Philip Kamah, \\
\hline & 19 & to the best of my recollection. \\
\hline 16:11:46 & 20 & Q. Can you help us with the last name, please? \\
\hline & 21 & A. Kamah, I think that's K-A-M-A - Iet's add an H. Kamah. We \\
\hline & 22 & can probably correct it. General Philip Kamah. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. Mr Taylor, had he been a member of your NPFL? \\
\hline & 24 & A. No, no, no. General Philip Kamah was one of those - he was \\
\hline 16:12:07 & 25 & the chief of staff of the armed forces of Liberia during one part \\
\hline & 26 & of the war. \\
\hline & 27 & Q. Mr Taylor, after this had been prepared, did you review it \\
\hline & 28 & for final approval? \\
\hline & 29 & A. I would say yes. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

A. No, no, no. No, there was - this is the Foreign Ministers meeting. My Minister of Foreign Affairs was there.
Q. That would have been Monie Captan?
A. That is correct.
Q. Then it indicates:
"The meeting reviewed the situation in Sierra Leone since the breakdown of negotiations bet ween the Committee of five and the representatives of the junta since 30 July 1997."

Then it recalls ECOWAS decisions and it recalls resolution 1132 placing an embargo on Sierra Leone.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then number 4 indicates that the Committee of Five and the junta's delegation agreed to accelerate efforts towards the peaceful resolution of Sierra Leonean crisis. And indicated that the peace plan for Sierra Leone was adopted and a timetable for its implementation over a six-month period with effect from 23 October 1997, recognised that Corporal Foday Sankoh continued to play an active role. And then in number 7 it also indicated Corporal Foday Sankoh is expected to return to his country to make his contribution to the peace process. Can you explain that for us, please? When it says Corporal Foday Sankoh is expected to return to his country, was there a plan in place at that time for Foday Sankoh to return to Sierra Leone in October 1997?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was to return to his country to make his contribution to the peace process. So what conditions, if any, were to be placed on Foday Sankoh's return to Sierra Leone?
A. Well, the only condition that 1 can recollect right now, again the peace plan we're talking about, for the benefit of the

Court, we're now talking about the 1996 agreement that have been signed between President Kabbah and Foday Sankoh in Ia Cote d'Ivoire. So the condition from my understanding is that they would accept to implement the 1996 agreement and that he would be sent - Iet's look at the period now. Foday Sankoh, we know where he is at this particular time in October 1997.
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, Iet's look back up at number 5 because they are talking about the Committee of Five and representatives of Major Johnny Paul Koroma adopting an ECOWAS peace plan for Sierra Leone and a timetable for its implementation over a six-month period with effect from 23 October 1997?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then in paragraph number 7 they talk about the ECOWAS peace plan for Sierra Leone.
A. Yes.
Q. Then in 6 there is an indication that he is expected to return to his country. And when it says expected to return to his country, had there been negotiations underway with the junta for Foday Sankoh to return to Sierra Leone?
A. Well, I remember yes, because Foday Sankoh is an official. His named as, to the best of my recollection, as Vice-President or the number two man in the junta, but he is not there to take his seat. So, yes.
Q. And were your representatives part of this decision making about him returning to Sierra Leone?
A. Well, the Foreign Ministers had gone through this and my representative was there, so we were part of that process, yes. Q. So it was expected that he would be returning to Sierra Leone and he would be able to take up his role as the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & Vice-President or the vice chairman under the junta? \\
\hline & 2 & A. No, counsel that's not what l'm saying, counsel, no. \\
\hline & 3 & That's not what l'm saying. I think I am responding to your \\
\hline & 4 & question. You wanted to find out if Foday Sankoh would return \\
\hline 16:19:57 & 5 & and l'm trying to - I was trying to lay for the Court that there \\
\hline & 6 & was no real threat to Foday Sankoh because when the junta took \\
\hline & 7 & over he was named as Vice-President. So l was responding to your \\
\hline & 8 & question. \\
\hline & 9 & Q. You had indicated because, "Foday Sankoh is an official"? \\
\hline 16:20:10 & 10 & A. Yes. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. "To the best of my recollection as the Vice-President or \\
\hline & 12 & the number two man in the junta, but he is not there to take his \\
\hline & 13 & seat"? \\
\hline & 14 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline 16:20:23 & 15 & Q. So my question is this expectation of himto return to his \\
\hline & 16 & country, was it the expectation he would return to sierra Leone \\
\hline & 17 & and take his seat in the junta government? \\
\hline & 18 & A. Well, I think the language that they use here in the text, \\
\hline & 19 & I like that l anguage too, is more like to participate in the \\
\hline 16:20:45 & 20 & peace process, okay. To play an active role in the peace \\
\hline & 21 & process. That's the objective that I want to stick with. That \\
\hline & 22 & was the whole objective. \\
\hline & 23 & Q. My question is this, and maybe you don't know, but "was \\
\hline & 24 & expected he would return to his country", was it expected he \\
\hline 16:21:02 & 25 & would return to his country and take his position in the junta \\
\hline & 26 & government? \\
\hline & 27 & A. I could only assume that this would be the case. Once he \\
\hline & 28 & returns to Sierra Leone the junta is still in power. They are \\
\hline & 29 & given a time frame agreement by ECOWAS that they must renege. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & I et me not say renege, that they must l eave power. So by coming \\
\hline & 2 & into Sierra Leone all would be expecting that foday Sankoh would \\
\hline & 3 & take his position and then continue along with the junta and \\
\hline & 4 & i mplement the agreement to relinquish power in line with what \\
\hline 16:21:42 & 5 & ECOWAS and they have agreed. This is my - this is the best l can \\
\hline & 6 & put on it. \\
\hline & 7 & Q. And of course had you a representative who was reporting \\
\hline & 8 & back to you on these matters. Yes, Mr Taylor? \\
\hline & 9 & A. My Foreign Minister was there. And that's why you have \\
\hline 16:22:02 & 10 & this communique, yes. \\
\hline & 11 & Q. If we look at number 7, "The ECOWAS peace plan for Sierra \\
\hline & 12 & Leone provides for", and if we look at the second bullet point \\
\hline & 13 & from the bottom, "I mmunities and guarantees to the leaders of the \\
\hline & 14 & May 25, 1997 coup d'etat." What does this refer to, immunities \\
\hline 16:22:25 & 15 & and guarantees? What is that? \\
\hline & 16 & A. Making sure that - just what it says, immunities. I'msure \\
\hline & 17 & they're talking about legal immunities and guarantees that they \\
\hline & 18 & would not be held responsible for staging a coup detat against \\
\hline & 19 & the constituted government. This is my interpretation of that. \\
\hline 16:22:52 & 20 & Q. And, Mr Taylor, if we look at the second page of this \\
\hline & 21 & communique, and if we look at paragraph 11: \\
\hline & 22 & "The meeting expressed its appreciation to the UN and the \\
\hline & 23 & OAU for their cooperation with ECOWAS and appealed to them for \\
\hline & 24 & material, logistic and financial support to ECOMOG to enable it \\
\hline 16:23:34 & 25 & to carry out the mandate given by the authority of the Heads of \\
\hline & 26 & State and Government and the United Nations Security Council." \\
\hline & 27 & So again, Mr Taylor, we have appeals for Iogistics and \\
\hline & 28 & financial support and material for ECOMOG to carry out its \\
\hline & 29 & duties, correct? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. To carry out its duties in Sierra Leone for this time, yes. Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr Taylor, at this meeting in October 1997 where your Foreign Minister attended, did your Foreign Minister tell the other attendees at this meeting of the Sierra Leonean delegation that had come to your country in August 1997?
A. No. But in fact, I did not say that a delegation had come to Liberia in August 1997.
Q. Mr Taylor, l believe you have testified before that a delegation did come and you refused to see them?
A. Well, if we go back to - no, I don't think he told them. I did not get any report from him that he had told them. He could have, but 1 didn't get any report.
Q. Did you direct him to tell them about this?
A. No, I did not direct him to tell them.
Q. Mr Taylor, if it would be of assistance, when we begin again on Monday l'\| have the reference for you to your prior testimony about this group coming from Sierra Leone to Liberia.
A. I agree they came to - I agree that they came.
Q. All right, they came?
A. Yeah, I agree that they came.
Q. It was the word "delegation" that you disagreed with?
A. I'm not - maybe we're mi xed up here.
Q. If you look at page 153, on mine it's line 12:
"No, but in fact \(I\) did not say that a delegation had come to Liberia in August 1997."
A. I guess the way how the questions came when, you talk about a delegation, you know, it was not a question as to whether the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & junta had sent a delegation. That was not your - the way you \\
\hline & 2 & just threw it in and. \\
\hline & 3 & Q. But we are in agreement that in August 1997 a delegation \\
\hline & 4 & from the junta came to Liberia? \\
\hline 16:26:08 & 5 & A. Or thereabouts. \\
\hline & 6 & Q. And you have told the Court you refused to see them? \\
\hline & 7 & A. Oh, definitely. That's true. \\
\hline & 8 & Q. Thank you for that, Mr Taylor. Madam President, how much \\
\hline & 9 & time do you show that we have? \\
\hline 16:26:40 & 10 & PRESIDING JUDGE: We have five mi nutes. \\
\hline & 11 & MS HOLLIS: \\
\hline & 12 & Q. If we could look at MFI-234, please, which was DCT-270. We \\
\hline & 13 & see that this is, "United Nations Security Council S/RES/1156 \\
\hline & 14 & (1998), 16 March 1998, resolution 1156 (1998) adopted by the \\
\hline 16:27:38 & 15 & Security Council at its 3861 st meting on 16 March 1998": \\
\hline & 16 & "The Security Council recalling its resolution 1132 (1997) \\
\hline & 17 & of 8 October 1997 and the relevant statements of its President, \\
\hline & 18 & taking note of the letter from the charge d'affaires Al of the \\
\hline & 19 & permanent mission of Sierra Leone to the United Nations to the \\
\hline 16:28:09 & 20 & President of the Security Council of 9 March 1998 (S/1998/215) \\
\hline & 21 & acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations: \\
\hline & 22 & 1. Welcomes the return to Sierra Leone of its \\
\hline & 23 & democratically elected President on 10 March 1998; \\
\hline & 24 & 2. Decides to terminate, with immediate effect, the \\
\hline 16:28:34 & 25 & prohibitions on the sale or supply to Sierra Leone of petroleum \\
\hline & 26 & and petroleum products referred to in paragraph 6 of resolution \\
\hline & 27 & 1132 (1997); \\
\hline & 28 & 3. Welcomes the intention of the Secretary-General to make \\
\hline & 29 & proposals concerning the role of the United Nations and its \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
future presence in Sierra Leone;
4. Decides to review the other prohibitions referred to in resolution 1132 (1997) in accordance with paragraph 17 of that resolution and in light of developments and further discussion with the Government of Sierra Leone;
5. Decides to remain seized of the matter."
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Taylor, in this paragraph 4, "Decides to review the other prohibitions referred to in the resolution", that includes the arms embargo on Sierra Leone, does it not?
A. I don't want to speculate, counsel. I would have to see resolution 1132, please. I don't want to speculate. I would not I ie that \(\mid\) remember all of it, counsel, of 1132.
Q. Mr Taylor, as we look at this resolution 1156, 16 March 1998, we find nowhere in this resolution a condemnation of the ECOMOG intervention, do we?
A. No, but that was not the context of the presentation of this document. This document ..
Q. \(\quad \mathrm{Mr}\) Taylor, my question was very simple. First of all answer my question.
A. What's your question?
Q. We find nowhere in this document a condemnation of the ECOMOG intervention, do we?
A. No, we do not see it in this document, no.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, we'll have to leave it at that. The tape has run out. Perhaps you could pick up on Monday where this is concerned.

Tomorrow being Friday, the day when we do other work, the proceedings are adjourned to Monday, 25 January at 9. 30 a.m.
1
2
3
4
[ Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4.30 p.m.
to be reconvened on Monday, 25 January 2010 at
9.30 a.m.] remind you of the Court's standing order not to discuss your evidence, please.

Mr Taylor, I beg your pardon. I take the opportunity to
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