THE LEGAL LEGACY OF THE SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE

This book examines whether the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), which was established jointly through an unprecedented bilateral treaty between the United Nations (UN) and Sierra Leone in 2002, has made jurisprudential contributions to the development of the nascent and still unsettled field of international criminal law. The work, which focuses on the main legal legacy of the SCSL, opens with an examination of the historical and political circumstances which led to the outbreak of a notoriously brutal civil war in Sierra Leone which lasted between March 1991 and January 2002 and led to the deaths of approximately 75,000 people. Following a discussion of the creation, jurisdiction, and the trials conducted by the SCSL, the author examines the SCSL’s unique personal jurisdiction over persons bearing “greatest responsibility” for the serious crimes committed in Sierra Leone and the implications of its use in future ad hoc international tribunals; the prosecution of the novel crime of “forced marriage” as other inhumane acts of crimes against humanity; the prosecution of the war crime of recruitment and use of children under the age of fifteen for the purpose of using them to participate in hostilities; as well as issues of immunity for the serving head of state of Liberia, which President Charles Taylor sought to invoke to block his own trial for international crimes before the SCSL. The book then discusses the status of blanket amnesties under international law, and critically evaluates the SCSL’s ruling that such a domestic measure could not block prosecution of universally condemned crimes before an independent international tribunal. Lastly, the book evaluates the tenuous interaction between truth commissions and special courts given both their simultaneous operation in Sierra Leone and distinctive mandates aimed at reconciliation and punishment. The author demonstrates that the SCSL, as the third modern international criminal tribunal supported by the UN, made some useful jurisprudential additions on many of these topics, and in some cases broke new ground, and that these represent a valuable legal and judicial contribution to the development of the nascent field of international criminal law.
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Preface and Acknowledgments

After the end of the Cold War, in the early 1990s, the United Nations established various types of ad hoc international criminal tribunals for different parts of the world to prosecute the perpetrators of crimes against humanity, genocide, war crimes, and other serious violations of international law. Although the UN Security Council–created International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and Rwanda (ICTR) were the modern pioneers, and are therefore better known, the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) followed not long afterwards and occupied its own space in the landscape of modern international criminal tribunals.

The SCSL, which was created through a bilateral treaty that was concluded between the UN and the Government of Sierra Leone in January 2002 following the latter’s request, was designed to address perceptions of shortcomings in the ICTY and ICTR models, in particular, their apparently costly nature; the relatively slow pace of their proceedings; their geographic and emotional distance from the local populations in whose names they were asked to render justice; and their seemingly unfocused prosecutions which sometimes included lower-ranking suspects that some deemed more appropriate for trial within national courts rather than before an international penal tribunal. The coercive Chapter VII legal basis of the twin UN tribunals and the consensual treaty-based character of the SCSL therefore differ markedly, reflecting the particular historical and political circumstances of their establishment.

Today, the ICTY, ICTR, and the SCSL have all completed their respective mandates. All have transformed into some type of residual mechanism, with the first two sharing a common one while the latter has its own separate body. Both residual courts are located in The Hague. Interestingly, in the lead-up to the completion of their work, the tribunals themselves as well as legal academics and others turned towards efforts aimed at evaluating the likely impact, and limitations, of these ad hoc courts using doctrinal, semi-empirical, and empirical approaches in an attempt to discern their “legacy.” Though often mentioned in contemporary
international criminal law discourse, but not always defined, the term “legacy” as
used in this work is a narrow reference to the body of legal rules, innovative practices,
and norms that the tribunal is expected to hand down to current and future
generations of international, internationalized, and national courts charged with
the responsibility to prosecute the same or similar international crimes. I describe
this as the “legal legacy,” as that term is used in the title of this book, in contrast to
other possible types of sociological, political, and other legacies that the tribunals
might leave behind.

This definition can be distinguished from the broader conception of legacy
offered by the UN for internationalized tribunals, which encompasses their “lasting
impact on bolstering the rule of law in a particular society, by conducting effective
trials to contribute to ending impunity, while also strengthening domestic judicial
capacity.” My use of the term here does not contemplate the physical infrastructure
like the SCSL buildings that were left behind in Freetown or the documents and
archives and records of the tribunal now officially located in The Hague, those being
matters that are more appropriately considered in discussions of the residual
mechanism. It also leaves out the institutional aspects of the SCSL model such as
the creation of defense or outreach offices or other types of institutional innovations
that were developed during the founding of the tribunal or in the course of its
existence. The latter are important, but not the focus of this book.

The SCSL, though the last of the first three UN supported tribunals, became the
first of the modern ad hoc international criminal tribunals since the Nuremberg Trials
to complete all of its cases through to appeals and to symbolically close down
d its doors even as it transformed into a Residual Special Court for Sierra Leone.
Perhaps unsurprisingly given that they were the first truly international criminal
courts to be established, various scholarly efforts have already been undertaken to
assess the legacy and impact of the ICTY, and to a lesser extent, the ICTR. Most of
the attempts to evaluate the legacy of the twin UN tribunals have focused on their
pioneering additions to the Nuremberg legacy and the normative advancement of
the concept of individual criminal responsibility at the international level as well as
on the elaboration of the substantive content of the various international crimes
within their jurisdiction, in particular, genocide, crimes against humanity, and war
crimes.

In contrast, between the establishment of the SCSL in January 2002 and its
closure in December 2013, fewer scholarly works have studied that tribunal and its
legacy to international criminal law and practice. Yet, because of the near unique
fact pattern of the Sierra Leone conflict, the SCSL was often confronted with a range
of novel legal issues in the course of its proceedings. This gave it the opportunity to
develop some interesting jurisprudence on issues of wider significance for the field.

1 Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Rule-of-Law Tools for Post-conflict States:
The Sierra Leone Court was among the first to grapple with some of the more important and recurring legal dilemmas for many modern post-conflict situations. For example, among others, the SCSL was the first international criminal court to prosecute persons bearing “greatest responsibility”; to try and convict persons for the recruitment and enlistment of children for the purposes of using them in hostilities. It was also the first international tribunal to recognize the new crime against humanity of forced marriage as an “other inhumane act,” and importantly, the first to indict, fully try, and then convict an African president for planning and aiding and abetting the commission of international crimes in a neighboring state thereby getting the opportunity to pronounce on the question of his immunity.

Finally, because of some key SCSL decisions which are now frequently cited by the International Criminal Court and other national and international tribunals, future legal efforts to hold perpetrators to account may now benefit from greater clarity on, among others, the question whether blanket amnesties granted under a peace agreement barred the prosecution of universally condemned international crimes before an ad hoc international criminal court; and the question whether alternative accountability mechanisms such as special tribunals and truth commissions can coexist and complement each other where used simultaneously.

The purpose of this book is to discuss the SCSL’s legacy on these legal issues on which the tribunal made some juridical contributions. It seeks to contribute to the emerging literature on the legacy of ad hoc international criminal courts by offering an assessment of the main legacy of the Sierra Leone Court from the perspective of an academic, but who because of his prior role, also had the opportunity to occupy a front row seat in the tribunal’s most important trial involving Liberia’s former president Charles Taylor. The focus is to analyze what I have described as the “legal legacy” of the tribunal, in particular, its key judicial decisions on the above mentioned issues and their possible contributions to the wider corpus of norms for substantive international criminal law and practice. This, of course, is not an exhaustive assessment. There are other judicial decisions on several other issues such as the role of the United Nations Security Council in creating ad hoc courts or the first prosecution of the war crime of attacks against UN peacekeepers, which due to reasons of space, are not considered in this book. Though generally positive, the evaluation was also critical; it sought to be as objective as possible and to take advantage of the distance created by many years in academia while at the same time engaging with the substance of the SCSL’s work through publications and other scholarly endeavors. It is my sincere hope that, by engaging in this critical assessment focusing on the main contributions and limitations of the SCSL rather than all its possible legal legacies, this book will make a useful contribution to the legal literature on international criminal courts. It should add to the legal literature on the contributions of the somewhat understudied SCSL to the development of international law as well as to the ongoing global discussion about how best to
enhance accountability for international crimes through the establishment of such special tribunals in partnership with the affected State.

As usual, with multi-year projects of this kind, this book would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my family and various friends/colleagues. First, to my immediate family, I am grateful to my wife Jan Osei-Tutu, and our three boys, Salieu, Chay, and Kannin, for their loving support and encouragement. Thanks also to my two kotors, Ibrahim (aka IB), Salieu (aka Sal), and my two jajas, Binta and Jarieu, for their usual moral support.

Second, because the seeds of this book were first planted as part of a doctoral dissertation completed on the Special Court for Sierra Leone at the University of Amsterdam Faculty of Law, I am indebted to Erika de Wet and Harmen van der Wilt, my two PhD supervisors, for their insightful comments on the various chapters which I wrote for the thesis. I also appreciated the incisive comments of the examining board, comprised of Y. M. Donders, P. A. Nollkaemper, G. K. Sluiter, L. J. van den Herik, and G. Werle. Grateful to them all, though of course, I take full responsibility for all arguments, errors, and omissions.

Two additional chapters were completed during my research leave as the 2018–2019 Fulbright Distinguished Chair of Public International Law at the Faculty of Law, Lund University and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law. I am grateful to the Fulbright Commission for the opportunity, and to the many academic colleagues who made my Swedish experience a very pleasant one. Although I never presented this work or asked them to comment on aspects of it, their warmth and hospitality during my stay in Lund provided a rather congenial atmosphere in which to continue my research. Most staff at both of my host institutions proved to be warm and friendly. I therefore hope they will forgive me for singling out Michael McEachrane, for our many great conversations on everything from law to politics to philosophy and Pan-Africanism; Maria Green, for helping me avoid cultural gaffes, especially for prodding me to stop and enjoy the inestimable joys of fika, which I have come to love; Morten Kjaerum, for always great lunches and stimulating conversations about the present and future of human rights, multilateralism, and international law; and Alejandro Fuentes, Radu Mares, Kamal Makili-Aliyev, and Rolf Ring for their generous time spent with a short-term visitor and useful tips about teaching and culture in Sweden.

In the Lund Faculty of Law, Eduardo Gill-Pedro, Xavier Groussot, Valentin Jeutner, and Ulf Linderfalk and their colleagues made me feel welcome, while Karol Nowak, who runs the LLM program in human rights, shared insights on the Swedish legal education system. It helped limit classroom culture shock, for both me and my students; and made my comparative teaching experience a rather fun experience. My excellent Swedish and other students proved to be quite open-minded, even as I introduced them to the alien Socratic Method. Fellow international law travelers Valentin Jeutner and Britta Sjöstedt helped me settle into life in...
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Lund, with tips on where to go and what to do, punctuated by some nice lunches and periodic evening drinks with a group of younger international faculty.

To the friendly staff at the Fulbright Commission of Sweden, in Stockholm, I especially thank Eric Jönsson and Monica Dahlen. They and their colleagues both shared richly on the Swedish culture and way of life. They also invited me to additional Fulbright events in other parts of the country, including to Uppsala and Stockholm. They generously provided guidance, as I navigated the necessary bureaucracy that came with this great intercultural exchange. I am grateful to them for helping make my fond memories of Sweden.
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