Voices from the Rwanda Tribunal

Official Transcript: Everard O'Donnell (Full Interview)



Role:	Deputy Registrar
Country of Origin:	England
Interview Date:	15 October 2008
Location:	Arusha, Tanzania
Interviewer:	Donald J Horowitz
Videographers:	Max Andrews Nell Carden Grey
Interpreter:	None

Interview Summary

Everard O'Donnell discusses the unique characteristics of ad hoc tribunals and the challenges of coordinating multinational ad litem judges. He notes that the ICTR has been effective at tracking and capturing international fugitives such as Jean-Paul Akayesu. Although the ICTR has been criticized for providing 'victor's justice,' O'Donnell stresses its efforts to deliver justice impartially. He reflects on the case of Mika Muhimana who was convicted of genocide, but later had his conviction overturned by the Court of Appeal.

The transcript of the interview begins on the following page.

1	Part 1	
2	00:00	Okay. Well, my name is Everard O'Donnell. And I'm the Deputy Registrar.
3 4 5 6	00:04	Donald J Horowitz: Alright, and I'm Judge Donald Horowitz of the ICTR Information Heritage Project, and I will be interviewing you for a certain period of the time, and then Ms. Nathan will take my place for part of the interview as well. And tell us what the duties of the Deputy Registrar of the ICTR, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, are.
7 8 9 10	00:36	Okay. Interestingly, he is not the Deputy of the Registrar just. He has his own separate functions. In any rational organizational structure, somebody who's called the Deputy Registrar might be expected to be the person who assists the Registrar in all his functions, but nothing like that here.
11 12 13 14	00:59	A Deputy Registrar's job is to look after all the sides of the court function process. The actual supporting the courts themselves. From the prison, comes under the Deputy registrar, the language section, translation services, court reporting, archives, court management, defense teams, the provision of basically all immediate support to the court system.
15 16	01:41	As separate from the administration of the organization as a whole, which goes under a separate category.
17	01:47	DJH: Explain to me what 'the administration of the organization as a whole' means. It's \ldots
18 19	01:53	Well, in any mission of the United Nations, you're going to have very much the same kind of support – life support systems.
20	02:01	DJH: Okay.
21 22	02:02	Payments, finances, travel, shipping – all those sort of materials. They're, they're separated off from essentially the immediate legal support functions, which comes under me.
23 24	02:15	DJH: Okay. So you're not directly involved with those other administrative functions. You are, essentially, the court support, or, and the – and those that come with court.
25 26 27 28	02:28	That's right. And I mean, Re-, the Registrar himself is in charge of the administrative support functions. So that's why I say that I'm off on the side. I don't sit in the hierarchy of the – the organogram of the tribunal. I don't sit in a line directly beneath the registrar. When he goes away, of course, then I am meant to fulfill his functions.
29 30	02:52	DJH: So at this moment, for example, he's not back from somewhere. You're in charge of that as well?
31	02:57	Ostensibly.

32 33	02:58	DJH: Okay. Let's go back for a minute – or a few minutes – and ask you a little bit about yourself. Where are you – where are you from, originally?
34	03:09	From England.
35	03:10	DJH: Okay. And tell us a bit about your education and training and profession.
36	03:16	All right, I was – at the University of Southampton. I did my Bachelors and my Masters in
37		International Politics there, under Professor Joseph Frankel. And then I read for the Bar and
38		was called to the Bar in 1976 and I practiced in criminal law, in both defense and prosecution.
39		I have a rather bizarre little English barrister habit of being a prosecutor one day and a
40		defense I-, attorney the next.
41	03:48	And then, after that, I became a little too specialist in prosecution, so finally I joined a new
42		professional prosecution service in England and became a, a crime prosecutor, then a senior
43		crime prosecutor, before I finally made the fundamental mistake of taking an apple from an
44		American lady in my orchard in Devon, and was subsequently seduced and went to America.
45	04:17	DJH: And where – and, and where, where did you go in, to in America?
46	04:23	I went to a place that very few peo-, it's sort of a cultural black hole called western North
47		Carolina in the Appalachian Mountains, where I soon discovered that my curriculum vitae as a
48		senior crime prosecutor of the west of England did not exactly translate into any known
49		function.
50	04:45	And so, I – after a time, after a time which I devoted to breeding, which I don't think you
51		probably want to hear a great deal about, I had two children and then we – I joined Legal
52		Services of North Carolina. And
53	05:03	DJH: That's civil legal services?
54	05:04	Civil legal services.
55	05:05	DJH: Yes.
56	05:05	Purely civil. And I proceeded to act as pro bono coordinator, and then I worked on HIV/AIDS
57		projects in Asheville, and in, in due course was recruited in 2000 to come here.
58	05:22	DJH: Okay. Just to be clear, because there are a lot of people who are going to be viewing
59		this years from now, and, and from different legal systems – when we talk about civil versus
60		criminal, in the United States, everything that's not criminal is civil. Is that kind of your
61		understanding? How would you define, you did civil legal aid, which was different from the
62		prosecutions you'd been doing?

63 64	05:48	Yeah. I mean, it involved, essentially, I mean, poverty law. It's a special branch of civil leg-, law, as you have defined it. And it essentially involves landlord and tenant issues, any issues
65		involving entitlements and so on.
66	06:07	A program, actually, a wonderful program, set up by President Johnson in the war on poverty,
67		originally, and then rejuvenated by that great liberal, Richard Nixon, and then I think sort of
68		facing considerable degree of difficulty during the time I was there, of funding.
69	06:27	But it was a very, very interesting and mind-expanding experience, because I was able to see
70		the underbelly of American capitalism, which is an experience that I think everyone should
71		have, particularly those in America who are in leadership positions.
72	06:46	DJH: Okay. And so, in this you are representing f-, may I say the interests of essentially poor
73		people.
74	06:59	Yeah.
75	06:59	DJH: Pe-, the underserved, the vulnerable, and so forth. Now, you were not a member of the
76		– were you a member of the Bar?
77	07:07	No.
78	07:08	DJH: Did you become a member of the Bar?
79	07:09	No, no.
80	07:09	DJH: So were you allowed to do some actual court practice?
81	07:13	No. What we did was basically everything but.
82	07:16	DJH: Okay. ().
83	07:16	So case preparation, case screening, interviewing, going out, field work. And as far as the
84		HIV/AIDS project was concerned, that again, organizing. And in due course, I became
85		President of the Western North Carolina AIDS Consortium, which was a sort of – essentially a
86		consortium of funders for you know, targeting the HIV/AIDS population of North Carolina. At
87		that time, a very diverse population.
88	07:51	DJH: Mm-hmm. And how many years were you, then, in that area, or in () ?
89	07:56	Seven years.
90	07:57	DJH: Okay. And then you say you were recruited for the UN?
91	08:02	Yeah.

92	08:03	DJH: How did that come about?
93	08:06	Well, a certain amount of dissatisfaction on my part with being in western North Carolina and
94		not really practicing an area of law that I was very interested in, although the experience itself
95		was very valuable, led to my communication with a number of my ex-colleagues in England.
96	08:27	And in, in due course an opportunity came up, a particular request had been made by one of
97		the judges here, a commonwealth judge, that he wanted an English barrister to assist with the
98		work of the chambers here. And so I was invited to apply, which I then duly did, and was duly
99		taken on, in, I think, the space of about eight weeks.
100	08:49	DJH: Okay. And that was in the year 2000, was it?
101	08:52	Yeah.
102	08:53	DJH: Okay.
103	Part 2	
104	00:00	DJH: Let me go back six years, if I may, to 1994. That's a year that has taken on some
105		significance for you, I'm sure. Do you remember, or can you try to remember, what you
106		were doing in 1994, particularly in April when things got particularly difficult? And when you
107		first heard about it – tell us a bit about that experience.
108	00:29	Well, I don't know whether you've ever been to western North Carolina, but it's a pla-, a place
109		in which not only is it extremely mountainous, but culturally, it's extremely remote from the
110		rest of America.
111	00:43	And apart from Asheville itself, which is a fairly cosmopolitan town, all the area around
112		Asheville – and I was in, may I say, a, a Fundamentalist Baptist county, a dry county, a county
113		that probably wouldn't have really been able to know in which direction Europe was.
114	01:07	And so, there was remarkably little reporting of what happened in the Third World, and in
115		particular, Africa. And the first I heard of what was going on in Rwanda was, interestingly
116		enough, at a poetry slam in Asheville, when someone proceeded to read a poem about the
117		events that had been unfolding in April. This was early May that I was at this poetry slam.
118	01:41	And I was really astonished that anything like this was going on. The guy, the poet, did an
119		introduction and then read a poem, and so I went up to talk to him afterwards and asked him
120		what was all this about. And that was – I heard it word of mouth. Then, of course, I found out
121		all about it thereafter.
122	02:00	But it had remarkably little impact upon most Americans. And I don't think, for example, my
123		wife and her friends in western North Carolina knew anything about it until months after, abo-
124		, when I, when I started talking to them about it.

125	02:20	DJH: And that would have still been in '94, or '95?
126	02:22	Yeah.
127	02:24	DJH: And in the interim years before you left western North Carolina, did you have any
128		special interest or involvement with, with the subject?
129	02:36	Well, as a senior crime prosecutor, one of my areas of interest had been international criminal
130		law. I'd been concerned with international environmental law. That was one of my particular
131		professional responsibilities in the United Kingdom. But very little. Most of our work was really
132		national – of national concern.
133	02:59	DJH: Okay. So now you had this opportunity in, in 2000 to come to the ICTR. What did you
134		know then about what was going on here – that is, what were you told before you got here?
135	03:17	Well, that's an interesting question, because naively – I mean, I read of course, everything that
136		I could in the short space of time that I had. And it looked to me as if it was, you know,
137		remarkably interesting and a unique organization, and one that my background gave me no
138		particular lead in as to how to approach it.
139	03:39	And my request via email to the then Registrar for details of my job description and what I
140		would be doing didn't meet with any reply. Telephone calls here didn't meet with any
141		particular information. So I was in a state of somewhat – well, a certain penumbral awareness,
142		as I set out.
143	04:04	But I, I dropped in on my government in England to meet my previous colleagues in the crime
144		prosecution service, and I met also the people in the foreign office, who had been part of the
145		process by which I had learned about this job. And I was told then, I was given a sort of
146		particular perspective upon the tribunal.
147	04:29	And there was a cer-, I was led to believe that there was a certain amount of concern about
148		the lack of progress made by the tribunal at that particular time. The lack of casework, the fact
149		that only by, by that time, only one full trial had taken place. The fact that the other trials, the
150		pre-, the pretrial process had, had not really got off the ground. The fact that, of those
151		arrested, they, it looked as if they were going to be a long time awaiting trial.
152	05:02	And a general lack of, I would say, lack of certainty on the part of the United Kingdom
153		government about the future of the direction of the tribunal. And indeed, one of the
154		comments made to me as I was leaving was something to the effect of – I'm not going to give
155		you a quotation, but – that they hoped that the efforts could be directed towards bringing the
156		tribunal to a close.
157	05:36	DJH: All right. And, and so – had you been to Africa before?
158	05:41	Never.

159	05:43	DJH: Okay.
160	05:42	I was, I have a, a Middle Eastern background as a child, but not
161	05:47	DJH: Where in the Middle East?
162 163	05:48	Oh, everywhere. Aden, Iraq, Beirut, everywhere. My father was a Middle Eastern civil engineer.
164	05:56	DJH: Ah. Okay. So you came to Arusha?
165	06:00	Yeah.
166 167	06:01	DJH: Okay. Did you also – well, let me – when you got to Arusha, did you know what your job was going to be?
168 169 170 171 172	06:09	No. I presented myself – well, it's always a very alarming experience, particularly in those days, to arrive at Arusha airport, and you get driven through the darkness, all alone in a bus and you know, there are road blocks and lights dimly seen, and then you get thrown out in a hotel. All alone, you have absolutely no clue about where you are or what's, what's happening.
173 174 175 176	06:33	And the next day, I presented myself at the tribunal to be greeted with astonishment as to, "Who on earth are you?" There was no office for me. I presented myself in due course, I think on the second day, to the President, President Pillay, and I said, "I'm a new senior legal advisor in chambers." And she said, "Oh, are you? Who sent you?" So, it was that kind of experience.
177	Part 3	
178 179	00:00	DJH: When you talk about the President in a lot of cultures, that's not understood. Is that, was that the President judge?
180	00:07	Yes.
181	00:08	DJH: Okay.
182 183 184	00:09	Yes, the, the, the judges, the permanent judges of the tribunal – in those days, there were only permanent judges – elect from amongst themselves a presiding judge, who's called the President, and a Vice President.
185	00:21	DJH: And is there some term of office, either by custom or by regulation or statute?
186 187	00:28	No, there is a term of office. Each judge has a mandate of four years, and a President has a, a mandate of two.
188	00:36	DJH: Okay. And are they renewable?
		© 2009-2015 University of Washington Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

189	00:41	Yes.
190	00:42	DJH: Both the President and the other terms?
191	00:45	Yes.
192	00:46	DJH: Okay. So the President judge didn't know you were coming?
193 194 195 196	00:52	No, I, I, I mean, I think, I think the, the President, at that time, there was a considerable conflict between the Presid-, the President and the Registrar, the then Registrar, and there was a considerable lack of communication between the two poles of the tribunal. If I can explain ?
197	01:11	DJH: Sure.
198 199 200 201	01:12	As you know, if you've looked at the statute of the two ad hoc tribunals, you'll see that it, it, it's a, it's essentially a compromise between the mission model and between the way a court functions. You have the Secretary General's representative, who's the Registrar, and he, in the statute, is given responsibility for the administration of the tribunal.
202	01:38	DJH: You're talking about the statute which creates this ad hoc tribunal?
203 204	01:42	Right. It's the one passed by the Security Council, incorporated in the original Security Council Resolution, which then became our, to some extent, you could say, our constitution.
205	01:51	DJH: Okay.
206	01:51	And
207	01:52	DJH: And i-, so, this is not a court that is formed by treaty between or among nations?
208 209 210 211	01:58	No, not like the ICC. No, I mean, obviously we are a treaty creation in the sense that the original United Nations charter is the treaty which set up the Security Council. The Security Council then set up the ad hoc tribunals as subsidiary bodies of itself. So we are, in fact, an organ of the Security Council.
212	02:17	DJH: And an ad hoc tribunal means what?
213 214 215 216	02:21	It means that it lives, and then it dies. It, it's a temporary court. It's an unusual situation, because, you know, as you know, in all national courts, we're not used to short-term courts. The Star Chamber, I can, I can remember, in the United Kingdom's experience, was a short- term court.
217 218	02:39	Courts set up for specific ex-, events and particular experiences usually are frowned upon, I think, in jurisprudence. It, it, it smacks a little bit too much of non-routine justice. It smacks of

219 setting up a structure for a particular event. And that's one of the reasons why the ICC was set 220 up to be a permanent institution. 221 03:04 DJH: Okay. And by ICC . . . ? 222 03:07 The International Criminal Court in The Hague. 223 03:09 DJH: Okay. And that was set up by treaty, when? 224 03:11 It was set up in . . . 225 03:15 DJH: Approximately. 226 03:15 ... it became effective in July 2001, when there were enough signatories to the actual treaty. 227 03:21 DJH: And so, that came after the two ad hoc tribunals. 228 03:26 Yes. The two ad hoc tribunals were set up in 1993-4, when you have these two m-, massacre 229 events in the ex-Yugoslavia and in Rwanda, inaction by the Security Council, general feeling – I 230 mean, obviously there was action in due course by NATO in the ex-Yugoslavia, but it was felt to be very much too late in the day. 231 232 03:57 There was total inaction in Rwanda, withdrawal of the UNAMIR forces. The United Nations 233 was generally seen to be impotent, and the Security Council in particular impotent. 04:09 And so, there was a sense after each of these events, "Well, how can we be seen to be acting, 234 235 you know, so that it looks as if we've made some response rather than just wringing our hands 236 and weeping crocodile tears." Or real tears. Who knows? I mustn't be too cynical. 237 04:29 DJH: Okay. So let's get back to where you were talking. You said there were some problems between the President, the ju-, the judiciary or the, the judges, and, and the Registrar? 238 239 04:38 Right. Right. The Secretary General appoints the Registrar, who's an Assistant Secretary 240 General. And there you have, to some extent, the peak of the pyramid in the United Nations 241 staffing table. And to all intents and purposes, when you look at the statute, the Registrar looks as if he's at the apex of the pinnacle. 242 243 05:01 But then you've got the judges. The judges appointed, they're Under-Secretaries General, so 244 they, they elect the President from amongst themselves and the President is a person who's 245 actually meant to be running the scheduling of the court hearings, running the sittings of the judges, the appointments of the judges - you know, basically handling the whole of the 246 247 judicial side of things. 248 05:25 And you've got an obvious area of conflict there. I've spoken to the original architects of the 249 statutes, and they both have under-, undertaken that this would never b-, have been done, if 250 it had been done again, had they seen what the result would have been. Because, well, what

happened was after the rules – the rules under the statute – the, the judges were entitled to 251 252 make rules of procedure and evidence . . . 253 05:53 DJH: And there were two statutes, one for the former Yugoslavia, and one for Rwanda. 254 05:56 Yugoslavia, yeah. That's right. 255 05:58 DJH: Were they pretty identical? 256 05:59 Yes. Pretty identical. 257 06:00 DJH: Okay. 258 06:01 There are, there are differences in the definitions of crimes because of the difference in the 259 nature of the massacres in the former Yugoslavia. We have a, a - basically our basic crimes are targeted towards internal crimes rather than international crime. So there were special 260 261 provisions made for that. But apart from that, basically the statutes are the same. 06:29 And the Yugoslavian judges had been given a rule-making power under one of the statutory 262 263 provisions. And they had met together in plenary even before our creation, and had 264 developed, abou-, just over a hundred rules of procedure and evidence. 06:45 265 And it was obviously quite early on that the fact that the judges felt that they should be in a 266 supervisory role over the secretariat side of things, became manifest. Because the judges 267 passed a rule making it clear that the supervisory function would be performed by the President over the Registrar. And that is expressed in two of our rules now. 268 269 07:17 We took over the rules, again, from Yugoslavia, and so we have the same supervisory 270 provisions. So although it doesn't appear in the statute, in two places in the rule, it says the 271 Registrar shall be supervised by the President. 07:31 272 So you can see that there, there was – the judges i-, in effect made it perfectly clear that as far 273 as they were concerned, and no matter what the statute said, they were going to be 274 exercising the governance of the tribunal. And it caused conflicts in the early days of the, 275 certainly this tribunal. 07:52 276 Because the Registrar felt that there were certain responsibilities that he had as the senior 277 staff member responsible to the New York, to the General Assembly, to the Secretary General, 278 that he could not just do whatever it was that the President wanted him to do. 08:11 279 Whereas the President felt that she had a right to say, "I want this, I want, you know, this, and 280 I want this person recruited," and so on. "And I want it done now." And the UN rules, you 281 know, don't work like that. They work very fairly and they work slowly, it has to be said. 08:29 282 DJH: Are they – and this affected you in, or your initial experience?

08:34 283 It did. Because when the Registrar told me, "Oh, you're going to be the Chief of the chambers," I then relayed that information to the President and her immediate response was, 284 285 "I don't think so. No, you're not." So . . . 286 08:50 DJH: So what happened then? 287 08:51 Well, I made my excuses and left, bowing backwards as you know, showing obeisance. And 288 went back to the Registrar and the, the, the matter continued i-, in – with a little bit of a, a delay. In due course, what I - I was able to slowly develop a rapport with the senior judges 289 290 and in due, in due course, the conflict between the Registrar and the President was resolved. 09:23 291 The Registrar was removed and replaced by the present Registrar, Adama Dieng, who has 292 always had a very good working relationship with the judges and with the presiding judge. 293 Complete change. 294 09:36 And basically, our system, our bipolar system, can only work if there's a close working 295 professional, and one hopes sometimes friendly, relationship between the two poles. And 296 that's been the case ever since the appointment of Adama Dieng. 297 09:55 DJH: And when – and was that in 2000 or 2001? 298 09:57 2001. 299 09:58 DJH: Okay. So what did you do in the mean time? 300 10:01 Just slowly developed, inch by inch, warm relations with people. Diplomacy. Just, in, in, in – so 301 often in the United Nations, personal relationships matter. And the United Nations in this 302 particular continent, one would say they matter even more. 303 10:23 So you can't just rely upon your formal function and say, "But this is my position. I therefore expect you to do this, this, and this." You have to develop relationships here. And that was a 304 good lesson for me, because previously I had not really been able to work like that. 305 10:39 306 DJH: 'kay. Part 4 307 308 00:00 DJH: So, but, but I'm still I guess a bit confused, and maybe because it was confusing, about 309 what you did those first months? Were you acting without – forget the title for a minute – 310 were you acting as the Chief of chambers, or would, what ... 00:15 As far as the staff were concerned, yes. The staff of chambers, the legal officers in chambers 311 312 had actually wanted a Chief of chambers. They had been very much looking for someone to 313 give them direction, give them some kind of management.

314	00:27	DJH: Had there not been one before?
315 316 317	00:30	There had been some time before, but there'd been a long hiatus, a long gap. And that had, that had caused a certain amount of dissatisfaction, and directionlessness amongst the legal staff.
318 319 320	00:45	So, you know, getting people, going around, talking to them, getting them back together. Devising a c-, a continuing legal education program, having meetings, giving them a sense of corporate identity. By this process, I was able to start to function as a Chief of chambers.
321	01:03	DJH: And tell me what the functions of the Chief of chambers are.
322 323 324 325 326	01:07	Well, the Chief of chambers basically operates as the immediate manager of all the, all the legal staff who work directly for the judges. And then he also acts as the interface between the judge's chambers and the rest of the tribunal in the sense of making demands upon the resources of the tribunal and then also bringing back, information back into – and feeding it into the judiciary and the immediate legal staff.
327 328 329	01:38	That's officially it. In fact, what you found was that the, the most intimate relationship that exists is between a judge – we had nine judges at that time. Well, nine here and then two in The Hague as part of the appeals chamber.
330 331 332 333	01:56	And each judge has an associate legal officer, usually a very young lawyer, fresh out of law school or with only a couple of years of working experience. Usually very highly qualified, academically, who work on drafting the decisions, advising the judge, legal research, and so on and then finally drafting the judgments.
334 335 336	02:18	Now that, when I came here, that was a very personal relationship between each judge and the associate legal officer – actually, the judges had been selecting directly their own associate legal officers.
337 338 339 340	02:29	This had been a cause of conflict in itself with the Secretariat and with the Registry, because of course, that's not how one recruits inside the United Nations. One recruits by some general, transparent procedure. And it was quite funny, if I can just give you an anecdote to illustrate the kind of thing that was going on.
341 342 343 344 345	02:49	One judge called me in. This judge is no longer here, (). Called me in, and said, "I want this person," and handed me a CV. And I looked at it, and this particular person came from a country with which I am familiar, and didn't appear to have a very high level of legal qualifications. And I inquired as to why this particular person was wanted by this particular judge.
346 347	03:15	The judge said, "Oh, he, because he comes from that particular country." And it wasn't the judge's country; it was a completely – a far away, different continent. And I said, "Oh, I see.

Why, and why in particular that, that country, judge?" And he said, "I spent some of the best 348 years of my life in that country." 349 350 03:34 And so, that was the kind of way in which recruitment was done. And in fact, that, as it 351 happened, that particular person was recruited and did very well here. In due course, he got legally qualified under our aegis and has now left. 352 353 03:50 But I mean, that's an indication of, of the kind of ways in which judicial recruitment t-, 354 recruitment of judicial assistants tended to be done. And it's, it was not effective, because it 355 produced results that were sometimes bizarre and sometimes not entirely transparent. Well, 356 never transparent. 04:09 357 So I tried to introduce transparent systems. Also, giving the judges their desire, because it's a very intimate relationship between a judge and what, in America, you would call their legal 358 359 clerk. And therefore the judge must have a major say in it. 360 04:26 But you also have to ensure certain other characteristics of recruitment, such as geographicalcultural balance, excellence, minimum qualifications, all those things are adhered to. So that 361 362 was something I was able to do, slowly, slowly, slowly. 04:42 DJH: Okay. 363 364 04:46 Oh, can I mention one other thing? 04:47 DJH: Of course. 365 04:48 366 Although I'm technically, was, as Chief of chambers, meant to be directly supervising all these 367 staff, what you found was that the legal officer was supervised directly by the judge and you 368 had very little role. Insofar as we had other legal staff working in chambers, that, that relationship was a lot easier. 369 05:08 370 But any time you felt that there was a non-functioning member of the legal assistants staff, 371 somebody working directly for a judge and you wanted to do something about it, what you immediately found was that the legal assistant was able to handle the situation (___) through 372 373 the judge. 374 05:26 And so you were unable to touch the situation at all. In other words, you had, what you had 375 was a series of little no-go areas. You, you couldn't touch (), the, the protected person working with the judge. 376 05:38 377 So in fact, there are a lot of informal networks which you, which you cannot tell by looking at 378 an organogram of the organization. And that, that situation is relayed right away throughout 379 the organization.

380 381	05:50	So I just thought I'd throw that in, to say that sometimes calling yourself Chief of chambers was often, one felt, an honorary position rather than a very effective position.
382	06:00	DJH: How long were you Chief of chambers?
383	06:02	Until 2005.
384	06:06	DJH: So, five years? Okay.
385	06:07	Yeah. October 2005.
386	06:09	DJH: Or four and a half, something. Yeah.
387	06:10	No, it was – it was full five years.
388	06:12	DJH: Okay.
389	Part 5	
390 391 392	00:00	DJH: And when you got there and you know, broadly, what did you find that you felt you really needed to do? You had had a number of comments from friends of yours before you took the job about, you know, shutting it down.
393 394	00:17	DJH: And I guess I'd be interested in your impressions about what you found and what you thought you need-, you needed to and could do. And in fact, did, perhaps.
395 396 397 398	00:26	Well, yeah. Well, no, I was able to play an assisting role. But there were already people here who were aware of the fact that there were certain fundamental structural problems that had to be addressed. In particular, I would say that President Pillay was aware, but in particular I would, I would identify the role of Judge Møse who was the Vice President when I arrived.
399 400 401 402	00:54	He was very clearly aware that matters had to come to a head, matters had to change. The principle problem was this – you, here you have almost, in fact, at that time, very restricted courtroom facilities. You had three trial chambers with three judges, so that's nine judges. But they were all sharing fairly limited facilities.
403 404 405	01:27	You had the Prosecutor who controlled the tap of the cases – turned it on and off – deciding how many people she wanted to arrest, how she was going to present the indictments, how they would go before the judges, and what crimes were going to be presented to the judiciary.
406 407 408 409 410	01:53	And it was perfectly clear to anyone who came, particularly to me, coming in from the outside, but Judge Møse was already on top of the issue, that the Prosecutor's ambition to arrest well over 100 people, given the throughput, the capacity in terms of hours per week, per month, per year, of the judges working with the facilities we had, the tribunal would last for two decades, at least. And that was manifestly, politically unacceptable.

02:27 411 And something had to be done. The Prosecutor had to change. When I arrived, the Prosecutor 412 was Carla Del Ponte, a wonderful woman who one would be very anxious to go in on a frontal 413 beach assault in Iwo Jima with her, with her holding a Kalashnikov. I mean a very brave and a very, very strong wo-, woman, a strong leader. 414 02:53 DJH: Where was she from? 415 416 02:54 She was from Italy and had cut her judicial teeth fighting the mafia and with, with great 417 success, according to her press conferences. And she had definitely got a very strong approach 418 to prosecution here. 03:16 But of course, she divided her responsibilities with, between pro-, prosecuting at The Hague 419 420 and prosecuting here. And what she tended to do was to arrive here a bit like the Queen of 421 Hearts, arriving, giving orders, developing, meeting people, and then disappearing very fast. 422 And . . . yeah. 423 03:35 DJH: Let me stop you for just a moment. You said she was prosecuting at The Hague and 424 here? So she wasn't just assigned to this court, she was assigned to both ad hoc courts? 425 03:45 Yes. 426 03:45 DJH: Okay. 427 03:46 Yeah. Originally, when the Security Council set up the Rwanda tribunal, they felt that it was 428 important to ensure harmony, to some extent, of both the prosecutorial policy and the 429 jurisprudence. So they produced a common prosecutor and a common-, a commonality between the appeals chambers. So, in other words, the appeals chamber at The Hague with a 430 couple of additions became our appeals chamber. 431 432 04:13 DJH: Okay. Why don't you go back? You were saying she arrived like the Queen of Hearts 433 and then . . . ? 434 04:18 Yeah, there were a few sort of "Off with your head" moments, and then she would disappear off back to The Hague and there was a certain amount of concern as to whether management 435 436 here was – in the prosecution – was actually as long-term visionary as it should be. 437 04:40 Because a part of the issue was, well, you know, "We want to arrest all these people. They're 438 all guilty of genocide to some extent, and so therefore I want, I want them all." And the response to, "No, you can't have them all," was "I am going to have them all." 439 440 04:57 So you know, to some extent, when you're dealing with that style of leadership, it's a remarkably good style of leadership, but when it comes to actually trying to run a rational 441 442 organization, there are other considerations have to be brought into effect.

443 05:15 So we had, if I conflate the story a bit – because it could go on an awful long time. There was a meeting of all the judges of both tribunals in Dublin under the auspices of the Dublin 444 445 government and under Trinity College Dublin, at which we met Hans Corell, the legal counsel as was then of the Secretary General. 446 447 05:44 And at which these issues were thrashed out – how are we going to put the ad hoc into these 448 tribunals? How are we going to eventually address ourselves to closing it down? And one 449 obvious message that came out between, in the work of the judges, was basically with the 450 resources we have at the moment, and the tap going at the rate it-, it's going, flowing at the rate it's going from the Prosecutor, we have got a problem terminating these tribunals. 451 06:20 So therefore, we need to address both the tap and the resources. Increase the resources and 452 restrict the tap. That's, if I can summarize it, more or less, that's what went on behind the 453 scenes. Do - I think you're going to be talking to Judge Møse - talk to him about it, because he 454 455 was the, very instrumental in developing the, the way forward from Dublin. 06:41 456 So as a result of that, the completion strategy documents started to be pre-, planned and prepared. And it, it was fairly traumatic, because, certainly here, it was necessary for the 457 Prosecutor to understand that it was impossible to have that particular number of persons 458 459 arrested and dealt with. 07:06 460 And in due course, after a few Iwo Jima moments, if I can put it like that, we did eventually 461 have, the prosecution addressing itself, to a considerably, considerably, fewer numbers of 462 indictments. 07:27 DJH: Okay. So that was the, one of the first parts of the job that you were involved with. 463 07:33 464 Yeah . . . Yes. I was in support of the President there. 07:37 DJH: Okay. 465 466 07:37 And of course, at the same time we also had to increase our resources. And eventually, that 467 message was sold to New York. They did increase our resources. We increased the courtroom 468 capacity, we increased the judges, we added ad litem judges, another nine to our capacity, so we had 18 judges, so that we could sit two subsections of each trial chamber. 469 470 08:02 And so on. And we then ra-, we actually started to sit in shifts. Morning shifts, afternoon shifts. We elongated the work time of the tribunal and so on. 471 472 08:13 DJH: Got things moving. 473 08:14 Got things moving. We doubled, more than doubled the number of legal staff in chambers; 474 we, we, we increased our staff enormously. So it was, it was a difficult message for New York 475 to grasp, that in effect, if you wanted to close down this institution, you've got to increase the 476 resources to increase the throughput to get it closed.

477	08:33	DJH: When you say New York, you mean UN headquarters?
478	08:36	Yeah.
479	08:36	DJH: Okay.
480	Part 6	
481 482 483 484 485	00:02	DJH: The way things were going when you arrived, it soun-, and you were talking about this thing will go on for two decades to, et cetera, et cetera. I, I'm thinking back to, you know, a basic principle of, you know, speedy justice and, or at least having justice exist within a decade of – or you know, the, the conclusion of something occur within a reasonable period of time from when the person was apprehended or the, or the crime was committed.
486	00:32	May I just ask you, within a decade of what? A decade of arrest or decade of the events?
487	00:37	DJH: Well, I, I don't know.
488	00:39	You let it, you let it drift.
489	00:40	DJH: Yes. Okay. What, I guess the, the point I'm making is
490	00:44	I know the point you're making.
491	00:45	DJH: the, the question, yeah, good. What is it?
492	00:50	Yes. Well, I, if I am to be suit-, suitably defensive.
493 494 495	00:54	DJH: () I, no, I'm not, I'm not really thinking of, I'm thinking about, you know, the mission of the court and your sense of what the court – and, and that's really kind of where I was going to get.
496 497 498 499	01:06	DJH: I was going to get away from some of the, of the processes for at least a bit and, and, and ask you what your understanding was of the mission of the court itself? Whether by the statute or by, you know, what was at least accepted or by the judges or – and the, and the various peo-, () the authorities.
500	01:26	Alright. That's a slightly different question but it, it, it links back.
501	01:30	DJH: Right.
502 503 504 505 506	01:31	The mission of the court, if you read the original resolution, you see that the principal purpose of the tribunal was to effect individual justice against the perpetrators of the genocide in Rwanda during the a-, actual year 1994, not outside it, in Rwanda and neighboring states. So that was the, the actual geographical component of the mission and the temporal component of the mission.

- 50702:03But there was an added statement that because of course this was the Security Council using508its Chapter 7 powers which of course are peacekeeping powers and quite sincerely I think509members of the Security Council although academics regard this as debatable and you're510referred to the literature the Security Council felt that setting up a judicial institution would511bring reconciliation to the Great Lakes region, and . . .
- 512 02:34 DJH: That being Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda...
- 513 02:37 Yes, yes. The whole, the whole of the area around the Lake Victoria, and . . .

514 **02:42 DJH: Okay.**

- 51502:44So the mission was therefore expressly a peacekeeping mission. Now, one of the interesting516things about that mission is that it was therefore, you have this interesting situation where the517tribunal is set up for political purposes by a political body and it's set up to deal with518politicians and the witnesses come from a very politically intense area and there's still a519conflict between two parties in which you are trying one party.
- 52003:18And so the whole thing is intensely political. Nevertheless, the purpose as far as the Security521Council was concerned was to bring reconciliation and by doing, the, the obvious logic, the,522the nexus between the judicial process and the peacekeeping process was clearly that if you523punish the principal perpetrators of the genocide, then not only do, you do two things You524tell the story. You tell the story in a definitive way.
- 52503:49Objective people come from all over the planet with no axe to grind, with no tribal component526to their prejudices. They come perhaps ignorant of the tribal issues, of the dynamics of527Rwanda. You bring them from Russia. You bring them from India, Pakistan, Norway, Sri Lanka,528wherever. And you plant them down and you give them a set of facts, which are in fact529historical facts.
- 530 04:16 DJH: Now, you're talking about the judges.
- 531 04:17 Yes.
- 532 04:18 DJH: You, these people who you just brought, okay.
- 533 04:18 The judges, the judges.
- 534 **04:20 DJH: Okay.**
- 53504:22And not only do they judge whether X killed Y, Z, A, B, C, they also have to come to various536conclusions about historical facts that took place around those individual events. So you're537giving a historical account, a narrative, a historical narrative in each judgment and you're538giving it from an objective standpoint although not a historians' standpoint, a, a lawyers'539standpoint and we can return to that another time.

540 541 542 543	04:59	Secondly, you are holding perpetrators responsible who would never have come to justice had you not set up a court. This is one interesting thing – it was a message that I don't think had got home in Rwanda when I was here. I, several times I went over to Rwanda and they were completely, I thought, completely disillusioned with the tribunal.
544 545 546	05:26	The ordinary people didn't know what was going on there. They thought it was a waste of resources, which should be spent in other ways. They weren't aware of who'd been arrested and so on; total ignorance over there. And that was our fault. We hadn't sold ourselves.
547 548 549 550 551	05:43	But the interesting thing is that if Rwanda had been just simply asking the world community for rendition – sorry, that's a bad word to use these days, it now has overtones – for extradition of fugitives, firstly, they would have had to have been tracking the fugitives wherever they had gone, under whatever aliases they had gone, whatever continents they had gone.
552 553 554 555	06:08	They would have to co-, be, have a continuous tracking process that would work all the way through the extradition process until finally arrest took place and then the formal extradition process started. And that was not happening. The Rwandan state was not in a position where it could engage in international extradition of the principals in, behind the genocide.
556 557 558 559 560	06:30	So unless you'd set up a tribunal of some kind or some kind of institution with a, a police force, an undercover CID that could track globally, give hush money, go spy – e-, essentially a Secret Service, to go all over the continent to track these Rwandan génocidaires, then you would never have caught these principal individuals. And that message had not been sold to Rwanda.
561 562 563 564	07:01	So that was the first thing we started to do, was to say, "Look, none of these people," – now I don't want to give names because most of the, of them are under trial at the moment, unless, unless what I'm saying comes out in years to come but, but there are people being tried now who are of course innocent until proven guilty.
565 566 567 568 569 570	07:25	But let me, for example, choose names of those convicted, supposing you, Akayesu hiding in some foreign country under an assumed name, in disguise. Though he was pr-, in, in charge, a Mayor of a particular commune in which he'd encouraged rape as a form of genocide, famously, "Now you know what a Tutsi woman tastes like" is one of his phrases, to, as he encouraged the, the, the, the Hu-, the Hutu Interahamwe to go out hunting women and rape them before killing them.
571 572 573 574	08:05	Now, those individuals would never have been brought to justice had we not set up an institution like this. So part of the, the, the link between the peacekeeping mission and our existence is capturing those who would never have been caught. And in fact what we ended up doing was capturing virtually the whole of the interim government in 1994.

- 575 08:29 And again I have to be a little careful because the interim government by virtue of being a
 576 government does not mean all its members are guilty of genocide. Although many people
 577 have argued otherwise, that is not the legal position. We don't have guilt by association, guilt
 578 by organizational membership.
- 579 08:48 You had something similar to it Nuremberg. Members of the SS for example would have been
 580 regarded as having been guilty of certain offenses by virtue of that membership. This is not
 581 the situation in Rwanda.

58209:03Note: Gap in Interview (Approx. 5 minutes in duration.) Gaps occurred due to interruptions583during the interview, technical issues, or corrupted data files.

- 58409:12What essentially we had done was to arrest everyone from the Prime Minister, from all the585ministers downwards, the chiefs of civil society, the senior clergy who were responsible586because of course the role of the Catholic Church was also somewhat regrettable in some of587this, and the military leaders and all the basically all the people, the principals at the top of588what took place in 1994 were arrested. Very few have so far escaped.
- 58909:48So you have a whole government inside the prison here and interestingly enough they still590function almost like a government. They issued a communiqué the day before yesterday,591which landed on my desk yesterday, in which they proceed to defend the Republic of France592against the allegations that the French were involved in the genocide. So they're actually still593issuing communiqués as a government even though they are sitting in Arusha.
- 594 **10:17 DJH: In the detention center.**
- 59510:18In the detention center; very delightful situation. Anyway, the point is that you bring, you596show Rwanda in due course. And once we did our outreach, we have a wonderful outreach597program that was set up and, and funded by European Union which proceeded to tell the598Rwandans more about what was going on here, who was being tried.
- 59910:48And slowly I think the message has got out. Certainly amongst the elites in Rwanda, everyone I600think is now fairly familiar and our relations with Rwanda have warmed as a result of that,601generally.
- And so I, I think the people there know those responsible for the, the, the killings, have been
 and are getting justice, but of course justice for a lot of the victims may not be living in a
 prison, in a situation of comparative luxury in African prisons. And we still have a certain
 amount of criticism of our penal regime.
- 606 **11:36** DJH: Why don't you tell me what that, what that is?
- 60711:40Well, we to set up our prison we took over a corner of the lo-, local Tanzanian prison. And608we then set it up according to international standards, as you would expect from the United609Nations. And it has individual cells. It has recreational facilities, research facilities so the

therefore it's a fairly enlightened regime in penal terms.

people could work on their cases, computers, exercise gym, a chef feeding them food. And

610

611

- 12:21 If you move 50 yards to the right as you look at the UN det-, detention facility, you enter the 612 613 Tanzanian prison which are a series of block houses in which – and I make no criticism of the Tanzanian government; this is a fairly typical regime in Africa because of lack of resources and 614 of difficulties in using plant and machinery effectively. 615 616 12:50 You have hundreds of people all trying to use a very narrow space. In Rwanda itself for 617 example, I feel a little more comfortable talking about Rwanda, the, the, it was estimated that each prisoner has about 40 centimeters of sleeping space - tremendous overcrowding 618 619 amongst the ordinary prisoners in this part of the world, and very little in the way of food, 620 good food, very little in the way of recreational facilities. 621 13:24 It's obvious that our prisoners, although they are in some ways (___), some of them, those 622 who've been found guilty, are guilty of the most heinous crimes in the calendar of human 623 crime. Nevertheless, they are treated probably better than the person who stole something in 624 the local market. Part 7 625 626 00:00 DJH: And when you determined, and I mean by you, I don't mean you, you personally but 627 when it was determined to cut down on the number of people who were going to be 628 prosecuted which you discussed earlier, what happened to the 100 or so people that you are 629 not going to prosecute? Did they stay here? Were they sent somewhere else? What? 00:29 630 Well, they fell into different categories, and the Prosecutor, I'm sure, would be only too happy 631 to give you more information about those. But basically there were some against whom it was 632 felt that the process of continued tracking was unnecessary. There were others whom the, the 633 tracking was continued and the files were handed over to the Rwandan government for them to take action. 634 00:56 635 There were others for whom tracking continues and whom the Prosecutor would like to arrest 636 and bring here for eventual trial here or referral to other states for trial. And, I th-, I believe 637 there were 15 of those. I think we're down to about 12 of those now. And then, even within 638 that group of, of 15, there were, there were five "must haves" and ten, you know, "would likes." 639 640 01:25 So there were different categories according to their level of seniority. The Prosecutor I'm sure will be only too happy to open the doors to tell you all about that. 641 01:34 642 DJH: Were there some who – you already had custody of and then determined you wouldn't prosecute here for reasons of whatever? 643 644 01:45 Yes. © 2009-2015 University of Washington | Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org
 - This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

645	01:45	DJH: And, and then you transferred them somewhere else.
646	01:47	Yes. This is again a matter for the Prosecutor to talk about, because I'm not privy to the
647		process by which the Prosecutor came to that decision.
648	01:54	DJH: Yeah, I'm not asking why but I'm asking what happened to them.
649	01:57	All right, there were, the Prosecutor announced on several occasions, there were referral
650		cases. There were some who were going, he was going to refer to other states who had
651		expressed a willingness to prosecute those cases.
652	02:16	And then there were others who the Rwandan government had expressed a, a willingness to
653		prosecute. In fact, the Rwandan government would have been happy to prosecute them all.
654		But the-, there were some who the Prosecutor identified as being suitable for referral to
655		Rwanda.
656	02:34	Mr. Munyakazi was the first live individual whom we had in our detention facility to receive
657		that honor of an application to refer to Rwanda and the Prosecutor ch-, chose also some
658		fugitives as well, fugitives from justice for, for referral of the indictments to Rwanda.
659	02:58	There were then referrals to other countries. There, there was a referral to Belgium, a referral
660		to Norway. The same person after that referral was rejected was subject of an attempt to
661		refer to Holland; that also was rejected by the Dutch and he is back here now.
662	03:22	So in, in essence part of the completion strategy was to refer cases the Prosecutor felt were
663		suitable to other jurisdictions, national jurisdictions.
664	03:32	DJH: Mm-hmm. And those people, for example, th-, those who, few or however many that
665		were sent to Rwanda would presumably be detained in the kinds of facilities you described
666		the Rwandans have, as contrasted with the detention facilities here.
667	03:52	No.
668	03:52	DJH: No?
669	03:53	No, as a result of the efforts of the Prosecutor and the Registrar, a model prison facility was
670		developed for receiving referral cases from here and with funding from the international
671		donors, the international standard prison was, has been built.
672	04:16	DJH: Okay, in, in Kigali presumably, in or near Kigali.
673	04:19	Near.
674	04:20	DJH: Yeah, near Kigali. All right, and have any of those been tried by the Rwandan courts?

- 67504:27None of the referrals to Rwanda have taken place. The judges of there were three attempts676by the Prosecutor to refer and all well, all three were rejected by the trials chamber, trial677chambers for different reasons. And the appeals chamber has now just yesterday no, no,678just end of last week come to a decision supporting the trial chambers' finding that referral679to Rwanda was not going to take place because there was lack of certainty of a fair trial, in680effect.
- 68105:07The prison conditions, prison there were cert-, certain aspects of the penal law were also an682issue; uncertainty about whether it was possible that people referred to Rwanda might have683to serve imprisonment for life if they were found guilty, in isolation.

684 **05:24 DJH: Mm-hmm.**

- 68505:25That was one area. It was a bit it was, was ambiguity in the Rwandan law. But it, under one686reading, it would be possible for people referred to end their days in, and outliving the whole687of their life in isolation, and that was felt not to be commensurate with the international688standards.
- 68905:44The principal concern of all three trial chambers dealing with these referrals was the690independence of the judiciary. The appeals chamber to some extent qualified the findings on691that and, or in the, in the present finding, but supported the trial chamber in respect of the,692running the defense cases.
- 69306:12How could you what happens is when we run defense cases here, we bring witnesses.694Whoever the defendant wants as a witness we have to bring. Or we get them to testify via695video link, if they're too frightened to come to Africa.
- 69606:28Most of the Rwandan ex-génocidaires or Rwandan Hutus are, are in the diaspora throughout697the globe. A lot of them are wanted by the Rwandan government for crimes. And so we tend698to bring them here under anonymity, under pseudonyms, under secrecy. And we let them give699evidence under pseudonyms and then we send them away.
- 70007:02And the idea is that they will not then be able to be prejudiced by their appearance here, by,701for example, being arrested by the Rwandan government and its agents. The question arose in702the referral cases well, "How are you going to get génocidaires or alleged génocidaires, people703who had blood on their hands according to the Rwandan government, to fly into Rwanda to704give evidence on behalf of these referral cases?"
- 70507:33And it was felt that that obviously could not take place and manifestly, and I can remember706some conferences in Rwanda where people were shouting at me from the back of the room.707Some journalists were saying, "How can we let génocidaires come here and then put them on708planes and leave them and wave goodbye to them in Kigali?"
- 70907:51It's a very real issue. Well, how could they, emotionally? And it's just a very difficult situation.710So the question is well, can they all give evidence by video link? Well, then you have the

711 712 713		situation where all the prosecution witnesses giving evidence in person and all the defense witnesses giving evidence on screen, so it's an obvious disparity and that was felt to be unfair by, by – and the appeals chamber supported that position.
714	08:18	DJH: So
715	08:19	More than you ever wanted to know about referral.
716 717	08:21	DJH: No, no. Not at all because it, it also addresses another question which – and, and we can wander a bit.
718	Part 8	
719 720 721 722 723	00:00	DJH: And the question is, you know, frequently we think justice should be visible to the, to the victims, you know, and not at a great distance from them because at least in that way, the argument is that the victims will feel, some call it reconciliation with their own suffering, call it feeling that justice was done and they could actually see it done. And, and that's frequently a good thing in terms of getting on with life.
724	00:32	Yeah.
725 726 727 728	00:33	DJH: But that was not done here and some people must have thought about that. And so what you were just talking about bears to some extent on that question. I would ask you your thoughts on, on, on that question and perhaps some of the other issues that were raised vis-à-vis that.
729 730 731	00:55	DJH: I know you, you talked earlier about developing an outreach program to at least provide information to the Rwandan, the Rwandan people. So is that coherent to, to you and can you respond to that?
732 733	01:15	I always say that whenever a judge speaks it's always coherent. But I shall try and extract from it
734	01:21	DJH: That's not, that's not, that's not always quite the case, but
735 736 737 738	01:26	Yeah, I think it's a tremendous shame that these trials did not take place close to where the victims are and where the crimes took place, tremendous shame. And I think it's one of the issues that has dogged us in terms of our effectiveness. Having said that, when you go back to 1995, 1996, just think of the situation then.
739 740 741 742	01:57	The Security Council had to, and the, and the Secretariat had to put in place a trial system that was going to be able to operate in a fairly dispassionate, f-, free li-, environment in which defense were going to be able to act freely as well as prosecution. I know they considered Nairobi originally when they were trying to locate a place.

- And it, but it was felt that really the situation, although the infrastructure was better, the
 political situation in Kenya was not such as to make it a very neutral ground. And so Arusha
 was chosen although dusty and a town with no infrastructure, no computers, no roads,
 nothing. Was not really the best place in hind-, in hindsight, because it took a long time to get
 things going.
- 74802:59And it, what it does mean is we have to hire this aircraft, you know, which has almost been on749permanent hire throughout the, the, the life of the tribunal. Lifting witnesses with and a750so-called anonymity wi-, with pseudonyms out from Kigali airport, bringing them, flying them751into Tanzania, putting them up here in safe houses or in hotels, giving them enough money to752survive and then lifting them back and inserting them back into their communities.
- 75303:28Apparently, although, you know, officially not, with the community not even knowing that754they've been giving evidence in Arusha, you know, (_____). It, it's unfortunate but you know,755it's obvious, it's to some extent impractical.
- And it's, it's fairly widespread experience that, you know, the white Toyota car which is, even
 with no markings, is obviously a UN vehicle appearing somewhere in a rural community to pick
 up X. Or there, or the time the vehicle appears, X is away from the village, you know.
- 75904:04I mean, it's very difficult for people giving evidence here. Certainly I think this is more760important in the early days of the tribunal. Now, our witness protection system is, you know, a761lot more sophisticated but even so, people are known. We've had a situation few months ago762where witnesses who were meant to be anonymous had been denounced by a survivors'763organization in Rwanda for giving evidence for the defense.
- 76404:39And they were denounced and they were told they would no longer have the benefits of765getting survivors' benefits and so on. And when they complained to the witness protection766officer, the witness protection officer in Rwanda, who is not part of us, the Rwandan767protection, the government protection officer cooperates within the Procureur General's768Office, proceeded to denounce them herself for being snakes in the grass and for betraying769their colleagues.
- 77005:12So you can see the enormous difficulties. And so choosing a neutral territory was necessary771from the point of view of getting both sides heard. And one thing you see, the, the, when I772came here, people always used to say, "Oh this was just a . . ." I mean the, the, to some773extent our, our guests in the detention facilities still say that it's a political tribunal and so on774and so on.
- 775 05:39 But and a victor's tribunal, you know, the old thing about the Nuremberg slander you know,
 776 is thrown at us. We try the Hutus. We don't try the Tutsis. But if you look at the way we
 777 function, we give the defense every opportunity. We give them equal facilities. We treat them
 778 in every way we, we privilege them.

779 780 781 782	06:06	We, and you know, will do anything we can to ensure a fair trial. And I think our, our detainees individually, when they are not in their sort of group mode, they all agree that they are actually – we, we do a tremendous job in getting their witnesses here or getting them heard if necessary by video link.
783 784	06:31	And we get them the best lawyers we can get. We spend, we are often criticized for spending too much money on defense lawyers but we have some superb defense lawyers who, if you
785 786		compare them with the prosecution lawyers, I don't think they – I have to be a little bit careful here – I don't think they necessarily fall below the standard of the prosecution lawyers.
787	06:55	DJH: Well done. Another piece of it and it's perhaps more practical than anything else is, as
788		a judge myself, I know that sometimes it's important for me to see the area where
789 790		something's happened and obviously it's a bit impractical to get a court to get on an airplane and
791	07:22	No, we do it.
792	07:23	DJH: You do it.
793	07:24	Yeah.
794	07:24	DJH: Do you do it regularly?
795	07:25	We've got some judges who've just been there.
796	07:26	DJH: I under-, I understood that. I was talking about
797 798	07:28	Yeah, no, they do it regularly. Not every, not in ev-, every case but pretty well in most case – now, most cases.
799	07:35	DJH: Mm-hmm. Okay.
800	07:37	And it, it has to be encouraged. Expensive as it is, it has to be encouraged.
801	07:42	DJH: Okay. And apparently there was a decision made not to, as the years went by and
802		perhaps things settled down a bit in terms of emotion, not to do, not to move the court or
803		not to have at least a body of trials done by the UN in Rwanda or, or near Rwanda. Am I
804		correct?
805	08:10	That is absolutely correct and I regret that. I mean, I think at one point we did hope that we
806		could try the, do some of the prosecution cases in Rwanda and then bring the trial here and
807		do the defense case here. But it was overtaken by events, essentially. By the time we got to
808		the point where we could have done that, most of the multi-accused cases, which are very
809		long and convoluted were heading to the defense phase anyway.
810	08:39	DJH: 'kay. Okay. You have a, a – the court has a presence in Kigali
		(a) 2000 204E Line is an it is a filler at an in Descenter at a first statistic set of

811	08:49	Yes.
812	08:50	DJH: and what is that presence?
813 814 815 816	08:52	Well, we have a – well, we, it's a very small presence now but it used to be quite big. Basically, the prosecution have their presence there. They are the people who look for the witnesses, look into the evidence they have, basically run case investigation and then case support once the trial's ongoing.
817 818 819	09:19	Issues come up in evidence, they immediately phone through to the prosecution representatives in Kigali, get an investigator to go and check this, this and this because this has come up in evidence and so they go and check it and then it's fed back into the trial.
820 821 822	09:34	And then also we have other staff whose job it is to facilitate the running of the defense cases, the defense investigators, defense counsel, going around Rwanda, getting into the prisons, going into the communities to get their witnesses.
823 824 825 826 827	09:49	And then we've also got our witness protection staff whose job it is after the witnesses are finished here to ensure that they are looked after, that they don't have any prejudice, that, if they have needs, they have medical needs, we set up a clinic for treating medical conditions of the witnesses and we look after them basically. The idea being – you see, because if we look after our génocidaires here, we look after our guys here.
828 829 830 831	10:17	And considerable numbers of them have ill-, certain illnesses, infect-, infective illnesses which could be life threatening and we give them drugs, modern drugs which are not available to everyone in Africa. So there's another interesting ethical situation. We are feeding highly sophisticated drugs to keep our alleged criminals and our found criminals alive.
832 833 834 835	10:46	And we have witnesses in Rwanda, and maybe even victims who were infected with certain diseases by some of these self-same people or their, their acolytes and their, their, their foot soldiers, who died because of those diseases already because they ha-, didn't have treatment. And then we have witnesses who come here with those same diseases.
836 837 838 839 840	11:09	And I don't need to ink in all the details, I hope, but for example if you are a female witness of a rape or a rape wi-, victim and you come here and you have an infectious disease that you caught while you were raped in 1994 and you know that the individuals who ultimately were responsible are receiving highly sophisticated drugs to keep them alive, but that you are not receiving any treatment, what kind of justice is that?
841 842	11:37	So we set up a, a system to ensure that those sophisticated drugs were given to our witnesses in that position.
843	11:44	DJH: And victims, or at least ?

844 845 846 847	11:45	Not victims, you see in general, no. We did work, in fact we have an officer whose job it was to try and encourage the NGOs to get those drugs available and they've done tremendous work. And we-, through the NGOs in Kigali where we have ensured and we h-, we're getting the victims organizations we worked with to get those treatments out, out there.
848	12:06	DJH: Mm-hmm.
849 850	12:07	But, you know, how, hundreds of thousands of people – no, not hundreds, hundreds or thousands of people lost their lives before that took place.
851	Part 9	
852 853 854 855	00:00	DJH: One of the things we – we got onto some issues versus the specifics of your job. We went from some of the things that you've been actually working on in your current job versus when, when we were talking earlier about your being Chief of chambers and, and, you know, moving things along.
856 857 858	00:24	DJH: So let me come back to that and I, I suspect we're going to, somewhere soon, have to, have to take a more permanent break for today and then perhaps we'll come back another time and, you know, finish up some of the things that would be good to talk about.
859 860 861	00:47	DJH: In, in the process, again going back between 2000 and 2005, apparently things began to move along. You got more resources. You got some additional judges and so forth, and the judges were ad litem. Can you just tell us quickly what that means?
862 863 864 865 866	01:09	Well, ad litem judges were essentially the, had the same qualifications as the permanent judges under the statute but the idea was we didn't want to pay them pensions. We didn't want to pay them all the benefits. That would have made it a very expensive option. Part of the way it was sold to the General Assembly, our funding body, was that this is going to be a sort of quick easy option.
867 868 869 870 871	01:35	We'll bring them in for a maximum of three years to do specific trials, often much shorter than three years, and then we'll send them out. Unfortunately, they were, as a result of another whole series of processes in which we lost judges from long running trials, we were, we – the judges passed a law allowing su-, substitute judges for judges who were already sitting in the middle of trials.
872 873 874 875	02:07	And so some of the ad litem judges were put into long running trials. For example, Judge Bossa when she arrived, was put into the Butare trial; one of the Olympic record breaking trials of all time, and you know, long ago I think exceeded her three-year limit and is you know sitting ().
876 877 878	02:28	And so that in, in essence has meant that the ad litem judges have had to have, be given more benefits and some of these are still, the issues are still being looked at by the President and by the judges.

909 910	05:09	DJH: How, how does that, that work? And I don't mean just the, the connection between your judges, the judges here and appeal chamber. The appeal chamber is what it, what it is
908	05:08	Yes.
907	05:04	DJH: It's a, and, and a couple of your judges are actually on the appeals chamber.
906	05:02	It's a bit late now.
905	05:01	DJH: Okay.
904		our trial chamber judgments, I would say we've got a long way to go.
903		improved our jurisprudence. Certainly looking at the appeals chamber's recent treatment of
902		tried to improve a number of things about our output. I'm not sure we've actually overall
901	04:33	So we've tried to improve our jurisprudence. We've tried to improve the, w-, the style. We've
900		but I think that that original ethos has given way to a more modest attitude.
899		writing seminars. Originally, the judges felt that they, you know, shouldn't really be trained
898		continuing legal education program, which the judges have also participated in, and judgment
897		very definite necessity and with a, a wonderful person called Suzanne Chenault we devised a
896	04:01	Well, I think the introduction of professionalism in the legal work of chambers – that was a
895		about them? (), you know, of any significance.
893 894	03:42	DJH: sometime next week. All right, and, so why don't you sum up for us if you, if you would, your period as Chief of chambers. What other issues were there and what was done
892	03:41	Yeah.
891		talking with Ju-, Judge, Judge Short
890	03:33	DJH: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm. It's – I'm, I'm sort of figuring that out, yeah, and, and we'll be
889		it's, it's a very difficult situation. They're not so ad litem at all.
888		up sitting on two trials and ha-, indeed had to drop out of one trial because of his health. And
887	03:17	Ask Judge Short about it when you talk to him. He's an ad litem judge who, you know, ended
886		trial and then is meant to go away but most of them haven't gone away.
885		Whoever gets the most votes comes in first, gets slotted into this trial then slotted into that
884		upon and they're elected by the General Assembly and the President picks from the top.
883	02:59	So you had a pool, what you had with ad litem judges, you've got a pool of judges you can call
002		sitting in individual cases, you ve lost that nexibility.
881 882		cases and then pull them out. You want the flexibility. With nine permanent judges all (), all sitting in individual cases, you've lost that flexibility.
880		you're trying to run a court, as you yourself know, you want to put judges in for particular
879	02:42	The idea was that, you know, we, we just needed to be able to put judges – you know, when
070	02.42	The idea was that you know we we just needed to be able to put judges, you know when

911 912		 it, it handles appeals from decisions made by the court here or the Yugoslav court, I presume.
913	05:28	Yeah.
914 915	05:31	DJH: What's the mixture of judges? Is it not just judges from here that decide about the cases from here?
916 917 918 919	05:37	No. Basically, it's up to the presiding judge of the appeals chamber, who's the President of ICTY, to move the judges around as he wishes and he, he can assign any number of judges from the ICTY, or rather five, to our appeals chamber and then they mix and match with our two, but our two sit on ICTY cases as well so it's, it's totally flexible.
920	06:03	DJH: Okay.
921 922 923 924 925	06:04	One of the more bizarre situations is that the appeals chamber judges come down here for our plenary sessions, which amend our rules and pass our rules. And therefore we've got an interesting situation where the appeals chamber judges who are actually going to be passing upon the lawfulness or not of the provisions of our rules are the people who also participated in the passing of those rules.
926 927 928 929 930	06:33	One, let me just give an interesting example. When we effected the substitution rule for judges, it was fairly novel at the time for us. I don't know, I mean, there aren't many jurisdictions which allow you to substitute judges in the middle of a trial, who have not participated or listened to the evidence but who have to familiarize themselves with the transcript and records and watch any of the video that they wish to do so.
931 932 933 934 935 936	07:03	And then certify they are familiar with the proceedings and then jump in and replace the previous judge. Unusual situation and one that could have been addressed in an appeal but since our appeals judges took part in the passing of the rule that allowed it, of course, to some extent the position of the appeals chamber as a, a long stop, as a protection of the rule is removed. So you can see that there's a certain amount of structural exoticism in the way we do things here.
937	Part 10	
938 939 940	00:00	DJH: And that brings me to another question that you had talked earlier about the Prosecutor and that she or the office itself served both the ICTY, the Yugoslav, former Yugoslavia and the Rwanda tribunal. Did that change at any time?
941 942	00:24	Yes. Excuse me. There was a conflict with Rwanda over the RPF cases. The prosecution of individuals, Tutsi individuals who've been part of the invading army that stopped the

© 2009-2015 University of Washington | Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

943

944

(___) . . .

genocide, and were essentially run by General Kagame as he then was, who is now President.

945	00:50	DJH: RPF, RPF stands for what? Sorry.
946	00:55	Po-, basically the popular front, Rwandan Popular Front.
947	00:58	DJH: Okay. Okay.
948	01:00	They'd invaded from Uganda
949	01:02	DJH: Right.
950 951 952	01:02	and were officered to a large extent by English-speaking Tutsis under English-speaking General Kagame as () part of the general cultural issues that overplay the tribal situation in Rwanda.
953 954 955 956 957	01:19	And they – it is alleged that during the course of the invasion and during the course of the pacification process, the RPF engaged in killings, mass killings of Hutus. And therefore the question has always been raised by those we have in the UNDF, by their defense counsel and by the Hutu diaspora, "Why haven't we prosecuted the RPF people who committed massacres of thousands of, of Hutus?"
958 959 960 961 962	01:55	And this has been, you know, long been you know a bone of contentions; the Prosecutor hadn't done that. Prosecutor's position was always, "Well, I'm investigating. I'll, I'll, I'll look into it and I'll tell you later." And Carla del Ponte in fact reinvigorated the investigation of the RPF cases and this definitely did upset certain individuals who might have had something to lose as a result of that.
963 964 965 966	02:32	And it caused political problems for Carla del Ponte and she has always said that the reason why she was removed as Prosecutor of this institution was because of her – the vigor with which she was pursuing the RPF cases. But in fact there'd been considerable dissatisfaction, and I can vouch for that, with her dual role as
967 968 969 970	02:54	The question really was whether the prosecution was being given its full attention in this institution as it was being given in the ICTY. And certainly I think the completion strategy issue was one of the issues where that came to the fore most. And so I think the issue was on the table whether, whatever the situation with Rwanda.
971	03:16	DJH: Mm-hmm. And when was – who decided and what ()
972	03:20	The Security Council decided to remove her.
973 974	03:24	DJH: And not just re-, remove her but actually set two offices, in other words. Am I correct in that?
975	03:29	Yes, they appointed a new Prosecutor, Hassan Bubacar Jallow.
976	03:35	DJH: And that person is the Prosecutor only for the Rwandan court. © 2009-2015 University of Washington Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

977	03:39	Absolutely.
978	03:40	DJH: And then there was a separate one
979	03:42	For Yugoslavia.
980	03:43	DJH: () that for, for the Yugoslavia.
981	03:44	Yeah.
982	03:44	DJH: And when did that, that happen? What year, approximately?
983	03:50	l've forgotten.
984	03:51	DJH: Okay. A-, was it after you took your current role?
985	03:56	No, no. I was still Chief of chambers. So it'd be about
986	03:58	DJH: Okay, so sometime before 2005. Okay.
987	04:00	2004, '05 (). I'm sorry. I ().
988	04:02	DJH: All right.
		-
989	Part 11	
989 990	Part 11 00:00	DJH: We're, we're reaching sort of the last, last 15 minutes we can give to this today and I'm
990 991		going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your
990 991 992		going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which
990 991		going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your
990 991 992		going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which
990 991 992 993	00:00	going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of?
990 991 992 993 994	00:00 00:30	going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going.
990 991 992 993 994 995	00:00 00:30 00:32	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right.</pre>
990 991 992 993 994 995 996	00:00 00:30 00:32	going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the
990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997	00:00 00:30 00:32	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the ones whose job it is to keep it going. There have been times when we've had crises; you know,</pre>
990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999	00:00 00:30 00:32 00:36	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the ones whose job it is to keep it going. There have been times when we've had crises; you know, endless crises, you know, people having problems under pressure. I'm not talking about judges here. I'm talking about legal officers.</pre>
990 991 992 993 994 995 995 995 996 997 998 999	00:00 00:30 00:32	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the ones whose job it is to keep it going. There have been times when we've had crises; you know, endless crises, you know, people having problems under pressure. I'm not talking about judges here. I'm talking about legal officers. And you know you've always got to be ready to put out fires. I think just keeping the whole</pre>
990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999	00:00 00:30 00:32 00:36	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the ones whose job it is to keep it going. There have been times when we've had crises; you know, endless crises, you know, people having problems under pressure. I'm not talking about judges here. I'm talking about legal officers. And you know you've always got to be ready to put out fires. I think just keeping the whole thing going, just using diplomacy, getting people to continue talking when they wanted to</pre>
990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 999 1000 1001	00:00 00:30 00:32 00:36	<pre>going to switch over to something (_) very much be interested in about yourself and your role, whatever it's been, whichever role you've had. What would you tell us is that which you've done which, or been part of, that you're most proud of? Keeping it going. DJH: Yes. All right. No, I think supporting the judges, trying to assist them make a go of it. I mean they are the ones whose job it is to keep it going. There have been times when we've had crises; you know, endless crises, you know, people having problems under pressure. I'm not talking about judges here. I'm talking about legal officers. And you know you've always got to be ready to put out fires. I think just keeping the whole</pre>

1004 01:23 And you've got division between the Francophones and the Anglophones. You've got the civil, c-, common law distinction. You've got people who sometimes don't want to understand each 1005 1006 other. 1007 01:35 You've got all kinds of areas where conflict can arise, daily they arise. And I think more or less 1008 getting one's verbal WD-40 out and running around and spraying it and, and just keeping the 1009 thing going is, is what I would say, is, is the principal achievement. There are, I can think of 1010 many failures. I can think of many things that . . . 1011 02:05 DJH: That was my next question. What, you know, what are those things where you wish you or, or the - or th-, that which you were involved with would have done better? 1012 1013 02:14 I think the quality of the jurisprudence. That has, that's the thing that saddens me most; not 1014 being able to get the judges to agree to devote themselves to improving, as a corporate 1015 group, our jurisprudence. 1016 02:33 DJH: What, what do you mean by the jurisprudence? I mean, that's a word that lawyers 1017 themselves are sometimes imprecise about and we're going to be talking, you're talking 1018 right now to . . . 1019 02:43 Yeah. 1020 02:43 DJH: . . . people who are not lawyers. 02:47 International criminal law is actually pretty easy. It's not difficult. There are actual answers to 1021 1022 actual problems. There are fairly clear legal answers to most of the issues that arise in our 1023 daily, day to day work. And our judges arrive relatively innocent, if I can put it in that way. I 1024 mean no disrespect to them. It's very few judges who arrive here with a knowledge of 1025 international criminal law. 1026 03:24 And they bring with them the wisdom of their years on the bench, their knowledge of their 1027 own national law. And a lot of them continue to believe that's enough to deal with any issue 1028 that arises. But the truth is that we have now a body, a corpus of law relating to grave crimes, 1029 to procedural issues that is actually out there and it's easy to know. It takes effort. 1030 03:54 But it, I mean one of the great publishing boondoggles of the last ten years has been 1031 enormous quantities of textbooks issued on international criminal law and I would say threeguarters of them are miserable, terrible, but there are some really good ones which are, you 1032 1033 know, decisive, clear, comprehensive and if only it were possible to ensure that our jurisprudence, (_), by which I mean our judgments, were written in a way that just dealt with 1034 1035 the law as it is, as we have now developed it. 04:33 We spent – if you look at the two tribunals and the other hybrid tribunals, we must have spent 1036 1037 now nearly 40 judge years, if you put them all together – you know, eight years, ten years, and

		Everard O'Donnell
1038		so on, you add it all together. How is it then that we can still make some of the most
1039		fundamental errors in our judgments and that really does, I think is one of my great failures.
1040	05:00	DJH: Why yours?
1041	05:01	Well, I suppose if I had been more forceful, more like Carla del Ponte, I would have been able
1042		to lead all the judges into the promised land. But it's, it's just not been like that. They, they are
1043		very much individualists. They still bring their own views to the table. They're not going to be
1044		led. They're not going to be – this sounds disrespectful. I don't mean to be.
1045	05:30	But they don't feel that the knowledge they have, for example, of French jurisprudence or of
1046		the common law jurisprudence is to be thrown out, and other issues – the whole question of
1047		the doctrine of precedent for example. I mean we've had civil law judges who simply refused
1048		to follow precedent. Point blank, "I don't care what, you know, is being said by the appeals
1049		chamber. I'm not going to do it. This is my view." This, it's a s-, fundamental principle. You
1050		know, what can you do?
1051	06:01	DJH: And you have here some sort of combination of the civil and the common law. ().
1052	06:07	Yeah, I mean the, the, the difficulty for the civil law is, is that it's common law triumphant
1053	06:12	DJH: Mm-hmm.
1054	06:13	you know, by and large.
1055	06:14	DJH: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.
1056	Part 12	
1057	00:00	DJH: Well, I don't want to necessarily camp on failures but you used the word in plural. Is
1058	00.00	there something else you'd like to
1059	00:08	Oh lots, lots. I, I wish that we were cheaper and leaner. I would wish that we had not become
1060		so enormous and expensive. I think we could have had a structure that was totally different.
1061		We could have, instead of following this enormously bloated mission model which is what we
1062		have here where we have everything happening in-house, we could have just had a core of
1063		judges, a core of lawyers, basic administrators and then had everything else contracted out.
1064	00:43	You know, it would have been half the price. I wish we could have done a lot of our work in
1065		Rwanda. I wish we were more victim-oriented in our punishment system. I wish we were more
1066		punitive.
1067	01:06	DJH: How do you mean?
1068	01:07	Well, we're talking about the gravest crimes that mankind can commit and human, the human
1069		race has known. We're talking about the, the murder of between 800,000 and 1,000,000
		© 2009-2015 University of Washington Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

1070 1071		people who were murdered after horrendous torture. Torture was part of the process; it was never clean killing.
1072 1073 1074	01:32	The Rwandan victims themselves wanted to use their last resources, their last shillings, their last goods to try and beg the Interahamwe to shoot them and their families rather than to start hacking away at them as they did.
1075 1076 1077	01:49	But no, the Interahamwe burned them alive, used sharpened hoes and machetes to cut their Achilles' tendon and then left them w-, you know, crawling around so they could come back over at their leisure and slaughter them slowly by cutting off their limbs.
1078 1079 1080	02:08	It was just absolutely horrendous. It was worse than any Hieronymus Bosch vision of hell. There's never been – I mean, you know, you and I know about Auschwitz and we know about Belsen and so on. We know about all the shootings in the Eastern Command and so on.
1081 1082 1083	02:29	And nothing, even as horrifying as that, nothing prepares you for the ferocious bestiality of the way in which these slaughters took place in Rwanda. And by, by and large people don't dwell on it.
1084 1085 1086 1087	02:49	And it was (), one of the greatest pieces of child slaughter in human history as well. I mean about 400,000 children were killed and when you find – you talk to the Interahamwe, you know, why were so many children killed. Because the whole point was they were killed easily, quickly.
1088 1089 1090 1091	03:06	They run around in circles screaming, so they just club them and no problem. Easy. And then the old people and – eventually in the Bisesero hills they had – the hills were just covered with nothing but refugee Tutsis and so they went back day after day leisurely and they would just torture and torture.
1092 1093 1094 1095 1096	03:22	They would – I mean, there's one woman who's, who, who was, Mika Muhimana, who's our Lecter Hannibal, was convicted of killing. Her name will live forever and she and her – she was pregnant. She was just an ordinary farmer, a poor farmer but a Hutu, or a Tutsi. And Mika gets – comes there for his daily blood and they've dragged her out of hiding out of the bushes and she's got (_), pregnant.
1097 1098 1099	03:59	He cuts her apron, pulls out the fetus to see whether the fetus will live, you know like that, then throws the fetus down, then they cut her arms and legs off and they put sticks in her so she's flopping around. You know, I mean it's just absolutely unbelievable.
1100 1101 1102 1103	04:14	And those individuals are sitting here in our prison getting luxury food and, you know, (), we're just giving them – we're about to inaugurate a new exercise ground for them this, this week. I'm going there to watch a volleyball game between the staff and no doubt Mika will be there.

1104	04:35	And I find that very, very disturbing that – it does not accord with my perception of what
1105		justice is. My perception of justice may be out of date and very primitive but I don't believe
1106		that this process gives the world any more justice.
1107	Part 13	
1108	00:00	DJH: Let me step back for a minute. Before we go on to your definition of, of justice at this
1109		point, which I really would like to hear, you were describing a, a case or the facts of a case.
1110		What was the name of that case, (), the allegation, the perpetrator, the, the person
1111		convicted?
1112	00:21	Mika Muhimana.
1113	00:23	DJH: Okay, and, and he was convicted in the trial, in the trial chambers. Is that correct?
1114	00:32	Yes, he had received several life sentences
1115	00:35	DJH: Okay.
1116	00:36	for a number of grave crimes, including individual murders as well as participation in the
1117		general genocide.
1118	00:50	DJH: Okay. Was there an appeal?
1119	00:53	Yes, the appeal. There was always an appeal in these cases.
1120	00:58	DJH: Okay. And what was the outcome of the appeal?
1121	01:02	Well, he still had his life sentence affirmed but some of the individual counts were quashed.
1122	01:15	DJH: By the appeals court.
1123	01:16	By the appeals chamber.
1124	01:18	DJH: And why was that?
1125	01:19	Well, I was describing to you a case of Pascasie Mukaremera who was this Tutsi farmer who
1126		was pulled out and tortured and had her baby ripped out of her stomach and \ldots
1127	01:37	DJH: ()
1128	01:39	and we would never have known about that if it hadn't been for just one witness who was
1129		hiding in the bushes 20 meters away. Otherwise it would be an anonymous death, you know,
1130		like so many of the hundreds of thousands of deaths, just anonymous.

1131 1132	01:56	But just one person happened to be hiding in a bush unseen and was able to give evidence about what Mika did to her and to her baby. And he was convicted of that murder and
1133	02:13	DJH: Individual murder.
1100	02.10	
1134	02:15	Individual murder. When it got to the appeals chamber, unfortunately, the prosecution had
1135		not amended the original indictment before trial. They had originally alleged that another
1136		named individual had committed the crime, I think in the presence of Mika.
1137	02:40	And it was felt that even though there had been some notice where the time of the service of
1138		the statement of the witness that, of what the allegation was going to be, but nevertheless,
1139		the d-, indictment was sufficiently defective so that the indictment, the conviction had to be
1140		quashed.
1141	03:01	DJH: Of that particular case?
1142	03:02	Of that particular case.
1143	03:03	DJH: With that particular woman and those particular facts you described?
1144	03:06	Yeah, yeah.
1145	03:08	DJH: And
1146	03:09	And another where there was a rape charge also, quashed in which the e-, evidence was said
1147		by the appeals chamber to have been ambiguous. What happened was that some young girls,
1148		teenage girls were taken into a, a room by Mika Muhimana and another perpetrator and the
1149		witness gave evidence about what their, their screams and about them saying, "Why are you
1150		doing these things to us? Why, why are you doing this?"
1151	03:43	And then it was obvious that they had been raped and then they were killed, th-, when they
1152		came out and it was felt that the - there was ambiguity because they could have been talking
1153		to the other person in that room, not Mika.
1154	04:04	DJH: So that was quashed.
1155	04:05	Al-, albeit that presumably Mika was a willing participant in something. Nevertheless, I make
1156		no criticism but that was the, the finding of the appeals chamber and therefore that allegation
1157		was also quashed.
1158	04:22	DJH: What was the reaction, if any, of the staff here at the UN when or some of the staff at
1159		the UN?
1160	04:30	Well, I well remember when Pascasie's – the facts of Pascasie's case were being read out in
1161		the, in the trial chamber. That was a very strange moment for me because Judge Khan, who is
1162		from Pakistan, was the presiding judge in the trial chamber and she was sentencing Mika
		© 2009-2015 University of Washington Downloaded from tribunalvoices.org This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License

36

1163 1164		Muhimana for his crimes. And he was standing in front of her, in front of the glassed-in public gallery and Mika has always had a smile playing around his face.
1165 1166 1167 1168	05:08	He, he never s-, never really – the smile never left him. And Judge Khan was reading out the facts about how he had taken a knife and cut open her belly and pulled out the baby and then they had chopped her limbs off and stuck sticks in her stumps and stuff like that – and she was just reading it out.
1169 1170 1171 1172 1173	05:29	And there's the smile still playing around Mika's face. And I saw behind Mika in the public gallery two staff members in fact were watching, two women, secretaries. One is the President's secretary actually, an Ethi-, they're both Ethiopians. And they were just totally overcome by what they were hearing and they were both holding on to each other like this and weeping.
1174 1175 1176 1177	05:59	And it was astonishing to watch Mika smiling and them crying behind him as the judge was reading out what he had done to Pascasie, the unspeakable things he had done. And it was like almost like a Pieta, you're watching this and I was actually sitting watching all <mark>of</mark> this in the judge's lounge upstairs on the camera, on, on the, the monitor.
1178 1179 1180	06:26	And I could actually hear sniffles and the noise of weeping around me and there were the other judges in there watching, and staff members. And it was clear that everyone was overcome by what they were watching, including me.
1181 1182 1183 1184	06:43	And it somehow seemed to me – it was kind of one of those moments where you, you say maybe international justice is, is right and it is worth it. Because you – here we have this anonymous farming woman who nobody would have known about except by the sheer accident of somebody hiding in a bush.
1185 1186 1187	07:02	And you then had all these people who come from all over the planet, don't know anything, you know. They're, they're, they're, as I said earlier, almost innocent in their ignorance, and they come and they hear these facts and they are moved and they, they mourn.
1188 1189 1190 1191 1192	07:21	They mourn for her, this anonymous woman although we know her name, Pascasie Mukaremera. And high and low, whoever they are, they're all mourning her. And they, they – it does her homage. It does her death homage. It may be something of a conceit to say that this justifies the whole operation but to me, it somehow felt one of those moments where you say, "Yes, yes this, this, this international justice works."
1193 1194 1195 1196 1197	07:50	Unfortunately, of course when we got to the appeals chamber and the appeals chamber in, in their wisdom and they rightly so, I mean, I say as a matter of law they were no doubt correct, quashed the finding, the count, not on the facts but on the law, on a technicality, against Mika. And presumably they wouldn't have been so ready to do that if he didn't face lots of other life sentences as well.

1198	08:20	Then presumably, you know, they would have probably bent over backwards to find some
1199		alternative. But anyway, he was acquitted of that and of the rape and I guess there was a – I, I
1200		had a sense of outrage. For a moment, my loyally carapace dissolved a bit and I felt angry and
1201		I know a lot of other people, other people did feel that.
1202	08:47	But again when you look at it dispassionately after 30 minutes, you, you say, "Yes, yes that is
1203		international justice. That is fairness." You know, if you were (), you had just allowed your
1204		emotions to run these trials and not law, then he would have been convicted of everything,
1205		for what, for what it's worth.
1206	09:07	But there is a dispassionate component that says, "You have to fulfill this condition, this
1207		condition, this condition. Only if those conditions are fulfilled can you find this person guilty.
1208		No matter what the emotions, that is what the result is going to be."
1209	09:23	So it told me both that we are doing right. We have recorded Pascasie Mukaremera's story for
1210		the rest of time. Wherever digital media survive, people will know that witness's, that witness
1211		will be able to speak – perhaps through your project.
1212	09:40	You will have that witness's testimony about what happened to Pascasie. You will have the
1213		sentence and you will have the appeal. You will have the story of Pascasie Mukaremera
1214		forever. It will never die. When you and I have been forgotten, Pascasie Mukaremera's story
1215		presumably will remain.
1216	09:57	And so even if it was quashed, the story, the history of that particular event, in that particular
1217		small event to a small farmer in a small part of an anonymous piece of land, will live on and
1218		nobody will be able to gainsay that particular event. The, the judges found, all the judges,
1219		even the appeals judges, they didn't doubt the facts for a moment. So that, that was the story
1220		of Pascasie Mukaremera.
1221	Part 14	
1222	00:00	DJH: And what follows is the last question today and perhaps you've answered it at least in
1223		part already. What is your definition of justice, as to what this court ha-, has, should be
1224		doing?
1225	00:16	Oh, so easy a question.
1226	00:17	DJH: Yes.
1227	00:18	Thank you. I think here, I would like – I'm probably – you see, I come from a different time. I

122700:18Thank you. I think here, I would like – I'm probably – you see, I come from a different time. I1228sometimes feel I'm a bit of a dinosaur. I come from a different generation. I was born just1229after the Second World War but I was, I was sentient during the Eichmann trial and during the1230subsequent trials.

00:46 My sense of justice with crimes like this requires more than the perceptions of kindness and, 1231 1232 and enlightened penal provisions that we apply to these kind of crimes. I'm afraid I am one of 1233 the last, apparently one of the last capital punishment enthusiasts left on earth. Even Rwanda 1234 has now ba-, abolished the capital punishment provisions. 1235 01:21 But I think you want a justice system – when you look at the actual crime in all its horror – I 1236 think you want a result that is in some way commensurate, so that you don't feel when you 1237 watch it that the scales of justice are being unbalanced. 1238 01:41 And to me, when you treat people like this who committed the most unspeakable crimes and inflicted the most horrible extended pain on my fellow human beings, then I want – I think 1239 1240 there is, the justice has left the world if you don't treat them extremely harshly in turn. 1241 02:03 But you do it dispassionately. And you invent a system that reflects in some way the cruelty. It 1242 may not mean just hanging people. And I, I confess this is very much – I'm out on a limb here. 1243 This is not U-, even United Nations. I would be high-, highly disapproved of by my masters and no doubt disapproved of and disciplined because I step totally out of place, but to me these 1244 1245 crimes deserve unique punishments. And if I, if I could think of a punishment that would work for somebody like this, I would think 1246 02:35 1247 of a punishment that would leave them alive but with a continuing consciousness, a never, a 1248 never failing reminder every day and every second of their lives that remain, of what they did. 1249 02:57 So they, they could sleep. One would never deprive people of sleep if their consciences allow 1250 them to sleep but their, all their daily waking should be a reminder in one form or another of 1251 what they did to who, whether it be on screen or whether even the remains of the people they inflicted their tortures and killings on be in some ways present and close to them for the 1252 1253 rest of their lives. Something like that. 03:34 1254 DJH: Thank you for today. Thank you very much.