



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

1967

Some aspects of the impact of a status of forces agreement upon the administration of military justice.

Price, Oliver L.

Judge Advocate General's School

https://hdl.handle.net/10945/13058

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

> Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School 411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle Monterey, California USA 93943

http://www.nps.edu/library

NPS ARCHIVE 1967 PRICE, O.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE IMPACT OF A STATUS
OF FORCES AGREEMENT UPON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

by Lieutenant Commander Oliver L. Price, USN

Thesis P935



SOME ASPECTS OF THE IMPACT OF A STATUS OF FORCES

AGREEMENT UPON THE ADMINISTRATION

OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A Thesis

Presented To

The Judge Advocate General's School, U. S. Army

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the individual student author and do not necessarily represent the views of either The Judge Advocate General's School, U. S. Army, or any other governmental agency. References to this study should include the foregoing statement.

by

Lieutenant Commander Oliver L. Price, 368397 United States Navy

April 1967

NI ARCHUE 1907 Fried

DESIGN TO DETERM THE TAX THE PARTY OF THE PARTY AND A STREET AND A STR

SINGET S.

ol permenant

The Judge Advocate Concret's council, V. C. Law

The ortaless are nonelless entrained by the control of the control

100

Licutement Commander Oliver 1. Princ. Stager

Chor I feet L

LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIF. 93940

SCOPE

A study of the effect a Status of Forces Agreement and International Law will have upon the exercise of respective rights in certain areas of military justice, with particular emphasis on the recognition of the problem and specific situations such as negligent homicide cases, search and seizure and other potential problem areas.

MANA STEEL STEEL STEEL OF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PITH	P	AGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CRIMINAL JURISDICTION OVER VISITING FORCESsignatories to NATO-SOFA - concurrent jurisdiction	6
III.	OPERATION OF UNITED STATES COURTS-MARTIAL IN RECEIVING STATES	19
IV.	NEGLIGENT HOMICIDE - THE SOCIAL DILEMMA	43
V.	SEARCH AND SEIZURE CONTINENTAL STYLE	57
VI.	SECURING THE ATTENDANCE OF FOREIGN CIVILIAN WITNESSES— civilian employees - dependents - foreign civilian witnesses - international cooperation	84
VII.	CONCLUSION	91
APPENI	DIX A - ARTICLE VII, NATO SOF AGREEMENT	94
TABLE	OF CASES AND STATUTES	98

STREET, SQUARE,

	The last transfer of the last	
0	DELIGITATE COMMENT - DESCRIPTION AND RESIDENCE	
9	- The second of	
.47	-remove a to members - and members as serials as fairness	
-74	The state of the s	
a	miletal = distribution = desprise = line in the land i	
-47	which the same of	
	named and the part of the part of the same	168

SOME ASPECTS OF THE IMPACT OF A STATUS OF FORCES

AGREEMENT UPON THE ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

By Lieutenant Commander Oliver L. Frice

I. INTRODUCTION

Anyone who has served with our armed forces knows that the disciplinary problems encountered overseas are at least as great as those arising in the United States! The Manual for Courts-Martial and the Uniform Code of Military Justice were written for just this sort of world wide application, a body of law applicable to our military forces around the world.

Today the unparalleled global commitment of the United States armed forces brings to its lawyers many complex and unique problems which turn upon the interpretations of International law. These problems arise as a result of large numbers of service personnel, their families and civilian technicians being assigned to duty in foreign states. As it has always been the responsibility of the military commander is three fold. First, he is responsible for the

l. "This code shall be applicable in all places." Uniform Code of Military Justice art. 5 (hereafter cited as UCMJ art.

STATE AND ADDRESS OF SECURE AND ADDRESS OF THE ADDR

DISTRIBUTED AT

The distinct three whose three west past former than the the test of the test of the distinct three whose past of the test of

Taken the constructed along constraint of the called and contact and attact a

Volume old of Chicago Sarther art. 5 Norweiter cited

well-being of these American communities composed of civilians as well as the military establishment. Secondly, he is responsible to the chain of command for the discharge of the mission under law, and lastly though by no means of least importance, the commander is responsible to local authorities for faithful observance of treaty obligations, adherence to host nation laws where applicable and the good relations and cooperation with host nation citizens. The magnitude of this responsibility needs no explanation.

The extent to which foreign law may be applicable to visiting forces is dependent upon the legal status of the force in the host country as established by the terms of entry. These terms of entry are usually contained in international agreements which provide the authority for the presence of our servicemen.

Every day we read in our newspapers and see on television accounts of various crimes being committed, trials
and hearings involving known and unknown personalities.

Many of these situations involve unique legal problems and
the resolution of these problems is what makes the news.

But consider a foreign environment such as Japan,

Germany, Italy, or other country and raise these same legal

issues, adding an International flavor and it becomes ap
parent that these problems now involve additional factors

and yellowed allowed believes and the second of the second

The method to mind for the last may be applied to the winter to the form of the makey. These there of entry sectionally somewhat to the method in the method of the entry of the the

villed in country of request to the sections of the state of the state

which make resolution more difficult. It is as if we place the boy on the corner, or the family next door, smack into a Japanese community and tell them to continue to enjoy life as they know it. Problems? They are almost inevitable! What the boy on the corner always considered "joy-riding" or "drag-racing" may evolve into most serious crimes under the laws of the host nation. That is the purpose of this paper - to consider a very few of the problem areas which our service lawyers frequently encounter.

A typical area of potential difficulty is where a servicemen being tried before a court-martial challenges the jurisdictional basis of the trial itself because of a failure to obtain a waiver from local authorities, thereby authorizing trial by United States authorities as provided for by treaty. Does the accused have standing to raise this point? What are his individual rights and obligations under a treaty?

Another problem area which has arisen is the legality of our use of evidence obtained in accordance with local law by foreign nationals but which does not meet the Constitutional requirements of our own system of law. How does the law officer rule as to the admissibility of this evidence which the accused contends was unlawfully seized? This

The contract the contract of t

- typesed in the later of consequently deficiently to some leading as a sequently obtained the sequently obtained to sequently obtained to sequently obtained to sequently obtained to sequently obtained the sequently obtained the

The main and was a second to the second to t

question may be further complicated by the addition of other factors such as whether the search was conducted "on post" and whether United States military law enforcement personnel accompanied the local police.

Interesting collateral issues may involve the securing of attendance at the trial of foreign nationals who are witnesses. Does the trial counsel's subpoens power run to civilians in a foreign country?

Although these questions may frequently appear and confront the military lawyer overseas, little attention has been paid in legal writing to this area of the law. In fact, only a few controversial judicial decisions have been rendered, although the volume of these problems is certain to increase. Therefore, it will be the purpose of this paper to consider the foregoing questions of jurisdiction, search and seizure, negligent homicide overseas, and witnesses while attempting to ascertain whether logical conclusions can be drawn in regard thereto.

It will not be the purpose of this paper, however, to develop in any detail the history of criminal jurisdiction overseas or the many types of international agreements, including the much discussed North Atlantic Treaty Organization - Status of Forces Agreement, for it is at once

The small delication of the state of the sta

per one appearing the fair of the fairt and appearing the second of the fairt and the second of the fairt and the second of the fairt and the second of the

desired the collect overse restern, little extension of the collect of the collec

is only out to be common or tell more, among, he depends in any retailed on the first of any dependent in any retail the birthorn of any limited any limit of the second arrangement, in altable the second limited before the common of the second any any retailed the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second and any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the second any of the second and any of the s

discernible that much has already been written in this area.²

To obtain much of the information in this article I contacted several judge advocates with considerable experience in the areas noted. Some of these individuals were contacted by questionnaire, others by interview. Their comments and replies will be used throughout this paper and reference will be made thereto.

As this paper is basically concerned with specific aspects of a NATO-SOFA type agreement and its effects upon the administration of military justice, it may be helpful to an understanding of the problem briefly to consider the jurisdictional aspects of receiving and sending states and the NATO Status of Forces Agreement itself. Once this vantage point has been achieved, the specific questions stated above and other problem areas can be considered.

^{2.} There are several excellent sources which explain in detail the status of visiting military forces. These include Snee & Pye, Status of Forces Agreement: Criminal Jurisdiction (1957); Re. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement and International Law, 50 Nw. U. L. Rev. 349 (1955); Note, Criminal Jurisdiction Over American Armed Forces Abroad, 70 Harvard L. Rev. 1043, 1046-50 (1957); Baldwin, Foreign Jurisdiction and the American Soldier, 1958 Wis. L. Rev. 52 (1958). See also, Stanger, Criminal Jurisdiction Over Visiting Armed Forces, U. S. Naval War College, 52 International Law Studies, 1957-1958 (1965).

And the same and a second seco

I state the content of the content of the state of the content of

And the property of the contract of the appears of the appears of the contract of the appears of the contract of the appears of the contract o

II. CRIMINAL JUPISDICTION OVER VISITING FORCES

When the actual fighting of World War II ended it was obvious to most of the countries of the world that some organization of states would be necessary to keep the peace, namely some collective security system which would provide the basis for mutual defense and at the same time provide the states concerned with a guide to the solution of problems inevitably arising from the presence of visiting protective military forces. Although some of the treaties were implemented for different purposes and therefore took different forms, a treaty which precisely defined the status of the visiting forces and specified the respective powers which the receiving and sending states might properly exercise with regard to each other was the obvious enswer, 3 although at the time of their implementation considerable hue and cry was raised by Congressmen and others claiming amongst other things that "our servicemen could not receive fair trials in foreign countries" and that "we were negotiating away the servicemen's Constitutional rights."

^{3.} For an excellent discussion of jurisdiction see those works listed in footnote (2). Also, The Exercise of Criminal Jurisdiction Under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, Vol. 51, No. 1, The American Journal of International Law (1957).

DESIGNATION AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE

It been if on Africa to private factor or and made mixture with the electronical and no made of monthly again mer create at explanations at himse reduce to making manyo make bires (Will radays glicinas erilavifue once visus journey mild hald hid the top subwish latter for alled his salivous morroles and or adding a salty havesones nother out address -Singly to someower said mort unitaries afterfreely confidence in ing spotestive elitery regular, although that of the Effective here techniquely for fiffyiest numbers and tweetfore two different forces, a treety water overlish soot ored the elevan of the rigiting forces and spinitted the rigges. their define an interest the univisity and units evenes weld property supression in the related to align ordered while the our marked market without to maid but the depoter's tendent andit nest the parties are not bealthy but yet how are without his beautiful waselytes quot sant tentes they bear tour surgices. Don Feed Tringer Indiana of Alabet William Avgrang Ton & Cree and thomas a domestores out your equipped to the out said

description of the state of the

Quite naturally the question arose as to which sovereign has jurisdiction over such forces for criminal offenses the sending state or the receiving state in which they would be stationed? Historically some courts have held that under international law a foreign force invited into a State without conditions as an ally or a guest is by implication innume from the jurisdiction of the receiving state. 4 Some writers have suggested that the proposition that a host state is obliged to grant immunity to members of a visiting force is a rule of international law, 5 while others state that any immunity viciting forces may have is determined only by agreement. 6 However, the view which has the support of the bulk of practice is that, in principle, members of visiting forces are subject to the criminal jurisdiction of local courts, and that any derogations from that principle require specific agreement of the local State by treaty or otherwise. The Agreement of June 19, 1951

change v. McFaddon, 11 U.S. 116 (1812); Coleman v. Tennessee, 97 U.S. 509 (1878); Dow v. Johnson, 100 U.S. 158 (1879).

^{5.} See King, Jurisdiction Over Friendly Armed Forces, 36 Am. J. Int'l L. 539 (1942); King, Further Developments Concerning Jurisdiction Over Friendly Foreign Armed Forces, 40 Am. J. Int'l L. 257 (1946).

^{6.} See Re, supra note 2.

without soldly by the factor will be a fine out to be a fine of the sold of th Desired Annual of Language and the same of Allow and with the state of the through the state of the party of the same writer about a read in Figure was a rest of the last language or expressions of all twen or or pitters or modificate the "united programs and to multiplicate out part that fact a built cutting on het had better ettle profitte salidated in the Appellon of Address of Sound Street, NAMES OF THE OWNERS OF THE PARTY OF THE PART CHECK TO SHARE THE PROPERTY OF PERSONS AND PARTY OF THE P The same of the same of the same of the same of exercise, editority as pred it software to albeit out he from contractions of femores and so that on one respect and there is -the terr period entirement on the ber players first to of shall find that he freezeway allience witness which Dat 167 year to produce of the Annahilto an appoint

between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty recognizes the general jurisdiction of the receiving State. By way of exception, the Agreement permits the jurisdiction of the sending State over the members of its armed forces which are directed solely against the property or security of that State or solely against the person or property of another member of its forces or which arise out of any act or omission done in performance of a legal duty. In 1957, in three cases the Supreme Court of the United States further limited the court-martial jurisdiction of the United States overseas which had been exercised under the provisions of Article 2(11) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. These decisions in effect denied the existence of the customary international rule of implied waiver of jurisdiction by the host State when such an implied waiver is sought to be based solely on an unconditional invitation from the host State. The court held, in Wilson v. Girard, citing The Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon, 9 that "a sovereign

^{7.} See I Oppenheim, International Law 849 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955).

^{8.} Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1 (1957); and the companion case Kinsella v. Drueger, 354 U.S. 1 (1957); Wilson v. Girard, 354 U.S. 524 (1957).

^{9.} Supra note 4.

INTERNAL TO SERVICE TO A SERVICE AND A SERVI the May of Andrew Selly Desiry Add to not be a vitted to the section and MANAGEMY, IAI CONTRACTOR STATES AND ADDRESS OF THE STATES AND ADDRESS STATES STATES AND THE CONTRACT THE PERSON AND TAKEN MALES the addressed to authorate and excises claims delicated and to process or morar nor swelves profer to about said the gent to Ann at the Lewise or which shifted out of the resident or betteriou done in whytopunks of a feest write, " to 1957, -103 Versil Haddell and to Forest Monthly makes thought had Halfel and To improfungent College-Stime on Selectional paid Later will regard beneated byth full of the analysis water. specially to show experience out to (11) afairs to smokely Sweeters and bedone traite or arounded the existence to easily believed to edge time internal of complete and the Tarried belief on door made state that his plantable foot to the section of the or cared relater on an amount execute the or an amount of Part of the last lister, The Long hald, in wilder we blowd perference of sould problems as apprecial propoper of anythin

To see I decommuna, throughtours has not ink od.

man are the second to the second of the seco

^{.0 6500 55525 4}

nation has exclusive jurisdiction to punish offenses against its law committed within its borders unless it expressly or impliedly consents to surrender its jurisdiction" and that generally the only jurisdiction which United States military authorities could exercise over its military personnel in sovereign foreign countries was that which was permitted by the express consent of the foreign government concerned. The United States has sought to negotiate detailed agreements with all foreign countries where our forces are to be stationed.

The United States has entered into several agreements, the most significant of which is the Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces, hereinafter referred to as the "NATO Status of Forces Agreement." Probably the key article for our purposes, and the one most often cited, is article VII of this agreement which provides amongst other things that the sending state shall have "the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over persons subject to the military law of that State with respect to offenses, including offenses relating to its security, punishable by the law of the sending

^{10. 4} U.S.T. & O.I.A. 1792; T.I.A.S. No. 2846, signed at London, June 19, 1951; advice and consent of Senate obtained July 15, 1953; ratified by the President July 24, 1953 entered into force August 23, 1953.

The first of the control of the cont

The Cost standard of mich is the deposite between the cost of the season of the cost standard is the season of the cost of the season s

At Lookon, ours 10, 1971; navies and opposed of Scounce obtained fold 15, 1983; restrict by Nos Transferst July DA, 1957 entered into force Suggest DJ, 1957;

State, but not by the law of the receiving State." The pattern of jurisdiction over visiting military forces established by that Agreement was adopted in the United States - Japanese Status of Forces Agreement on 19 January 1960. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement came into force on 23 August 1953 with the United States, Belgium, France, and Norway the first of many countries to sign. Since that time the jurisdictional pattern of the NATO Agreement has been adopted by virtually every nation in which United States forces are stationed. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement therefore will be used as the basis for the purposes of this paper. The criminal jurisdictional provisions of the SOFAs generally provide the following:

a. The right of both sending and receiving States to exercise jurisdiction over the members of the force, in accordance with their respective laws.

^{11.} Article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement is set forth in Appendix A of this paper.

^{12.} Administrative Agreement between the United States and Japan, February 28, 1952; 11 U.S.T. & O.I.A. 1652; T.I.A.S. No. 4510; Article XVII, paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Japanese Agreement are the equivalent of Art. VII of the NATO-SOFA.

^{13.} See Appendix B of this paper for list of signatories to the NATO-SOFA and other agreements.

inter, but now to the last to prestry a middle to the persons of the court of the c

the party of the control of the sending and control of the control

in set forth in branchin of this chart of forces Agreement

^{13.} Adultite of the common to the common the content thinks and the content of th

Light of the appropriate to of him paper for list of signification of the list of the paper of the list of the

b. Military authorities of the sending State have exclusive jurisdiction over persons subject to its military law for offenses punishable by its law and not by the law of the receiving State.

e. Authorities of the receiving State have exclusive jurisdiction over such persons for offenses punishable by its laws but not by the laws of the send-

ing State.

d. In all other cases the right of jurisdic-

tion is concurrent.

(1) Primary jurisdiction, except for dependents, in all of these cases is in the receiving State subject to waiver except with regard to those offenses:

(i) Solely against the property or

security of the sending State;

(ii) Solely against the property or security of another member of the force or civilian component (including all dependents) of the sending State; (iii) And those arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official duty.

The NATO-SOFA establishes four types of jurisdiction as follows: (1) Exclusive jurisdiction - which means that one party to the agreement has the exclusive right to exercise jurisdiction over an offender; (2) Concurrent jurisdiction - which means that either party has the authority to exercise jurisdiction over an offender; (3) Primary jurisdiction - which means that with regard to an incident subject to concurrent jurisdiction, one party has the first or initial right to exercise jurisdiction over an offender; (4) Secondary jurisdiction - which means that in a concurrent jurisdictional situation, the second party has a secondary right to exercise jurisdiction if the other

THE RELEASE DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T

eminative and entering from your military and any or the property of the party of t

PRODUCTION OF THE PARTY OF THE

-aggregated to make the state of the state of

"Notice for communication."

many terms programmed to the plant of the party of the pa

or process of during visited 131

parents on these sent to an excession

on problem and on the glates (44)

related to the countries of the second territories to principal and the lateral sect that the second territories and territories and

again delegation to streamstern with my most particular an electrical

The collines (2) indicates personal and the collines of the contract of the collines of the co

party does not choose to exercise its primary right of jurisdiction. 14

The State having the primary right to exercise jurisdiction may waive jurisdiction in any case and so also may it waive the immunity of any of its representatives. Since any immunity is predicated on an interest of the state, it is the privilege not of the person but of the armed forces as well as to our ambassadors. The possibility of such a waiver is specifically noted in the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1951, 16 although our present policy is not to waive jurisdiction.

In 1965 the host countries in NATO waived their primary jurisdiction in 67% of the cases. World wide, the waiver rate was 65%. 17

^{14.} In the words of NATO-SOFA, Article VII 3(c) "... the authorities of the State having the primary right (to exercise jurisdiction) shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other State for a waiver of its rights in cases when that other State considers such waiver to be of particular importance."

^{15.} Wilson v. Girard, 354 U.S. 524 (1957); also see 1 Hyde, International Law 819 (2d ed., 1945).

^{16.} MCM 1951, para 12.

^{17.} Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee on Operation of Article VII NATO Status of Forces Treaty, 89th Cong. 2nd Sess. 2 (1966) Statement of Ray W. Bronez, Director, Foreign Military Rights Affairs, Department of Defense. At the time of its consent to the ratification

To the present his attended to control the time the

The first on the case par of neighbors of the same and no other age of the case par of the same per out of the same of the sam

grander words position of the repairment from the SASS of the control of the sass of th

The interest of the contract o

The sale of the sa

the not last, man the

TO ANTHON OUT BY SADSTEAD OF ANTIQUE OF ANTIQUE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY AND ANTIQUE OF ANT

In the past, it has been the general practice of the intel States as a sending State to ask for a waiver in all cases in which the receiving State has primary jurisdiction. In some countries, we have negotiated agreements which are designed to make waiver by those governments more or less a matter of course, to be granted in all except the most unusual case. In our Agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany carried this approach a step further, providing for a blanket waiver of German jurisdiction on application of the sending state, which Germany may recall in special cases. Over all, it seems probable

^{17. (}Continued) of the SOFA, the Senate appended a statement to the text which directed Commanding Officers to press a request for waiver in any case in which it appears that a member of the American forces being tried by a foreign court might be prejudiced by the absence of safeguards similar to those provided by the Constitution of the United States.
4 U.S.T. & O.I.A. 1828-29 (July 15, 1953); 99 Cong. Rec. 8730 (1953).

^{18.} Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee on Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. 26 (1960).

^{19.} E.g., the Netherlands, para. 3 of Annex to an Agreement of August 13, 1954, Greece, Art. II, 1, of the Agreement with Greece of Sept. 7. 1956.

^{20.} Agreement with Germany, Supplemental to NATO-SOFA 14 U.S.T. & O.I.A. 531; T.I.A.S. 5351, Article XIX with Respect to Foreign Forces stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany of August 3, 1959.

ALTER OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P

bd madwill malumnomed bodenath down had odd to mandam and the state of the state o

To work administration of the antiferror of the contract of th

The court of the contract of the court of the depoint of the depoi

Alderth or improved the comment of a state of the control of the c

that most offenses are subject to the primary jurisdiction of the receiving State, so that, with waivers normally granted in a majority of the cases, waiver has assumed a major role. Present United States policy in regard to waiver appears to be that it will not waive its rights but will ask for waivers in all cases except minor violations such as traffic offenses. At this point, the reader may well question the declared United States policy to request a waiver of jurisdiction in almost all cases despite the fact that in many instances military personnel convicted of serious offenses by host State authorities are treated with more benevolence than they would be under military law, thus giving the offender a better deal.

It has been alleged from time to time that these relatively light sentences have caused discipline in the armed forces to suffer. 22 However, there have also been complaints that foreign justice is harsh or otherwise unfair. 23 In at

^{21.} Department of Defense Directive 5525.1, May 5, 1962, Subject: Status of Forces: Policies and Information. Hearings on H.R. 3744 and H.R. 7646, Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, 84th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 6907 (1956).

^{22.} Ibid.

^{23.} Keefe v. Dulles, 222 F.2d 390 (D.C. Cir. 1954), cert. denied, 348 U.S. 952 (1955). Mrs. Keefe claimed her husband's rights were violated by the French in that he was compelled to be a witness against himself, might have been cruelly and

the state of the s

the ser team that the out of the state of the state that the state of the state of

St. Dopietance of introduct dispersion Strike, her 5, 1867. And John St. 1867. And John S

white .tm

This title out the control of the co

least one case, an accused who would have received a light sentence for a most serious offense had foreign authorities retained jurisdiction was ultimately sentenced to life imprisonment by a general court-martial. 24

Some writers have stated the reason for a waiver of jurisdiction is that the sanctions available to military

^{23. (}Continued) unusually punished by deportation to a penal colony, and was now in involuntary servitude and that therefore the Secretary of State had a legal duty to intercede and obtain Keefe's release. The position of the United States was that the record did not support Mrs. Keefe's position that her husband's rights were violated and that even her husband's commanding officer did not think it necessary to request State Department action. Also, the Senate reservation did not provide for Secretary of State intercession where American soldiers' Constitutional rights had been violated which they were not in this case, citing sec. 9, Art. VII of NATO-SOFA.

^{24.} United States v. Grisham, 4 U.S.C.M.A. 694, 16
C.M.R. 268 (1954). Several years ago a civilian employee
of the Army in France killed his wife by what was described
as a "physical beating characterized by the utmost savagery."
France, pursuant to the agreement then effective, had primary jurisdiction and accordingly the juge d'instruction
intended to send the case to a tribunal correctionnelle,
which could only impost a sentence of up to 5 years. A
U. S. Senator interceded in the case, however, and as a result of discussion between the U. S. Embassy and the French
Minister of Justice, a waiver of jurisdiction was obtained.
The accused was tried by General Court-Martial, convicted of
murder and sentenced to life imprisonment. (See Rouse and
Beldwin, The Exercise of Criminal Jurisdiction Under the
NATO Status of Forces Agreement, Vol. 51, No. 1, The American
Journal of International Law (1957), page 47, footnote 91.

And deposite and the second process of a second process of the second part and the sec

The section of the contract and deposits and treatment and the contract an

AT (County to be a seed of the second second

A constant of the constant of

jurisdiction may be considerably more effective in securing compliance with the law than the sometimes less rigid senctions of foreign courts. 25 One reason which has been cited is the different values on "crimes of passion, etc." Besides the ordinary penal senctions available to military courts, a punitive discharge, or in the case of an officer, dismissal from the service, can be adjudged by courtmartial. Non-judicial punishments may be imposed pursuant to Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, or the accused can be transferred.

Another reason for waiver is the necessity of making a complete disposition of an offense in a single trial. For example, if a United States soldier who misappropriates an Army vehicle is involved in a hit-and-run accident in which the victim is a national of the receiving state, he has committed two separate offenses against the law of both the sending and receiving state. The sending state would have primary jurisdiction over the misappropriation, while the receiving state would have primary jurisdiction over the hit-and-run offense. If no waiver is secured and two trials are

^{25.} LTC Joseph H. Rouse, JAGC, and 1st LT Gordon B. Beldwin, JAGC, supra note 3.

described and the lastic observation of the rest in the consistent date of the consistent date of the consistent date of the consistent of the constant of the

Another the court of a species of a state of the control of the co

At property to I am . Just . Stand . of demont Day . Sk

held, the soldier may use one court against the other by pleading for leniency before the first trial pointing out he faces a second trial, and at the second trial he may plead in mitigation that he has already been tried and sentenced for an offense arising out of the same circumstances. All this can be avoided by obtaining waivers of jurisdiction and trying all aspects of the case at once.

It has also been stated that the success of our military representatives in obtaining the large number of waivers of jurisdiction is primarily the result of our excellent local liaison. 26 Another author points out that the United States requests waivers in nearly all cases because the Commanding Officer must ask the receiving state to waive jurisdiction in those cases where the procedural safeguards set forth in the Constitution are lacking. The commanding officer is required to seek the waiver by the procedures set forth in the Senate Resolution of 15 July 1953. 27 It has been Army policy to obtain the maximum number of waivers possible. The percentage of waivers obtained seems to pay tribute to

^{26.} Supra note 17, p. 4.

^{27.} Williams, NATO SOFA - Articles VII and VIII: An American's Trial in a Foreign Court: The Fole of the Military's Trial Observer, U.S. Dep't of Army, Pamphlet No. 27-100-34, Military Law Review (1966).

the water and market brain and the party fields and played the entry has been reptiled your property by any property AMERICAN AND AND ADDRESS OF THE REAL PROPERTY AND AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY. District the same of the party IN A PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T the surveybulled to service purchase of subtree of one all the AND DESIGNATION OF THE PERSON AND PARTY AND PERSONS ASSESSED.

The last of the country and the country and only of the last of the country and the country an to bearing to pulses send all pointed in the printers and denies must be not not be adought the beauty of our wonders and all the party of the state of th along and per had been deep to take the water of the party of the party of without his marked total III where it operate whiteen magazine and and a same solution of the family seeding ng strong our stangers of Jacobscore was every beaut short at of restrict of nearest of pathod on manufactured all at depth the extendedness oil of riving and have so because the first two are if "ATT | I'm a contract of the first and will be revelor to across towers will minimal galling by -studyly burner makes four above survived to a businesses with

No. - Women below All, in Mr.

THE PARTY OF THE P

the success of our judge advocates. After the waiver has been obtained new problems may arise which must be resolved if a court-martial is ordered.

III. OPERATION OF UNITED STATES COUNTS-PARTILL IN ELCEIVING STATES

As pointed out earlier in this paper, the Uniform Code of Military Justice is extra-territorial and it is applicable in all places throughout the world where our armed forces may be stationed. These jurisdictional powers stem from the Constitution. Obviously then, the multitude of problems our military lawyers will encounter in the many foreign countries they will be required to sit are increased many fold by the fact of location alone.

The many and varied duties of the law officer of a General Court-Martial are assimilated to those of the Federal Judge. 30 In general he is responsible for the fair and orderly conduct of the proceedings in accordance with the law in all cases which are referred to the court to which he is appointed. 31 During the trial, he rules upon

^{28.} UCMJ articles 2 and 5. Note: An excellent discussion of General Court-Martial Jurisdiction appears in Winthrop's Military Law and Precedents (2d ed. reprint 1920) Chapter VIII, p. 81.

^{29.} Article I, sec. 8.

^{30.} United States v. Biesak, 3 U.S.C.M.A. 714, 14 C.M.R. 132 (1954).

^{31.} MCM 1951, para 39(b).

Approximation of the common and the

After an all tent to provide the rest of a little of the second of the s

The same and rested during of the line officer of a section of a contract of a contract of the same and the same and the same of the same and same and section of the same and section of the same and section of the same and the

Committee of the sections of the land of the section of the committee of the section of the sect

^{90.} Apticle I, see: 5,

THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T

cluist man acres to a

the court on questions of law and procedure which may erise. ³² His rulings upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty or the question of the accused's sanity is final. The question of jurisdiction under a status of forces type agreement is such an interlocutory issue.

Suppose, for example, that prior to entering his plea the accused moves to dismiss all charges and specifications on the ground that a waiver of jurisdiction has not been obtained from the competent authorities of the foreign country as required by the Status of Forces Agreement.

What action should the trial counsel and the law officer take? Certainly, a challenge to jurisdiction is a basic issue which must be resolved before the merits of the case are reached. This precise situation arose in a recent case wherein the accused contended that a waiver of French jurisdiction was not obtained in accordance with the treaty thereby violating Article VII of the NATO-SOFA Agreement. 33 The NATO-SOFA as well as those agreements which are similar to it contain provisions stating that:

^{32.} Ibid.

^{33.} United States v. Carter, 15 U.S.C.M.A. 277, 36 C.M.R. 433 (1966).

The source of the control of the con

Surage, has anneal, the invariant of the real modes of modes and the state of the encountry and the modes of the real modes and read and modes and the real modes are really as the real modes and the real modes are really as the real modes and the real modes are really as the real modes and the real modes are really as the real modes are

⁻⁵²⁵E 188

The authorities of the State having the primary right shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other State for a waiver of its right in cases where that other State considers such waiver to be of particular importance.

Counsel for the accused asserted that the SOFA, Article II and Article VII, clearly reflected that France had complete control over its own territory; that the American military have no right to act on French soil except as provided under the terms of the Agreement; that in those jurisdictional areas not covered by the Agreement, the laws of France control. The trial counsel argued that the only pertinent question was whether or not the authority to search was granted upon probable cause. He was upheld by both the law officer and the Court of Military Appeals. The Court of Military Appeals held that the basic requirement of liaison between American and French authorities was met even though by means of only a telephone call with the Verdun City Police, and that therefore there was full compliance with the terms of agreement. 34

^{34.} A meeting with a commissioner of the Verdun Police, a post provost marshal and a judge advocate representative ended with the Americans being informed that they could conduct such searches as the one at hand without making prior arrangements with French authorities. It was further agreed that this meeting was to be considered as satisfying the liaison requirements set forth under the Status of Forces

I se not torest terms of the down or or of the down of

Series for the common mestable that the continues of the content of the terminal of te

The country of a country of the coun

It would seem than in the light of the above one that come compliance with the terms of the agreement must be made before jurisdiction can attach, but one wonders what effect the casual manner in which the affair was handled by the French authorities will have on future incidents involving a search and a seizure. In effect, in this case, the French authorities have said, "If American's are involved and no Frenchmen are, just notify us and proceed with your search." Certainly such a procedure may lead to gross abuse should the post commander fail to exercise care in ordering any search. In substance then the burden for determining whether probable cause exists for a search rests on the staff judge advocate.

The writer's interviews with many military lawyers have indicated that many waivers are obtained as a practical matter often by means of a telephone call. The common offense of public drunkenness, for example, is handled routinely and most receiving states will turn any American

^{34. (}Continued) Agreement. Despite this, after the post commander had given permission to search, the Verdun City Police were informed by telephone of both the need and the reasons for pending search. Again the Chief of the Verdun Police authorized the CID to proceed alone in view of the fact that only American military persons were involved.

The constitution of the control of t

received recolling power of the new removal of the property and and the colling of the colling o

The following that gives primitation to started, the company of th

found in that condition over to branican military outhorities thereby waiving jurisdiction. If the offense is such that a waiver must be obtained, the military lawyer will start up the chain taking those steps, from telephone call, personal visit to local authorities, to formal request to the "country representative," as is required. One judge advocate formerly stationed in France stated that even the more serious offenses only required a visit to the local police station in order to obtain a waiver.

Since every minor traffic violation was followed by a waiver request when the agreements first became effective, foreign authorities became irritated at the number of requests, and processing of serious cases was delayed by the mass of minor cases. As a result, most countries evolved a procedure which would eliminate the necessity of considering all but the most important cases on a high level. In some countries waivers in minor cases can be settled by local authorities directly; in other countries waivers are automatically considered as if a request had been submitted. This is the procedure in England. There, no waivers are granted in traffic violations - only the most serious cases are considered.

As we have seen, Article VII of the NATO-SOFA is the law in determining whether the receiving State will try a

The employed and the property of the term of the state of

The second of the second secon

member of our armed forces who violates a law of the receiving State. 35 Even so, the question still arises, however, whether a violation of the local law under Article II is ipso facto an offense under Article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice so that he may be tried by the State sending the serviceman. If the receiving State tries him, the problem of double jeopardy arises in any attempt by the sending State also to exercise jurisdiction. 36 If the receiving State does not try the individual, then the problem is twofold: (1) Every violation of one of our local State laws is not in itself an offense under the Uniform Code. There must be some service discrediting facts and circumstances attendant to the violation. 37 Therefore, reasoning by analogy, if the individual is not triable under any other article of the Code, the foreign infraction does not automatically cause him to violate

^{35.} See Appendix A, para 3 of this paper. Traffic offenses are not specifically covered by para 3a of Art. VII of NATO-SOFA; therefore, primary jurisdiction falls to the receiving state in accordance with para 3b of Art. VII.

^{36.} Art. VII, sec. 8, SOFA.

^{37.} United States v. Grasso, 7 U.S.C.N.A. 566, 23 C.M.R. 30 (1957); see also UCMJ art. 134.

at any two till a detailed the result to the Area Science were common place waterup and the common Contest ordered or already end a maintain of the local has a class derivate a are the said to W.I. alekta maker make as order ages as Sale of Hillings derline to has an easy to deject on his Male sentine the neethname. It the visitable min - istory to make your ol ment'es proposed and not be sufficient and water II. The market between the authority and the section of the the sunstrain Aless does out the the contract, they are the later to make it along the selections at an infection any pulse sensitie on libertial ten at avail of at a libert lighters dolor there must be some warrant to be marked ", molitically will ad decimally manufactured him admit year at Considered and it was been by anteresty and wind makened with , along with the Addition, tought you without oblighed infraction come of minoralization of the test merimanist

offered are not specifically sensors to report to a letter.

Offered are not specifically sensors to report to a letter.

Offered differed to show fore, returned justices calls to the reportion of the sensors and the sensors are publications.

No. 178. TEL som, & Cart.

DE 1000 LANGUAGE COMMENDA OF COLUMN STATE OF STA

Article 134; (2) If, however, the charge is based not on a violation of the law of the receiving State, but upon a violation by an individual of Article II of the treaty. then the question is whether a violation of a treaty, which is the supreme law of the land under our Constitution, is in itself a federal criminal offense. One aspect of this question came before the Court of Military Appeals in 1956 in United States v. Ekenstan. 38 In that case the accused was charged with a violation of Article 134 under a specification which alleged that he had violated a provision of the Administrative Agreement with Japan by selling nonappropriated fund merchandise (golf clubs) to a Japanese national. The court held that the specification did not state an offense under the Code because the Administrative Agreement with Japan bound the signatory governments and not individuals, and that in any event an individual could not commit a military offense by violating a treaty. authority on the subject has stated that: "Where States stipulate by internation treaties certain benefits for individuals other than their own subject, these individuals do not as a rule, acquire any international rights "under these treaties," but the State whose subjects they are has

^{38. 7} U.S.C.M.A. 168, 21 C.M.R. 294 (1956).

Article I Very III are property for some in the set on Woman to paint orderson total to select to relate to PRODUCTION OF THE LANGEST OF RESIDENCE AND AND SOURCE. A AND SHIP SHIP SHIP DO THE EAST HOUSE SAY CONTRIBUTED AND mint to durant and passers arrested to the same of the same of evertical communication to trace our erors because in 1976 the barried successful to the state over the mounts a filtrary a realist M.F. adapted to reductory a 60 to despeed and To your freezy a facultable had not haid home by author poster -not will it we would not a product of the supplemental and the supplemental will negative of the contract of th FOR SER PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF PERSONS organizations and narrose total this reason beautite on whate THE REPRESENTATION VILLAGED WITH EARLY RECOVERED AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PA name introduction or home in our many has palentavious our one and a maintain of smorth qualifies a female one authors when the state had been the or offered the TOT STYTEM IN A LINCOUR ADDRESS OF THE PARTY signifying wind, about my winds and solds withinis weight within a median court of the selection of the same and the same these townston, That the characters and the term of the

^{36. 7 ...} a.d. min. This or said age (XB48):

an obligation towards the other States of granting such favor by its Municipal Law. 39 The "binding force" of a treaty concerns in principle the contracting States only, and not their subjects. As International Law is law between States exclusively, treaties can normally have effect upon States only.

Two years later in United States v. Curtin, the Court of Military Appeals again held that the Japanese Administrative Agreement did not bind individuals. The exact point has not been raised in regard to NATO SOFA. If it is and it is determined that Article II, NATO SOFA, does bind individuals then the court will be faced with its dictum in Ekenstam, that such a violation of a treaty is not a violation of a federal criminal law.

But in the case of <u>United States v. Prischolz</u>, 42 an Army court-martial said the accused was chargeable with knowledge

^{39.} I Oppenheim's International Law 21, 637-638 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955).

^{40.} Id. at 924.

^{41. 9} U.S.C.M.A. 427, 26 C.M.R. 207 (1958).

^{42.} ACM 16766, Frischolz, 29 C.M.R. 852 (1960). The accused in this case was a Captain, possibly accounting for the court's readiness to impute knowledge.

The state of the s

The second are the party of the second and second as the second and second and second and second as the second and second as a second as a

NAME OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

say the toppened the continue to the sty deposit the say the the say the toppened the say the

ASC SE LAT . OA

ME: S THE CAPTE OF CORE, BOT (1956).

ast . and lone, symmetre, to n.v. N. 150 (1000) and the test assembling for the assembling to the assembling to the assembling the test assembling the test assembling the assembline the test as the test as

of the Security Treaty between the United States and Japan. In that case, the accused was charged with using the mails to defraud by having photographic equipment mailed to him in Japan for resale. The court-martial held the accused to be chargeable with knowledge of the Security Treaty between the United States and Japan, and the provisions of the Administrative Agreement made thereunder, stating that members of the United States Armed Forces are subject to Japanese customs laws, regulations and taxes, except for the importation of household goods, vehicles and clothing for personal use and that such goods may not be disposed of to persons in Japan. It is doubtful this case can be squared with either Ekenstam or Curtin.

Yet, in the recent case of <u>United States v. Carter</u>, 43 a search and seizure of contraband was conducted in the accused's French-owned offpost dwelling by United States Military authorities seeking stolen United States Military property. In this case, the court held, "The Status of Forces Agreement confers no individual right and most assuredly seeks only to preserve protections presently existing."

^{43.} United States v. Carter, 15 U.S.C.M.A. 277, 36 C.M.R. 433 (1966).

^{44.} Id. at 437.

as the most placed with some the later only of a column of the column of

The product of the second and the second of the second of

OL ATT AND ALLEY DE PROPERT OF SERVICE LOCALD FOR ANALYSIS

Alle the est appro-

Chief Judge Quinn concurring, stated, however, "Status of Forces Agreements do not merely define relationships between the United States and the host nations, they also provide many special protections to the accused. "45 Chief Judge Quinn did not enumerate what those special protections were, although in the case of United States v. Cadenhead, 46 a minor, age twenty, pleaded guilty to a charge of robbery under Article 122 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice after having been tried before a Japanese Family Court. The defense counsel contended that under the agreement with Japan trial by court-martial was barred by the previous proceedings against the accused by the Japanese authorities. Here the accused was subjected to juvenile delinquent proceedings which were not open to the public and no counsel was provided the accused. Counsel stated, ". . . precious Constitutional rights cannot be diminished by changing names of tribunals or modifying the nomenclature of legal proceedings." He argued further that the juvenile delinquent proceeding was an "adjunct to the general system of criminal justice, and that therefore all safeguards of an accused in the criminal law, including protection against double jeopardy are applicable to this type of proceeding."

^{45.} Id. at 443.

^{46. 14} U.S.C.M.A. 271, 34 C.M.R. 51 (1963).

No solution of the state of the solution of th -10 militablisher until above to be presented nevert built place place and the same and the special bedayed our passed the money and an appropriate Labour than addynger THE PROPERTY CONTRACTOR SHOULD BE SEEN ASSESSMENT THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE were, although it the once of bitted binter v. defended, were provided to present a not relies believed and reserve ups a reselve as maker Arthur the car has been been at the SCA alates we want after basing bein tried before a factorial colly Court, ACLY THE DOTAL OUT TOOMS "AND ASSESSMENT LEADING BE DETENDED BET -our brokensk will tel termed new laidman-duced to Laint passet -ogn (connection of many or terrorism can be necessarily familiar on her office and an over too some analy amplicade months of the sentent beauty demand at helysom new Court tuil out of the acoust to its or the above of the charter of the of fritzenile or notifying the nemeralshire of humbers downstan aftermy but late section burner if ". sauthers Santarco to mercy foreign and or recorded in our and antiposore at present as to abundantial Its appropriate that few tentrant the criminal law, icalual a more than a make the law and the company T. withautone To must will at alleadings ore

h5. Id. av 1103.

M. 14 3.5, C. 7, A. 271, W 5, 7, 51 (1971).

The Government's position which was supported by the testimony of a Japanese professor was basically that there was no prior jeopardy because the prior proceedings were "educative and not criminal," and that "guardianship" was the key idea. The argument that the Japanese proceeding was civil and not criminal, with the care and guidance of the accused the objective rather than the punishment of him.

When the case reached the Court of Military Appeals, the defense counsel added the argument that even if the proceedings were not a trial, the court-martial is still barred because the Japanese Government had primary right to exercise criminal jurisdiction and that right was not waived.

Appellate Government counsel argued, (1) that points not raised at the trial level cannot be raised on appeal for the first time; and, (2) that even if the United States exercised court-martial jurisdiction in disregard of the primary right of Japan, the accused has no standing to object because a violation of the agreement merely raised a diplomatic issue between the United States and Japan.

In a unanimous opinion the Court of Military Appeals held that the Japanese proceedings did not constitute a trial within the meaning of Article XVII, paragraph 8 of

to the control of the

The the are not not been being the legislation and assessment and

Liner con the control of prompt Teamwood James States on the England of Allegard Date and the Control of States and Control of State

THE STREET TO THE PROPERTY OF STREET OF STREET, STREET AND ASSESSED ASSESSED AND ASSESSED AND ASSESSED ASSESSED AND ASSESSED ASSESSED ASSESSED AND ASSESSED ASSESS

the Status of Forces Agreement with Japan, thereby not barring the court-martial proceedings.

It would appear from the holding in this case that the double jeopardy provisions of the SOFA with Japan contemplate a proceedings directly intended to vindicate the penal law, that is a proceeding under the regular laws, which, if resulting in conviction, would subject the accused to the penalties authorized by the penal statutes. It is difficult to agree that the Japanese did not exercise jurisdiction over the accused because, for example, no information or indictment was returned as to the accused and that this was a contempt proceeding. The fact renains that the accused was arrested, confined, and a hearing was held. The hearing was presided over by Japanese legal authorities who ordered his release to United States authorities. The name given the proceedings should hardly have eny effect on the final determination. Nor for that matter should conflicting definitions of "jurisdiction" change the picture. A close examination of the facts, in my opinion, will show that "jurisdiction" by the Japanese was exercised and that regardless of what that action might be. it is a bar to trial by court-martial.

And the state of the contract of the state o

THE PRODUCT OF THE PROPERTY OF NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY O no similar et lorrador altregio marile como o su Lorre need tellers out there prime over a at deal and force was and distance below and the Property of and distance by another another home and to her youthin without and or house -thin Jos bid remains, and You norm of Plantities of Mi sheet with the large to the special parents, but wanted as for Beaution has 65 on marginal and provided by the prisoner by the and that tight was a contained contained in that souther the angles of the postings the post of the post of the -m bont semino at two britishing me are not all all of - Syndrine and sale and fed and reserving a fed frequency tests with \$250.00 that albert turned almost an arrange and provide heart at . 1921 Mary wifels on the Item Constanting, Mar in the lift will and manufactured in Profession but, the manufacture of the way of the contraction of the patricio al un se support uni de publicalment serie à averteur. the families have to be not by "colonianing and made III's a at Ji . . . This menton that four is abultaces that have . Later and Javon to Later of the

The Carter case at least appears to be in line with the earlier case of <u>United States v. Siniger</u>. 48 involved the refusal by a scrvicemen to testify before a Canadian Coroner's inquest for which he was cited for contempt. The Court of Military Appeals held the contempt citation and commitment were not a trial within the meaning of the NATO agreement relating to double jeopardy. The court stated that the accused was not "tried" for his refusal to testify within the meaning of paragraph 8 of Article VII of the NATO SOFA which provides in part that where an accused has been tried by the authorities of one contracting power and has been acquitted, convicted and is serving or has served his sentence, or has been pardoned, he may not be tried again for the same offense within the same territory by the authorities of another contracting party.49

It is indeed difficult to justify the holding in <u>Carter</u> and <u>Sinigar</u> in the light of the language of paragraph 3 of

^{47.} Supra note 43.

^{48. 6} U.S.C.M.A. 330, 20 C.M.R. 46 (1955).

^{49.} Rule 42(2) Fed. Rules of Criminal Procedure, 18 U.S.C. provides the same protection generally as Article VII of NATO-SOFA.

the colin was at Mulgal craise to Marilla and Marilla and the color that the color of Marilla and M

To be described to resummed of the solution of manhall been

[.] The latent of the latest and latest

^{48. -6} V.A.A.A.A.A. 331, 22 U.H.W. AS (1953),

U.B.C. provider the sees processed on ernardic as article VII of WAT water.

Article VII. Was not <u>Carter</u> acquitted or pardoned? Chief Judge Quinn, although concurring in the result disacreed with the construction of paragraph 3, Article "II of the 30FA, stating that this provision includes every kind of proceeding which contemplates punishment for wrongful conduct. This is the very language espoused by the defense counsel in <u>Cadenhead</u>! 50

It appears that one of the protections extended to an accused under the SOFA is that he may not be tried twice for the same offense although what is a trial remains an unanswered question.

A most difficult problem is encountered when attempts to reconcile those cases which attempt to define those rights which belong to the accused rather than to the government signatories to an agreement. We have seen in the 1956 case of <u>Ekenstam</u> and <u>Curtin</u> (1958) that International agreements bind governments not individuals. In the 1960 Board of Review case of <u>Frischolz</u> the Board held that individuals were chargeable with knowledge of the provisions of these agreements, but in the 1966 case of <u>Carter</u>, it appears that the Court of Military Appeals has remained with <u>Ekenstam</u> and <u>Curtin</u> in holding that International

^{50.} Supra note 46.

And of the contract of the state of the contract of the contra

and the control of the control of the second of the second

to reconstitute the content of the content to define them.

**More that the content of the content of the content that are the content to the content that are the content of the content

^{50.} CANTO NORM UK.

Agreements confer no individual rights and are binding on governments only.

Although it is generally undisputed the accused has a right to raise those issues which may bar trial, the question arises as to whether or not an accused, raising the former jeopardy issue may in effect determine which sovereign will try him. In United States ex rel Keefe v. Dulles. 51 a writ of habeas corpus was sought on behalf of an American soldier imprisoned by France. The soldier had been convicted of robbery in the night and had been sentenced to a four and one half year term. The action was encouraged by an organization called the Defenders of the American Constitution, an opponent of status of forces agreements. 52 The writ was denied on the ground that the soldier was not in the custody of either the Secretaries of State. Defense, or the Army, and that there was no one within the jurisdiction of the court who was responsible for the detention. The court, however, examined the petition as one seeking a mandatory order to require the Secretary of State to obtain

^{51.} Supra note 23.

^{52.} See testimony of Eugene Pomeroy, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, 84th Cong. 1st Sess. on the Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Agreement, at 66 (1955).

Agreement and the best posterior of the statement of the

a new Augustin and Sudary Star of the Company of the stend as pulse three tables onich on the total com paint on anyle tion erises as to smaller to the second of a secient former income the transport description against the con-Parties of it was new to a service bed by the order and the to be the similar of thouse were burned at a descent coldier imprisoned by service, "no solution has been corvicted of society the selection of he said the selection bedsiv Tong and one of the and the said the track of the track of and design united the inferders of the united the extension, an apparent of whethe of forces expension, "? one can relate and they hower, of no later our fire and prompted garden to extract vision and middle to their account of or this wind, and built once was no one within him the invited and in rich and and and and inspected and only proposed to modificate The court, nowwers, exampled the settles at one stable a standard order to crosser bac secretary of trace to obtain

If ever some .27.

St. des certinate of laneau Parenty, intrins Delois Subsentition of the Committee on Laneau Parenton, United States Subsentition of States on Laneau On Committee of Article VII, Market of Committee of

the soldier's release through diplomatic channels, but denied relief on the ground that the commencement of diplomatic negotiations is completely in the discretion of the Executive branch of the Government. The court stated further that in the absence of a showing that the accused's Constitutional rights had been violated no relief could be granted.

In a 1962 case, ⁵³ the Court of Military Appeals held that when an act violates two or more statutes, the accused cannot select the statute under which he will be prosecuted and he cannot complain if he is prosecuted for violating the statute which carries the higher penalty. An earlier federal case, ⁵⁴ held that when a person has violated criminal statutes of two different sovereigns, it is for the sovereigns and not for the criminal to settle which shall first inflict punishment. What effect then does the fact that there is a treaty involved have upon a trial?

The classic case and the one which aroused the most interest in this area is <u>Wilson v. Girard</u>, 55 the first case to

^{53.} United States v. Culley, 12 U.S.C.M.A. 704, 31 C.M.R. 290 (1962).

^{54.} United States ex rel Demrois v. Farrell, 87 F.2d 957 (8th Cir. 1937), cert. denied, 302 U.S. 683 (1937).

^{55. 354} U.S. 524 (1957).

how relied by the street of the shows the converse of the converse of the contract of the converse of the conv

In a 1362 case, The Court of Military American interest that a second court along an actuates, the assumed courts along an actual actua

The classic ones and the enter stand around the mast and terms of the third around in ellicon v. Cipario, 55 the first ones to

^{73.} United These o. Culley, 17 U.c.C. . N. 100. 11 C.C. . N. 290 (1962).

^{95 (8}th thr. 1019), carr, during, he not he was a line of the control of the cont

raise squarely the issue whether a serviceman who commits an offense while in the performance of official duty has any right, constitutional or statutory, to be tried by the United States military authorities rather than by a court of the receiving State. This case arose out of a dispute between the Japanese and the United States authorities as to whether the offense involved arose out of a performance of official duty.

While on duty as a sentry guarding a machine gun and some items of clothing left nearby in Japan, Girard fired an expended cartridge case from his grenade launcher which killed a Japanese woman scavenging brass from the range. The United States argued the act was a matter of official duty and that we had the right to try him, but the Japanese did not agree. Eventually the dispute was terminated by a United States waiver of its primary jurisdiction and subsequent trial of Girard in a Japanese court.

The reader may ask, "Well, can't a sentry exercise what force is necessary to carry out his orders?" The position the United States took was that Girard's action was in accordance with his basic orders and was therefore official duty giving the United States primary jurisdiction. Girard's commanding officer certified, "Done in performance

The actual process of the process of all the control of all the control of all the control of any of the control of any of the control of the

The man and the man of the man and the man

In central and notice the number of the ardeness of the desired of

of official duty." Other facts arose as a result of further investigation, including testimony from a buddy of the accused who was assigned to guard duty with Girard. His testimony indicated Girard acted outside his assigned duties by enticing the woman into a dangerous position and then firing in order to frighten her away. This horseplay, said the Japanese, took the incident out of the official duty category.

was made by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and was confirmed by the President. Certainly, the rule set forth in Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon, 56 that, "A sovereign nation has exclusive jurisdiction to punish offenses against its laws committed within its borders, unless it expressly or impliedly consents to surrender its jurisdiction," played an important part in Chief Judge Marshall's decision. But what of the treaty between the United States and Japan? Japan's cession to the United States of jurisdiction to try American military personnel for conduct constituting an offense against the laws of both countries was conditioned by the covenant of Article XVII, section 3, paragraph (c) of the Protocol reading that:

^{56.} Supra note 4.

efficient date, "later and enter a made of norther annotation, training and a mode of norther annotation was made and to evere ourse outs of the state of the sta

The angle of the following of rects and the competent of the state and the competent of the state and the competent of the following of the fo

all aven grand the

. . . The authorities of the State having the primary right shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other State for a waiver of its right in cases where the other State considers such waiver to be of particular importance.

Obviously the Japanese considered this case to be of particular importance and a matter of national pride, for it was on the front page of every newspaper in Japan as well as the United States. The real issue was whether, upon the facts of the case, the Constitution or legislation subsequent to the Security Treaty prohibited the carrying out of this provision authorized by the Treaty for waiver of the qualified jurisdiction granted by Japan. No constitutional or statutory barrier was found to the provision which was applied in the case, therefore the wisdom of the arrangement was exclusively for the determination of the Executive and Legislative Branches. Thus the surrender of Girard to Japanese authorities was consonant with well established rules of international law and the individual has no say in the matter.

But what are the interests involved, and which of them are the more important? In the case of <u>United States v</u>.

<u>Copeland</u>, 57 two American servicemen were tried by a general

^{57.} ACM 11674, Copeland, 21 C.M.R. 838 (1956).

Dowloanit win Jamaness simulator of satismant of the process clause clause from the clause and a matter of satismant of the front pass of typeny assistant in the limit at the loans pass of typeny assistant in the latest and the loans of the case, the Constitution of Installation and Satestant buy the Constitution of Installation and Satestant Satestant and the Constitution of Constitution and the Constitution of Constitution and the Constitution of the Satestant in the Satestant of the Satestan

dre the nort are the increased inscient, and enter of the same of the area and inscient at the a

Tr. AUN 11874, unselend, 71 C.M.W. 898 118961.

Court-martial for the rape of a 15 year old Libyan girl.

The court said, that under International Law, the jurisdiction over the members of the armed forces of the United

States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly state in which the visiting armed force
is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign. This is an incident of sovereignty which
may be waived by the visiting sovereign and is not a right
of the individual concerned. Consequently, the courtmartial of the United States which tried the accused had,
not only constitutional and statutory authority to do so,
but the authority of an accepted rule of international law.

This is the holding in United States v. Sinigar.

Seven years after the Copeland case, a young serviceman, age twenty, was convicted by a Japanese Family Court
on the charge of robbery. Subsequently the accused was
tried by court-martial on the same charge and the issue of
double jeopardy was raised. The court in affirming the conviction held that the Japanese Family Court proceedings did
not constitute a prosecution for a criminal offense under
the laws of Japan and thus were not a trial within the meaning of Article XVII, paragraph 8, of the Status of Forces

The most and all the transfer of a 12 come of the composition of the c

Remark years of the Carelinal case, a process restlict one, age tenning, and commissed for a incommon tentily Desire on into observe of the commission of th

Agreement with Japan, therefore the court-martial charges of robbery were not barred by the proceedings. 58

Finally, an accused serviceman was convicted by a Spanish Fraud and Contraband Tribunal which levied a fine on the accused based on the value of goods he introduced into the Spanish economy tax free. Subsequently he was tried by court-martial in violation of Article 92 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The accused did not raise the issue of former jeopardy at his court-martial. The Court of Military Appeals first held the Spanish proceedings to be administrative in nature and not a criminal court proceeding; secondly, the Court of Military Appeals held that since the former jeopardy issue was not raised at the court-martial the accused waived his rights; the Court of Military Appeals then went on to say that even if the Spanish action was a trial, the accused was still amenable to trial by court-martial. Although the agreements with Spain concerning jurisdiction over United States forces in Spain contained a provision that a member of the United States forces who commits an offense punishable under the Code was immune from Spanish prosecution for the same offense

^{53.} Sugra note 46.

separate characteristics and percentage of plants of the comments. The state of the server of the

at we have your manufacture contrasts on publication of worth a marked day or Donat set homes and has along the order Completely by bring to solve our on Louis Company of the the big the state of some the tree, substituted to the may be be existent to restrict to a father-when he hard for All lastner but and find by willing to she woulded And the formation and the observed reserved the served with the late. were restricted for ASSA PARTY STREET, A PROPERTY AND THE PARTY AND THE Appropriate to the first than become our weather thanking the will be a benefiting ARTHUR THE WORLD AND THE PERSON OF TAXABLE PARTY AND THE PERSON OF TAXABLE PARTY. section to the two court spinsons suggested and both they been times out parents and appear common of father-bridge our and he man this ope of an even part kinemal tradition to Constitute and in the second of the second of the second the Application and Committee of African world to Baild M. of sector should be all your visable to be and notice of the Total more than the second is last three grown a bing almost about not being whom where emplies me thought the far-poly and all the new tipe to be not not be discovery deposed to the same a few additions.

The same water per

on the basis of a determination by United States authorities, there were no reciprocal provisions which would operate to divest United States military authorities from exercising court-martial jurisdiction over the accused; therefore, a rejection of a former jeopardy claim, if made, would properly result. 59

In the light of the above cases, it would seem clear that there are larger interests than the personal interests of the serviceman involved and that logically a single instance whereby an individual "claims his rights" should not be allowed to interfere in the operation of international treaties and obligations, for to allow an interference of this nature would mean that those treaties would be of little lasting value. Clearly, the individuals' rights are subordinate to those of nations, and when considered in that light it can be said he has no additional rights under the SOFA. On the other hand, it must be conceded that the American serviceman has greater protection than the serviceman of any other country in the world, not only under his rights as a citizen under the Constitution, but under each and every NATO type treaty we have negotiated

^{59.} ACM S-21050, Reed, 33 C.M.R. 932 (1963).

the control of the co

In wolling the months the persons were the form the persons wherethe the through the persons invertebra of the occupied and she looked in a ringle in the state of the occupied and she looked in an armine to the state of the st

^{57.} ACM I-12050, Herd, 33 C.H.S. 930 (1965).

regardless of where he may be stationed in the world. Unquestionably the Constitution applies overseas, 60 and while courts-martial are criminal prosecutions those Constitutional protections and rights which the history and text of the Constitution do not plainly deny to the military accused are preserved to them in the service. 61 An alternative to present agreements might well be to place the constitutional rights and safeguards of the individual in the superior position in the writing of the treaties in the first instance. but one cannot but help wondering whether any other country in the world would agree to provisions which would guarantee these constitutional rights to American oitizens other than Korea. Certainly the Girard case brought to light some problems we should consider in the light of developments unforeseen at the time the Constitution was written, namely, the world-wide deployment of our citizens called to duty and sent to foreign lands for extended tours of service. who may, by administrative decision of American authorities, be delivered to foreign governments for trial. "We are indeed fortunate that our experience in this area has

^{60.} United States v. Kauffman, 14 U.S.C.M.A. 283, 34 C.M.R. 63 (1963).

^{61.} United States v. Crawford, 15 U.S.C.M.A. 31, 35 C.M.R. 3 (1964).

-eff alter our of humbers of her of wheth he made because white the promises sacions satisficant ser efficiency many I me trailing a seed and provider Large to the California and California and the tree town restain and the state for an accurrence Contraction to a state of the contraction of the co on authorities of the Art of the marries. 51 he signification in Expositivity a concentration of the latest and the statest and the same wince appeared and at tach to that each to the angeles the badyle parameters the fit ends not nutritioned and to supplying and our sould expluse energy with the thirty of the particular and the particular and the seturgers fines out or restriction of owner black hipper and mil mand markles would be seen broad and soldings from advantables and all --- the first beauty and brought out atabases ---Sterood for the state of a state of a state of a state of the contract of the contract of the state of which has been been able to the second of th and some to begin a freeze of their as treef of property and and the same openions of mainteen surface the ter the openions be delivered to formitte constraints for trial . "In sec. parameter than the combines on age attended heater

^{00.} UNION Section T. Vanetrian, IN U.S. C.M.A. 201. 301.

di. Onices States v. Unanters, 15 U.s.d.v.l. 11, 75 C.R.R. 3 (1764).

generally been a happy one and thus to date these Constitutional problems have been largely submerged."52

^{62.} Senate Comm. on Armed Services Operation of Art. VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty, S. Report #1041, 87th Cong. 1st Sess. 2 (1961).

monarelly observe happy and and the same things to same the same with the same and a same the same and the sa

^{62.} imple com. en ara service contrata man. ...
Vil. 10 teles el exces rest, s. a cert full com.
Vil. 1. t. e. 2 (1 1).

IV. NEGLIGENT HOMICIDE - THE SOCIAL DILEMMA

During the period December 1, 1964, through November 30, 1965, 32,311 United States military and civilian personnel and their dependents were charged with offenses subject to the primary or exclusive jurisdiction of foreign courts; 22,151, or nearly 70 percent, of these cases were traffic offenses. 63 In Germany alone there were 6,400 minor traffic offenses involving United States military personnel. 64 Statistics do not show the number of negligent homicide cases, but it would seem safe to say that the number, whatever it is, will increase next year. Why is this so? Could it be that because the numbers of drivers and the numbers of vehicles on the congested streets and highways of the cities of the world increase each year? Is the fact that the motor

^{63.} Hearing Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate 89th Congress, 2nd Sess. on the Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Agreement, at 3 (1966).

^{64.} Supra, note 63, at page 5. Under the new procedure in Germanythe reporting of all cases involving United States personnel is required, but only those cases over which the United States can request a waiver are included in determining the waiver rate. Waivers are not normally requested for civilians and dependents; however, 929 of the 1822 military-connected civilians and dependents who were charged with local offenses were released to United States authorities for appropriate disposition.

IN MEDICAL MONEY A DISTRIBUTION OF A PARTY AND A PARTY

Invier the period concentrate, through Persons 50, 1965, 25, 31, 31 United Academ unitedly and offither wifered that the their Periods of any content of the the content of the the content of the the content of the their office of the content of the their office of the content of the content

^{63.} Herrior Manner onbeautitus of the Countries of the Co

ob. (many, hack of, a many 5, ...) at the processing in Comment of the processing of the control of the control

States than in the other countries of the world a cause of this increase? In the opinion of the writer, this continuing increase is due to the greater number of vigorous young people reaching the age when they are able to drive motor vehicles legally. This, plus the factor of our ever increasing affluence which makes these vehicles readily available, would seem to be the fundamental cause of accidents which rise proportionally to the number of drivers and vehicles utilizing highways.

Why should an offense not recognized at common law, 65 not recognized as an offense in any state in the United States today in the absence of statute, where such statutes are actually few, 66 be made punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice?

^{65.} Perkins, Criminal Law 62 (1957). "As a matter of the common law of crimes, any killing below the grade of manslaughter is innocent homicide and for the most part this has not been changed by modern statutes. There are a few states, however, with legislative provisions for the punishment of certain homicides below the grade of manslaughter. Michigan is the leader in this field, enacting a negligent homicide statute in 1921, whereby a lesser penalty than that specified for manslaughter was provided for "any person who, by the operation of any vehicle at an immoderate rate of speed or in a careless, reckless, or negligent manner, but not wilfully or wantonly, shall cause the death of another."

^{66.} Ibid. Perkins lists Michigen - negligense less then gross
Oregon - ordinary negligence
Louisiana - excusable negligence except that it results from criminal negligence

States through the voluer descripted or the north a calle of this invariant that is related to the object of the states of the states of the calle of the states of the states of the states of the object of the calle of the cal

(a) Themle on offens not respendent to come in, is not not necessary to the major of the come of the c

the summer of the strict of th

^{66.} Lold. Persime lies with on, - necliment less
than erous
Dreson - ardinorr mesitemes resconduct tt
Louistana - excusable melicemes resconduct tt
read true orininal continues

In 1952, in the case of United States v. Kirchner. 67 the United States Court of Military Appeals held negligent homicide to be an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and punishable as conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces, or a disorder and neglect to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces. The court went on to say, "It is our view that unlawful homicide through simple negligence is an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice." If this pronouncement were literally followed, it would make any tort which proximately resulted in the death of another punishable as a crime, provided only that it was committed by a person subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. 68 How then does it happen that the tremendous community of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coast guardsmen, and others subject to trial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice are held to such a degree of care and confronted with penal

^{66. (}Continued) Texas - ordinary negligence District of Columbia - ordinary negligence

^{67. 1} U.S.C.M.A. 477, 479, 4 C.M.R. 69, 71 (1952).

^{68. 10} U.S.C. sec. 801-940 (Supp V, 1958).

THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF T despited the siness could be spited to see the section of The property of the second residence of the second of the -hill pairs of synthem a to Turkets an activision has colored or feeting how retreath a we assembly men all your albert the separate of code and distribute to be to be to be land water too at all , cas of mo date source and assort anastro na mi commiliano miguin dercondi colletto Internitor with all II ". related types in the should need to the table among one olds time of , avoiler tilespill tone deaccomes which promise the resulted to the casts of mother virtuality define months a 25 hale too am Al and the believe and fold as made to the United Cole of Military Proties, 60 and of Sealons and I see to the common more opened and the common of the common of callons, and on the cost contains, on the Jost to trial under the Uniform Vote of William Fatton are Inne the order los man la same and of all

is, is n.s.d. see. Million (com 7, 1855).

sanctions 69 in the absence of its use?

of death of another by simple negligence. It is the unlawful killing of a person as a result of the failure to use
due care and circumspection in the circumstances. The elements of the offense are: (1) the victim is dead; (2) that
his death was unlawfully caused by the acts or omissions of
the accused; (3) that such acts or omissions of the accused
constituted negligence; and, (4) that under the circumstances
the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order
and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to
bring discredit upon the armed forces.

70

A review of the existing cases seems to indicate that the element of the offense which causes the most trouble is that the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good

^{69.} In the military, sentences are not adjudged on each count of the indictment, or, to put it in military language, on each specification of each charge, and it is therefore often impossible to determine in a case involving several offenses, including negligent homicide, just what penalty attached to that individual offense. In United States v. Kirchner, 1 U.S.C.M.A., 2 C.M.R. 69 (1952), the sentence was a Bad Conduct Discharge suspended, total forfeitures and six months confinement at hard labor.

^{70.} U.S. Deptt of Army, Pamphlet No. 27-9, Military Justice Handbook, The Law Officer (1958).

THE REST OF SAME OF SAME OF THE PERSONS

of felts of anti-or in chief and as the relative to relate of the relate of the relate of the relative of the state of the relative of the state of the state of the relative of the state of the relative of

home to major any odd od new bearings but to domines will dend

of the control of the Later, are noncommon as an although to see a see as a second to control of the control of

Parties and and the few orthograph to them all the contract (1998).

order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces. That is such conduct? Would eye witness testimony that the accused immediately after the accident behaved in a most chivalrous manner, or testimony from the next of kin of the victim that the collision was an unfortunate accident and that the accused was a credit to the American armed forces be sufficient to convince a court that the act of the accused was not to the prejudice of good order and discipline? To the first question it would appear such testimony would require the opinion of a witness and if such opinion were admissible it must then be determined whether this evidence would be persuasive.

On the other hand, would newspaper accounts introduced by a zealous trial counsel showing pictures of the accident and pointing out that the accused was an American soldier be of such import as to convince a court the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline? Would the fact that the incident occurred in a country such as Germany, France, or Italy rather than the United States change the situation? What punishment does the law provide in negligent homicide cases in Japan, Korea, France and Germany or in other countries of the world where our

order and allowed the entrollers of the entrolle

On the prior of the state normal state and the information of the state of the stat

of the <u>United States v. Lowe</u>, ⁷² the accused who was not on duty, while operating a privately owned vehicle was involved in an accident in Germany. Subsequently, he was convicted by court-martial on a charge of negligent homicide. The military court held in that case that the mere presence

Article 267 of the Korean Criminal Code provides for imprisonment for not more than two years or a fine of

not more than 25,000 hwan for negligent homicide.

Article 319 of the French Penal Code provides that any person who by lack of skill, imprudence, carelessness, negligence or failure to observe regulations, involuntarily commits or brings about a homicide, shall be punished by jailing from three months to two years and a fine of 100,000 to 2,000,000 francs.

Section 222 of the German Penal Code of 1871 provides that anybody who negligently causes the death of a human being shall be punished by imprisonment for a max-

imum term of 5 years and a minimum term of one day.

As might be expected, the Turkish Criminal Code provides for the most severe punishment, section 455 providing that whoever causes the death of a person through negligence or carelessness or inexperience in his profession or trade or inobedience to regulations, orders or instructions shall be punished by imprisonment for two to five years and by a heavy fine of 250 to 2500 liras.

^{71.} Article 282 of the Revised Japanese Penal Code, 1961, provides that a person who through negligence causes bodily injury to another shall be punished by a fine not exceeding 100,000 yen or a minor fine. Article 283 provides that a person who through negligence causes the death of another shall be punished by confinement for not more than one year or a fine not exceeding 200,000 yen.

^{72.} CH 407757, Lowe, 32 C.M.R. 597 (1962) pet. denied, 32 C.M.R. 472 (1962).

The sales of the second second of the second second

asticle for the torest Letition bods province

for Langtannian for any one that the mate or a first of

Arbitole Rev of the remote lense Code protect

that an person who he like a which is not a me, which we will be a common to the commo

1705 THE WOLD FRANCE WEST OF THE SO THE POLICE OF THE SOUTH

provides the repeat of medical critical the deal of th

whole Parameter de liver and a condesser and office of

previous for the contract continuent, analyse of con-

Andrew and the same of same of the same of

^{10.} If a second or the whole of the contract o

of the accused in Germany pursuant to military orders was a sufficient basis upon which a negligent homicide proximately caused by him could be considered prejudicial to good order and discipline. No other evidence appeared in the record other than the accident itself. The Court of Military Appeals said:

. . . this was actually the first of four deaths caused by traffic accidents since 1 January 1962; members of the court were aware of command efforts to prevent operation of vehicles under conditions contributing to accidents, and they acted accordingly in imposing the maximum sentence.

To this writer, it would seem certain that any civil action for damages would be defeated.

An opposite position was taken in <u>United States v</u>.

<u>Hunt</u>, ⁷³ a case which involved the accused in an auto accident in Texas. The accused was off duty and his military status was not apparent. He pleaded not guilty to the charge of negligent homicide but was found guilty by the trial court. The Board of Review "reversed," noting that the only evidence in the record to prove that the accused's conduct was of a nature to bring discredit on the armed forces related only to the accident itself, and this

^{73.} CM 397481, Hunt, 27 C.M.R. 557 (1958).

-come obtained transform a value man along the table of the article of the articl

The cold and the cold and a second and a sec

We take enthory to would mean negthful that on circl notion of for former and defences.

An amperit working were taken in This of the control of the contro

^{79.} CH 2074/13, Idea, 27 C.M. S. (1054).

evidence was sharpely conflicting. In this case, the defense counsel was able to adduce testimony to the effect that the accident did not result in discrediting the armed forces in the community in which it took place and pointed out the accident took place on a rural road.

In 1961 a United States soldier stationed in Germany⁷⁴ drove a vehicle at about 55 miles per hour in a 31 mile per hour zone. It was dark when he hit two Americal soldiers who had been drinkins, killing one of them. Both the accused and the victim were in civilian clothes. The Board of Review, citing the <u>Kirchner case</u>⁷⁵ said, "Negligent homicide is not only discreditable to the individual but reflects unfavorably upon the reputation of the service when it becomes known that such individual is a member of the service."

In all civilian jurisdictions the offense is statutory, 76 usually a misdemeanor, and does not involve moral turpitude. It is punishable only because by mischance the alleged negligence had a fatal result. In a society where such occurrences are all too common and becoming more so each

^{74.} ACM 17272, Tomlin, 30 C.M.R. 933 (1961) pet. denied, 30 C.M.R. 417 (1961).

^{75.} Supra note 67.

^{76.} Supra note 65.

Tenner, command one sole to accomplish to the contract to the scenarios of a series of the contract to the con

In 1961 w Upited (tacked addition at 10 ment in a 20 million at 100 million at 10

to all others and the state of the state of

The 128 19795, Yearlin, Ty 913 (1962) per-

^{19.} somete note his

^{76.} June water 65.

and every day, it seems unlikely that a service member's simple negligence causing or contributing to a fatal accident would have any real effect upon the reputation of the armed forces, particularly in foreign countries when it is considered that today almost every young American not only knows how to drive but owns a car - unlike most other young people in the world. Unless we are prepared to hold that it does have such an effect as a matter of law, we are reduced to making a case by case determination of this element as a matter of personal opinion.

It is submitted that it is impossible to establish objectively that an alleged fatal motor vehicle accident actually discredited the armed forces in the eyes of the general public. This appears to be true not only in the United States but also throughout the countries of the world where our forces are stationed. There is really no way in which such fact can be proved or disproved within the limitations of the rules of evidence and our trial procedure. All we have in many cases is an inference drawn from other facts that the alleged conduct is service discrediting.

In effect when we submit the question of whether the accused's conduct was service discrediting to the court as an element of the offense, we are reverting to the practice

-three learners of the term of

The amplitude that it is impossible to extendish distribution of extendish distributions that motes resident modes are supposed that as a succession of the state general product. This apposed to be true and only only on the successful distribution of the extendished the countries of the extendished of the extendished at the countries of the extitution of the extendished at the countries of the extendished at the countries of the limit of the limit of the extendished at the extendished at the limit of the extendished at t

the following to moderning and distance to made sorble plants to become a following and the sounds and the sounds are

of an Larlier time while members of a court-martial were the judges of facts and law - under such a factrice on act is service discrediting whenever a court-martial and a convening authority consider it so.

In jurisdictions outside of the United States the comcept that criminally punishable negligence must be on a

plane higher than simple negligence is also generally recognized. In the case of <u>United States v. Schultz</u>, 78 the accused, a civilian, was tried by a General Court-hartial in

Japan on the charge of involuntary manslaughter and found
guilty of negligent homicide. The Court of Military Appeals
upheld the conviction of the lesser offense on the basis
that it was an offense under Japanese law. However, in
first determining that negligent homicide is not a violation of the law of war, the court stated:

A careful perusal of the penal codes of most civilized nations leads us to the conclusion that homicide involving less than culpable negligence is not universally recognized as an offense. Even in those American jurisdictions still relatively few in number - which have given statutory recognition to either negligent

^{77.} See opinion of Board of Review member Crooks, in United States v. Hunt, 27 C.M.R. 557 (1958) at page 61.

^{78. 1} U.S.C.M.A. 512, 4 C.M.R. 104 (1952).

Transmit a distribution of a contract that are a second to be a se

Justing the control of the control o

The second of th

United Shever v, num: 17 5.4.6. 357 (1956) at onse [3].

homicide or vehicular nomicide, the degree of negligence required is often held to be culpuble or gross - the same as required for involuntary manslaughter. Imposing criminal liability for less than culpable negligenes is a relatively new concept in criminal law and has not as yet been given universal acceptance by civilized nations.

The court apparently did not consider the Civil Law jurisdictions of the world which have generally provided that death or injury resulting from simple negligence is punishable under their penal codes, 79 and the victim's family had to rely on civil redress.

The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Digest of Opinions, June 1951 - January 1954, Part A. Homicide, sec. 115.1, p. 418, stated that:

In order to establish criminal liability for negligence it must be shown that the negligence was aggravated, culpable, gross, or reckless and the evidence must show that the accused knew, or ought to have known that death would likely result from his conduct. Criminal liability may not be predicated on every act negligently performed merely because such carelessness results in the death of another. (citations omitted)

No mention of the offense of negligent homicide appears in the 1923 Manual for Courts-Martial. The first appearance of this offense being specifically mentioned in the 1949 edition which also provided a sample specification in Appendix 4,

^{79.} Supra note 71.

en of his neither hands of the contract of the

The court normanaly did not consider the Civil Les Inche distinue of the coris world which have sensitely accounted that death or injury countils from mirris hashingened is continue had a under their repair codes. The mad the statistic tenter and the statistic of the redense.

The indge Advocate nearmal of the mary, Direct of Octologie, Ince 1951 - January 1950, rest A. Mostelle, end. 1751, n. 415, choise their

The state of the s

To communicate the first product of the first part of the salation of the sala

^{79.} Inner more VL.

in margraph 1170, mage 150.

Although Vinthron⁸⁰ rakes no mention of the origin of negligent homicide in referring to the general article he states that:

against civilians and not at or near a military camp or post, or in breach of violation of a military duty or order, they're not in general to be regarded as within the description of the Article, but are to be treated as civil rather than military offenses.

Nowever, if treated as a civil offense, negligent homicide would generally not be punishable but, "ith the exception of the <u>Munt</u> case, <u>supra</u>, the Courts have simply not addressed themselves to this problem or have merely passed over it by indicating that negligent homicide is per selection discrediting conduct. It is incongruous to hold that certain conduct brings discredit upon the armed forces when it does not generally bring discredit upon the individual doing the act. And what is the "prejudice" and "discredit" which is necessary to convict?

It is the writer's opinion that if unlawful homicide through simple negligence is an offense under the Uniform Code of Wilitary Justice, the court is holding military personnel to a degree of care far exceeding that required of

^{80.} Winthrop's Military Law and Precedents (2d ed. reprint 1920) Chapter XXVIII, p. 724.

Train to the control of the control

The posterior and price of the property of the control of the cont

-my portition particles or much on the particle of foreign

TO. Whitecon's Pilitary has and recedents in all secretary 1021, and 1021, a

other citizens regardless of whether the incident occurs overseas or in the United States. The question arises, however, as to whether greater burdens are imposed upon our servicemen by such treaties as the NATO-SOFA. It would appear that a soldier who has negligently caused the death of a foreign national would become subject to the jurisdiction of the host government, a situation which the United States has attempted to avoid in almost all instances. Why? Certainly in a negligent homicide case the authorized penalty in the civil law countries is roughly similar to what American courts can award. It must be concluded then that the primary reason is the strong desire on the part of the American treaty makers to retain jurisdiction if at all possible in an American system of law thereby providing as much as it is possible those safeguards guaranteed every American by the Constitution. Although great differences in procedure exist between the civil and common law practices, section 9, Article VII. of the NATO-SOFA has provided those basic safeguards to our servicemen overseas.

The only remedy to limit the application of negligent homicide is the enactment of legislation including within the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide a specific offense of negligent homicide with appropriate limitations

regimes the property and the contract of the ball of the contract of the contr grouped to the the Dates Danker. The more term setund, your remains we are being the property published at the analytical a from \$2 arrangement are an authorit many on management the care was not beautiful and the season of the manager of the contract of the co -cibrical and on saniday weened blick Involven univers a to And the said wellow meldengile a planetteron some and he meld Thetes was expended to broad to lead to a sale and NAME OF TAXABLE OF THE PARTY OF THE STATE OF TAXABLE OF or salings thought in the beautiful in roughly sining to much broadware me dame at a brime and margare and from and To drag and so asimply menous and as someony transless and such ILE IS TO TE WELFALL MINEY OF BURERS TARGET WESTERN BUT no solitivous adequal to memory amplication of aleganor Tivro beefinemen abtumpelen anone aldemos at it as four Assertance of the Countilation. Although event differences . Dury wall mounds man first bad received to be a sale and Al Willess Banklan 4, astigle VII, by the William areals wides these wints unfounted to our never areas within and the

The doly remain of that him application of antitions of the place of t

on its coverage. It is difficult to conceive of a solution for the American stationed overseas in the light of the existing legal systems with their high regard for personal property, physical injury and high feelings of nationalism.

HE LANGER A TO RESIDENCE OF SERVICE AND AS A PROPERTY OF BA put to bitely out of account has brack and sent out and Donester for briefs with their matter from markets senting desired to would and the day of the lines of being a provent

V. SEARCH AND SEIZURE CONTINENTAL STYLE

Article VII, paragraph 6(a), of the NATO treaty provides for the international cooperation in the securing of evidence and reads:

The authorities of the receiving and sending States shall assist each other in the carrying out of all necessary investigations into offences, and in the collection and production of evidence, including the seizure and, in proper cases, the handing over of objects connected with an offence. . .81

Our law officers have admitted real evidence seized by foreign investigators when such evidence would have been clearly inadmissible if seized by American investigators. These decisions have been upheld on review. 82 The pertinent portion of the Manual for Courts-Martial concerned with this topic reads as follows:

Evidence is inadmissible against an accused if it was obtained as a result of an unlawful search of his property conducted or instigated by persons acting under authority of the United States . . . All evidence obtained through information supplied by such illegally obtained evidence is likewise inadmissible.

^{81.} See Appendix A for complete text.

^{82.} Supra note 24.

^{83.} MCM 1951, para 152.

SAYON COMMITTED REVENUE AND ADDRESS OF

wides for the integrand concerning in the kery means prowides for the integrablished concerning in the escurius of eridence and reader

in the column of the column of

Our les affects and total total entitles for any critical for any control of the control of the

ironalizio assint en accidenti de anticolo en accidenti de acc

[.] In wagen it were corriete tert.

[,] he sten athul . .

^{53.} NOW 1051, pages 150.

Nowhere does the Tanual Lefine or lisenes what constitutes an unlawful search although examples are given of searches which are lawful. Nor does the Manual define either "search" or "seisure." For clarification of this very brief Manual discussion, resort must be had to paragraph 137 of the Manual to provide the necessary clue as to where to pursue the inquiry. Paragraph 137 states that:

. . . so far as not otherwise prescribed in this Manual, the rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the United States district courts or, when not inconsistent with such rules at common law will be applied by courts-martial.

Therefore, it may be concluded that those searches considered unlawful in federal trials of criminal cases are of the same types as those considered unlawful in military trials. This in turn requires a consideration of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads thusly:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the

^{84.} NGM 58-00130, Hillan, 26 C.M.H. 771 (1958) for a "flashlight search and seizure" and subsequent apprehension of the accused; also, United States v. Summers, 13 U.S.C.M.A. 573, 33 C.M.R. 105 (1963, "suspicious individuals.")

to series our neighbors many the alleged of the series of another as the series of a series and the series are series and the series are series and the series and the series are series a

of herisacron estemant on an entre and party of artistance and at the transmit of artistance of the transmit of artistance of the transmit of artistance of the transmit of th

Anathra and the era sense desirable of the single of the desirable of the sense of the single of the sin

The Mine of the South to the South t

^{*}Place and the control of the contro

place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

It may be concluded that the Manual term "unlawful" is equated to the Amendment term "unreasonable" in reference to searches. Thus, in both civilian and military practice, an unreasonable search and seizure is an unlawful one and the fundamental inquiry in each instance where evidence is sought to be excluded on the ground of an unlawful search or seizure must be whether the search was reasonable. 85

As to seizure of evidence, it must be (1) a fruit or instrumentality of the crime; (2) contraband; (3) weapons, or a means of escape. 86

Evidence is inadmissible in a military court if obtained as the result of an illegal search conducted by or on behalf of the United States by its officers acting in the enforcement of its laws, ⁸⁷ and a person (CID agent) duly assigned to law enforcement duty making or participating in a search for the sole purpose of enforcing

^{35.} United States v. Doyle, 1 U.S.C.M.A. 545, 4 C.M.R. 137 pet. denied, 4 C.M.R. 174 (1952); ACM 15962, Williams, 28 C.M.R. 736 (1960), and an excellent discussion in Hillan, supra note 84.

^{86.} Abel v. United States, 362 U.S. 217 (1960); United States v. Rhodes, 3 U.S.C.M.A. 73, 75, 11 C.M.H. 73, 75 (1953).

^{87.} Supra note 83.

press of the restoring and the persons of bilings to be retorn,

the course of the Asendesn's face 'uniconspiral' in reference

to messesting, from in the office and sittles provide,

to messesting in the office and sittles provide,

the fundamental injurity in the instructure with effect in

south to a croin ed on the ground of an uniterial secretary

or relies and the meaning in the annual and secretary

As to best a an ather in annual and secretary

structure at the original (1) a frest or an annual secretary.

of the second of an initial through a second of the following of the following. The following of the followi

^{04,} AMET W. CRIE-1 INTER, 362 1.5, 277 (1940), CHILLED OF CENTRAL PROPERTY (1951).

^{67.} Supra note 33.

States. States. A search conducted by one having direct disciplinary authority over the accused is likewise a search under the authority of the United States inasmuch as the problem of law enforcement is often a problem of military command.

A search has been considered to be one "instigated by" the United States where the mere presence of military investigators at the scene occurred. 90 It appears that a higher degree of participation by federal officials is required in an overseas area, since the presence alone may not be sufficient to make the fruits of such search inadmissible. 91 Ob-viously the law of search and seizure, admittedly complicated is further made so when the overseas factors of foreign law and international treaties are added to the picture.

The typical situation overseas is where certain evidence obtained by local civilian police during a search of the

^{88.} United States v. Volante, 4 U.S.C.M.A. 689, 16 C.M.R. 263 (1954); ACM 17070, Hoore, 33 C.M.R. 868 pet. denied, 33 C.M.R. 436 (1963).

^{89.} United States v. Volante, supra note 88; United States v. Doyle, supra note 85.

^{90.} United States v. Doyle, supra note 85.

^{91.} United States v. Doyle, supra note 85.

nillary variable monored by as the land of the land of

hed hearthanil one of hereilanes mand und domain he

the balled free whore the state of the country of the tent of the country of the

Obtained by local cirilian relice 'uring a sareh of the

C. N. N. S. L. W. J. W. 19070, "COYE, 27 C. . N. COYE, 27

The transfer of the court of th

on, wisted bute v. tool , shore note ils.

W. Wated theten . Doric, rupe note 51.

accused's house is turned over to the American trial counsel for use at a general court-martial. The standard objection by the defense counsel - that the evidence was unlawfully seized even though the local civilian police seted according to the local law, is made. Is the proof offered by the trial counsel that the local police conducted the search strictly in accordance with local law relevant? What law is relevant? These questions have arisen in two cases, one a 1954 case arising in France, 92 and the other a 1962 case arising in Germany, 93 two civil law countries, but with different results.

A French criminal investigator acting under letters rogatory issued by a French magistrate interviewed the accused, an American soldier suspected of being a "pusher" for a counterfeit American Express Traveler Checks ring. The French agent was accompanied by an American MP who had been made available on request. The American representative searched the accused's Bordeaux apartment where the American found evidence which tended to incriminate the accused. When confronted with this evidence, the accused confessed

^{92.} United States v. DeLeo, 5 U.S.C.M.A. 148, 17 C.M.R. 148 (1954).

^{93.} CN 407443, Rogers, 32 C.M.R. 623 (1962).

Internal to the manufacture of the standard reports of the manufacture of the standard of the standard of the manufacture of the standard of the standard of the manufacture of the standard of the manufacture of the standard of the manufacture of the standard of the

receiped to see a refresh and the setting and a lattice are seeded to see an analysis of assets a function of the second manual, as accurate and the second of seasy a function of the second of seasy a function.

The second or second of the second of seasy and the second of the seco

^{93.} Cl knykka, memer, 32 C.F.1. 623 (1962).

to the American after compliance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Uniform Jode of Military Justice. Jubsequently, at his trial by court-martial the accused objected to the admission of the evidence obtained from the search on the grounds that the search was unlawful, and to the admission of his confession on the grounds that it fell within the "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine. His objections were overruled and the evidence was received. On appeal, the Court of Military Appeals held the evidence was properly admitted, citing paragraph 6(a) of Article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, which states as we have seen that there is a duty to "cooperate with foreign agents in the investigation offenses committed by servicemen and in the collection of incriminating evidence." Thus, the court reasoned that the American agent's presence was legal, and dismissed his participation in the search as merely incidental - in no way changing the fact that the entire episode was instigated by the French and was "primarily" their investigation. In dissenting, Judge Latimer stated that the fact that the armed forces are scattered throughout the world makes no difference to a serviceman's military judicial

^{94.} See Appendix A for complete text.

THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS ACTION AT MY THE DELICE CO. OF WILLIAM PARTIES, DIRECT Asserted States and Established for Party and to perform Abuse of and begin to part to an in a part of the second of and the or has already the manner out rant areas and an minute that of that charten out to return the for the countries. contradic of the velocity tout tout and to their ad ware overgrated and the orthogon on relatively to appeal, THE CONST. OF PERSONS ASSESSED INTO A PERSON WITHOUT THE PERSON WILL STANDAR SOUTH SERVICE OF SALES OF SERVICE OF SALES when a red or reaches we have an expense of the contract to the section al times in ional Man systemate of the a at trail food the livesty met of these washinger to service and in term and payed ". sorethre entires tone; her entiresting and referred that the Journal associate requires and level, and single of the particular tent of the particular all programs being Almest a to me very changing the fact that the matter colored "only that "glimming" has been many! all 'go beautiful has wire facts of the comments of the contract of BEYOU BUT THE COURSE OF STREET AND SERVICES TREET AND SERVICES AND THAT Lainibut wastiin a'mansolvent a or sanwastiib-om-assum

ple, see suppordis a for complete nest.

rights incomed as the Uniform Code of Military Dustice controls courts-martial wherever they are held and that the law should be interpreted and applied without regard to venue. We contended that when persons subject to military law are tried by courts-martial, the law should apply equally and not geographically and that the United States has a duty to protect the men it sends overseas, particularly since an American servicements home it entitled to be protected from invasion by other Americans regardless of where this home is situated.

Judge Latimer then pointed out that the French letters rogatory did not identify the accused, describe the premises, or the property to be searched, left the time of expiration indefinite, and therefore did not meet the standards of our law with respect to search warrants. He argued further that any search conducted pursuant to a warrant invalid by reason of failure to measure up to federal standards is not reasonable. Judge Latimer drew an analogy between a federal-state venture in the United States and the same acts overseas, saying that if the degree of participation is sufficient to support a finding that it is a federal venture to obtain evidence in the states, he would make the same finding for the same acts overseas.

The second of the second of the property of the control of the second of

Folge Latters then polyton our that his framen letters are represented to the control of the con

the Prench inspector and the notive for its emistence onanated shouly from the French police, with the American present a no more than incidental element, therefore, the search
was not an American one. Consistent with this view is the
American's testimony that the French inspector had originally
investigated the contents of the accused's writing box and
that thereafter the former solely by chance glimpsed a slip
of paper containing a signature which was vital to the case.
To this specific bit of evidence, Judge Latimer stated he
could not escape the conclusion that the American participated upon the chance, which subsequently materialized, that
something would be uncovered of official interest to him as
a military law enforcement officer.

In the 1962 case of <u>United States v. Rogers</u>, 95 the court held that the legality of a search of the accused's off-post quarters in termany incident to apprehension of his German wife by German authorities and an American CiD agent, must be determined under the laws of the United States and United States military law in the absence of any formal proof of German law. The Board of Review held that the record

^{95.} Supra note 93.

The appropriate of the course for the equation of the course of the cour

The characters of period to period and the control of the control

of the state of th

supported a conclucian distantialitary authorized both instigated an participated in a search of the accused's quarters there it showed that a military officer recoved information that the acoused's German sire had attempted to sell eigerettes of the same brand as those stolen from an exchange and that she had sheets and bilverware. The officer notified the Provost Jarshal and a ... investigator. who in turn notified Jerman Luthorities the accused's wife was expected to attempt further sales that night, and subsequently the Provost Marshal, his assistant, a CID agent and the German authorities observed the accused's wife carry a sack out and across the street to a bar, whereupon the German authorities apprehended her in the bar, and that military personnel accompanied German authorities to the accused's apartment and while the accused was present commenced a search. Then the accused asked for a search warrent he was informed that none was necessary since the search was being conducted by the Germans. The search uncovered some silverware and bed sheets and when the accused kept interfering with the search a military police patrol was called to remove him. The German and American police authorities remained to complete the search after which all of the seized property was taken to the CID office.

and third out I for the part of the sand and and an extreme SHOW THE WARRY PARTICULAR PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PA THE RESERVE AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF the said organishment for the same orders are those about the same of the THE LEGISLET DESCRIPTION OF THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY coverablement the or me covered to the building modifie rather a linearous with any tyroday's current a city section more at said was a los griffere their artes rulter's threath at Indonese the Principle USD in planting that was planting theoretic and participant THE STREET, SPECIAL PROPERTY OF STREET, WITH STREET, WITH SER. ORGERS IN RARE AND ADDRESS TON APPEAL TO A DAMP THAT PROPERTY THE PART WAS DELIVED THE PART OF THE PART and not nadalesception to begin in process the process of the proc the state of the same of the state of the state of the same of the -the spring a got being fermous and god another a broade AND THE THE PERSON NAMED AND POST OF THE PERS and the property of the laterage. The facilities are biorden and hadd been adwest had her printraville more northwee TOTAL BERTHAN TRADUCTURE A SPENIE WAS RELY BUT STATEMENT FOR DODGEST THE PARK OF STREET, SALES AND ASSESSED AND ASSESSED. Lin State the second and adolesce of Designing to plant the of the carry property and to cause of the CID of their

the contraction of the relation of the desired and the argued. (1) that the careline a pill any color conducted et the in tigether of, in the produce of, for the panose of, and in close association with the promote sutherities; even had this not been an apprican accord the lies, seared would be inadmissible in a reducal or willtery criminal procceding; (2) appellant a tro protrial statements were the fruit of the unlowful rearch and ceigure, and therefore, inadmissible; (3; use of tainted statements substantially prejudiced the substantial rights of the accused with respect to all offenses charged and that therefore, reversal is required. The trial counsel took the position that the reasonableness of the search was supported by the laws of the United States if not Cerman law, arguing that the search was a German one, pursuant to German law and not an American search at all.

The Toard of Review, in dismissing the charges and specifications, held that since the initial arrest and search of the accused's wife was instigated and participated in by persons acting on behalf of the United States, and such arrest and search were unlawful, it follows that the same taint of unlawfulness for lack of probable cause attaches to the subsequent search made by the German and American police authorities in the accused's apartment.

In the state of the principle of the state o Assignment Street profile at our street and duty the street the state of the state of the sentiment of the state of t and Alberton analysis of state management better at his vis-Analysis would had been discharged by the control of the control o -ove Designation weekills by Designation and obstractionary and allowand their recommendate Louisians and recommendation and positions A STANDARD WITH ANY PARTY WAS TO SELECT THE PARTY AND THE activities provide a provincial a supplied by the (C) publicate being postant Alia terrada ani to manga internation on the businesses. -or all fances or provinced that he hamiltoness the life of galaxie. For injul country deal are portained that one to be I had not believe the street of the blood of the blood of median out daily melinged west resigned too it looms too the manufactured on the last was proved to 2 processing , now married a way . Line is a charge and

The series of Seylow, in dignituding the controls and appeals to several account of the second formation that the second formation of the second second second formation of the second secon

cated. Certainly the restore thick and one the obtaining of the evidence should a carefully evented in the raining whether scartten investigator periodly con, earliested, since a close sorking relationship exist. In the ages between American and foreign antheration. The distinction between these two cases it deviously that is the former case, the search, at least besed upon the evidence in the record, was instigated by the French and the American as along only incidentally, while in the latter case, it was an American military officer who notified the Provost Marshal who in turn notified German authorities. It can be said that in each instance the foreign and American authorities were merely complying with the terms of paragraph 5a, Article VII, of the NATO-SOFA.

and United States v. Dial. 97 In the former case the facts of which are not relevant here, incriminating statements obtained from an accused by operation were held to be in-admissible without regard to waether the coercion was

^{96.} Supre note 33.

^{97. 9} M.S.C.M.A. 700, 26 C.M.R. 480 (1958).

passed to the control and the same of the control o

The state of the s

I offe farm nove the

^{1 (0292)} CON LEAVE POOR 10 (0292) (1955) (

Exerted by a government agent or a private individual.

In the latter case, a confession taken by a Terms policeman without a preliminary wirning and under such circumstances that under Texas law the accused should have been given such werning was not rendered inaddissible before court-martial inasmuch as the members of the Houston Tolice Department are not subject to the Uniform Code of Tilitary Justice and no evidence was produced to show the police officer acted for or on behalf of the military service.

The court stated:

It would appear that under the provisions of paragraph 152, MCM 1951, 99 a search with United States military law

^{98. &}quot;No person subject to this code shall interrogate, or request any statement from an accused or a person suspected of an offense without first informing him of the nature of the accusation and advising him that he does not have to make any statement regarding the offense of which he is accused or suspected and that any statement made by him may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court-martial." UCMJ article 31(b).

^{99. &}quot;A search of property which is owned or controlled by the United States and is under the control of an armed force, or of property which is located within a military installation

And the interpolate a conference of private legal tollarin the interpolate a conference through a legal policeuse tilling a prejudice of marking and ander equivalent of the conference of the best passed in the passed interpolation beam as not been annealed in the interpolation beams and the conference of the interpolation follows beams and the interpolation of tilliber described as a private to the the passed in the passed in the passed of tilliber described as a private of the conference of the passed of tilliber described as a private of the military samples.

... shitters compared may accept to all boats to med developed to the total part of the standard to med to med developed to the med to med to med to the standard to med to the developed to med to med to the developed to the dev

organization to annies and an electric content of the content of t

And any series of the series o

or buildunces we derest at rights granges to arrans A" . ""
, report learn at to formed will water up her arrans solded any
realinfictual wouldlike a sixtly decrease of mother arrange by we

enforcement personnel accornaging the local foreign police would be entirely lawful under United . tates law. . ven if the search was illegal by our laws the evidence obtained from such a search would be admissible in a court-mertial trial so long as the search was not managed or controlled by federal agents so as to make it a federal undertaking. 100 Although the off-post dwelling of military personnel in the United States may not lawfully be searched without a warrant, paragraph 152, 40, 1951, prescribes a different rule for foreign countries. Under this rule, it appears that a legal search of property may be effected, (1) if the property is located in a foreign country; (2) it is used by a military person, and (3) if the search is one authorized by the Commanding Officer. The court in DeLeolol considered that such a search would be reasonable within the meaning of the fourth amendment, with the result that there could be no problem of possible inconsistency between the manual and that amendment, assuming that the latter is to be accorded

^{99. (}Continued) or in a foreign country or in occupied territory and is owned, used, or occupied by persons subject to military law or to the law of war, which search has been authorized by a commanding officer having jurisdiction over the place where the property is situated, or, if the property is in a foreign country or in occupied territory, over personnel subject to military law or to the law of war in the place where the property is situated. . . is a lawful search."

^{100.} Supra note 92.

^{101.} Junra note 92.

solide pulses? here! nor anymeteres foreverse measurables the core and could belief when formal plexives on blaze the search was illied by set that the evidence order at Infrancisco is at antiquenta at above specials a dama most Intimates to became for her dorson and no mod on barry by fodered agreed to be some to some for an expense for an expense of Although whe off-court dwelling of military paradical in the United States our now hearthly to manuscrip or though you and and bud bud. parameters ift, NCW 1961, standardoon o different sule for front a finit erroces of paley with raint . nafrrower mylere's ni universi of il il industria of the organic is dragar Isombiet to a description assentage (2) If the used by a collection with the Anni Providence And and Advenue and the (P) the amineses Committee of Long The South in John of the continued that add by undisone and additive pleasement at blive decime a skiller Court as alone seads that from but the form board to be has impose and secretary paractal and all the contracts of the sections labeled as of all this out that a large a factor of 1660

of interest to the contract of the contract of its evolution of the contract o

^{100.} June make 39.

ICE. Manyon ners W.

when the consent of the Commanding Officer was inferred from his silent acquiescence. As noted, the MATO-SOLA¹⁰² goes even further in providing for the mandatory assistance between law enforcement personnel in investigations and the collection and production of evidence including the seizure. It would seem that in the light of a strict interpretation of the agreement a contrary result would be required in the Rogers¹⁰³ case, particularly since the case involved a violation of German law.

In the recent case of United States v. Smith, 104 the treaty was given full support where American CID agents accompanied the German police in an apprehension of a serviceman suspected of murder as he was returning to off-post quarters with his wife who was a German national. At the time of the apprehension, no explanation for the arrest was made to the wife. The following day, CID agents and German police met at the accused's home, and one of the German policemen told Mrs. Smith, "We came with the CID and they make

^{102.} See Article VII, para 6(a) of Appendix A.

^{103.} Supra note 93.

^{104. 13} U.S.C.M.A. 553, 33 C.M.R. 85 (1963).

one of correct of the instruction of the court only one can forther against the case of the correct of the court of the case of the court of the case of the case

-constraint to the designation of the state of the state

And an appearance of marriers are not not controlled to detected and controlled a

Lot. See drived will press him to the see . Hold

^{10%} jones note 2%;

token as the same or good and the court

a house search with you." A second German policeman said, "There would be a search." The German police had no warrant and did not participate in the search which was conducted by the CIL. The CID agent asked if he could search and Mrs. Smith "consented" although she had not been told the purpose of the search. During the search a pair of boots was seized. Two days later, the CID agents returned and told Wrs. Smith, "We are back here, we'd like to search your house again." She replied, "Very well, come on in." The agents had no warrant, had not secured the accused's permission, and had not informed Mrs. Smith of the charge against her husband. During the search, a pair of bloodstained shoes was scized. The court declined to decide the question of whether a wife has implied authority to consent to a search of her husband's property, finding that the Government had failed to show consent to the search by "convincing evidence" or "clear and positive proof." Assuming that under the facts shown, Mrs. Smith's "consent" amounted to no more than mere submission to the color of authority of law enforcement officers or acquiescence in their announced purpose to search, the Court held that the admission of the evidence was not prejudicial error.

Aller paped for anythin course a long that stones outside a American by Alef as \$150 pages but foreigner a an Algor would to be a property was supply opened but at advantations for but has - ANTE DES PROTESS SERVE AND AN ALL STREET PRODUCTION AND ALL SERVE more than the same of the same at the sensols, Contact the Japan's with he began might be and the same the distance of the same of the same of "Letting court many married the matrix proper many over 1991." the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of had buy projected the same of housest the look of means ADMENT NOW HOLDS A LONGER OF LANGUAGE AND SOME WIT SHEWE - pile a region to colling and object of builtons remained and a longitud year to docume a of Command or triffection Logical and -mon which his bedain and decomposed not doubt making , assessed box weath to Jameahre animateness as assure all to dance SHIER THOUGHT THE COLD NOW AND AND THE COLD NAMED IN on workeling toward to be the well to the release of the release of study and albuses of measures becomes winds at suspensing a faladiators has now complete and to not salada and first hist

In both the Jmith and Porers eases, United States military law enforcement officials conducted, in coordination with local police, searches of "economy houses rented by servicemen. It appears that this coordination, although not set forth in step by step detail in paragraphs 6a and 10a of Article VII of MATO-SOFA, is generally provided for. Various letters received by the writer indicate local policy may differ not only from area to area but from country to country as well. These Staff Judge Advocates overwhelmingly stated that their own local arrangements saved time and were most effective. The MATO-SOFA specifically provides for local liaison with those authorities and in so far as is necessary to maintain discipline and order among the members of the force. 105 The aforementioned cases have involved offpost searches. Would it have made a difference if the accused's house had been "on post"? To find the answer we must again refer to Article VII of the NATO-SOFA. Although not specifically covered, paragraph 6a does state, "The authorities of the receiving and sending States shall assist each other in the carrying out of all necessary investigations. . . " On the other hand, paragraph 10(a) provides

^{105.} Supra note 102.

-After markets and her property to a party of the property and the second party and hard negleties of the Earlies also file the manufales and the ar retrieved and the property of the section of the derwinderen i a meserre vant bris moorita kinne elektroum mat to our time of summers of finish and of gate of other ABELIAL TIL DE WATCHSON'N, IN MONERALLE SERVI AGE FORM THE VEHICLE Integer contined by the netter intices is intices appear -HOOD DE YEARDER SET EST SOME OF LOTE SOOT TERM HER TOTALE Time and the control of the control rate our cate bond thoughters I not ton a stack dods tounds and extraction. The different assetting and assisting the Local lintern with those authorothes and in so has a feroracless and pures, reduce has entirely to its window of enterpole of the furnity of a street of the street of the street of the was margolast. would be been a mile and a bloom abusement THE REPORT OF ARTS OF VISION FOR MANY BUILDINGS BASINGS SECONDA . PRODUCTION OF THE SECONDARY OF THE SECONDARY OF THE PRODUCTION OF THE PROD HOS MARKET COLLEGE COMMENCE, PARKAGERS ON LOSS MENLS, "Thus. raines (Inch second antiques and properties and to salidamental ORDER OF THE THE SAFFYING MAY OF ST. MCCARDER LATERALISM things . . . to the came head, many and lotter on the

^{1901 60 50 100}

only that the sending little shall have the right to police its camps or other pregises which they occupy as the result of an agreement with the receiving State. Paragraph 10(b) specifically limits the employment of military police outside of the pregises, camps, etc., only subject to arrangements with the authorities of the receiving State and in liaison with those authorities.

Paragraph 6a of Article VII of the NATO-SOFA also provides for the "handing over" of any evidence seized by the law enforcement agents of the sending State to the receiving State "in proper cases." Nowhere is a "proper case" defined or an explanation of who will make this determination apparent. Suppose that United States law enforcement officials obtain "evidence" unlawfully, may they turn it over to the local police in a concurrent jurisdiction situation? Is there a conflict with our own Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure? In the case of Rea v. United States, 106 the facts briefly stated were that a Federal narcotics agent obtained narcotics from the accused under a search warrant issued in violation of Rule 41a of the Federal Tules of Criminal Procedure. The accused was subsequently prosecuted by the District Court,

^{106. 350} U.S. 214 (1955).

Addition of courts our results of their section of their section of the court of the court of the court of the court of their section of the court of their section of the court of their section of their section of their section of their section of the court of the

The control of the co

THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY AND PARTY.

dismissed. Thereafter, the accused was charged with possession of merihuma in violation of Yew Mexico law and was convicted although the accused filed to enjoin the federal agent from testifying in the state action relative to the illegally obtained evidence. On appeal, the Supreme Court held in granting the injunctive relief asked for by the accused, that the policy of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure governing searches and sciences is defeated if the federal officer can use the fruits of an unlawful search either in federal or state proceedings. Another more recent case involving the same point is Cleary v. Bolger. 107

Now then can we justify this same action on an international scale that has been ruled illegal in the United States to the detriment of our citizens. In the United States we say, no, this illegally obtained evidence must be suppressed, although it may still be used in the state courts, while "anything goes" overseas as long as we can justify the matter by a provision of the international agreement, at least as far as our military courts go. Possibly this is necessary because of military necessity, or maybe we have

^{107. 371} U.S. 392 (1963).

The state of a state of the sta

The state of an extensive way of the first of the angle of anyther and a second of a secon

AND THE REAL PROPERTY.

well changes we gain time and experience with interactional treaties. The close may provide the asser to these questions.

cerning civilian employees of the armed forces in Japan are <u>Jaylor v. United States</u>, 108 filed in the United States Court of Claims June 15, 1366, and <u>Fowell v. Zuckert</u>, 109 decided <u>July 28</u>, 1366 in the United States Court of Appeals. Decause I believe these cases are of such importance, I will state the facts of each in this paper.

Etates Air lorce in Japan who was suspected of misconduct and fraud. Subsequently, two OTI agents armed with a general search warrant signed by an Air Porce Colonel named Wilson whose status was undisclosed authorized them to search Saylor's person, his two automobiles and his quarters located at Mashington Weights Military Compound near the center of Tokyo under the jurisdiction of the Air Porce, and to "seize any property pertinent to such investigation." No probable sause was

^{108. 35} U.S. L. Week 2006 (Ct. Claims June 15, 1966) recommended decision of Commissioner Day.

^{109.} United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit No. 19,793 decided July 28, 1966.

production of the state of the

The part of the part of the same of the same to be the same of the

before the tenders and the second property of the second o

COURT OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY THE

AND CHEST OF THE THE PARTY OF T

indicated to the Colonel who since the "merrint", no outh was given, and there was no limitation of retters to be seized. The agents, after realise the Tifth Amendment and Article 31 of the Uniform Tole of Military Justice to the accused, advised him of his right to counsel and proceeded to search and seize all documents in his home, his office, his autos, commingling them into a pile three inches high.

noved from his job although at the hearing, Laylor was given an opportunity to view each document and did not object to its admission into evidence. Faylor, who was entitled to the benefits of the Veteran's Treference act of 1944, brought suit for leck pay by reason of his ellered unlawful removal from his civil service position. The issue before the court was whether by failing to object to the admission of this evidence Saylor waived his right to do so.

The Air Force defendant justified the search complained of by its statement that the search occurred at a military installation in Japan where no American court is available and empowered to issue warrants. It was also argued that the plaintiff being a civilian employee serving with the military overseas is subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. 110

^{110.} UCMJ art. 2. "The following persons are subject to this chapter: (11) Subject to any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, persons serving with, employed by or accompanying the armed forces outside the United States."

terms of the control of the control of the control of the control of as to more in upto oil in section to the the property of the first walker will be a local to a limit to THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF T make a company of the control of the AND THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF AMERICAN PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADD the second of the second of the second of the second of new male carried preference and the recoverable and that every better with the All the Southern State and the pilling of were not not read that the second room of the second state of the second Market and the second state of the second stat begins the war or of the case of the bloom willing NAMED AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY. the second secon AND HE HE DOUGH HAD ANYTHE RETAIN CONTINUE AND IN SECURIORS. musican sinus sel lattitus suinite semi gir off special file is the lower comment of the resonant and by the to added here as proper profession on white result of an included And there will not be a considerable for decreasing him william but their gardymon files from particular a business to collect out the representation of the course of the cour

of indices are non-the industrial mate in one then idle and indices and indice

This the inventors of the Code emperaly includes norsons 'employed by" the armed forces outside the United States, it also included there accommonsing with forces. The imprese Court, in 1957, held that wives of arreingen serving abroad were entitled to all of the protections of the Constitution including the right to be tried by a jury Ill The Supreme Court held, in those capital cases, that the Uniform Code of Military Justice did not apply to the wives "accompanying such forces," or mather, it held that Congress in enacting the Code and including that language could not denrive those wires of their Constitutional right to a trial by jury in a civilian court. Although those were criminal cases and this is a civilian pay case, the parallel would seem to be that Congress could no more deprive a civilian employee of the Army, serving in Tanon, of his Constitutional right to be secure in his Japanese home, albeit on a military reservation abroad, from the unreasonable search and actoure, guaranteed to him by the Fourth Amendment. The Government cited a number of cases for the long held proposition that a military commander, under the Uniform Code, has the authority to conduct searches and seigures on a military

^{111.} Supra note 8.

didde the Senance of the International of Athin Appellated the first property and the applications of the last last last section of the state of the section Dated, in 1979, and other to show a supplement of the party of the par walked districts and the annual contracts to the state of the particular legal Character and least of an extracte and patternage Many new last out that person in your court of lifet trees. washing over the side of the party over his authority word lift to where the property should have by problem on furnishing that regress his time assessed that solds that his bed all her yout an Autor a at Joseph Limphiliphiliphi value to navin sanger Last section of the court would be a section of the court which were about the property of the party o THE PERSON NAMED IN COMPANY OF SOME PARTY OF STREET, AND ADDRESS OF STREET, ST the many, respire the beauty of the countries and a series of the -area medition and their persons second the at many of prompted the depose aftigance-on our car's charries relative Americans Att Americant (Sept. 1 at 1 at 1 at 1 at 1 and annual) This year incomes Albei profession wit not Albeit to codere a header while will been under provided bed region, buttoness would be a ser-PROFILE IS NO RECEIVED from Embetors I telebono of Affired

J little most +ff

installation, even though occupied as a residence, or an indispensible of sensitive process of price of dispersion. The cipline. This stelly, the fourth Amendment stood as the only bulkant remaining against anneason the secret and science of his private papers in his hours and settorotiles, and crainst any search except pursuant to a variant issued upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the things to be seized. The court held the only compliance with the requirements of the fourth Amendment was fact the quarters were identified as were the automobiles. The variant was, therefore, held to be a nullity and the search under it unlarful. The accused was entitled to recover pay and applicants since his removal from his position was of no force or effect.

In Towell v. fuckert, the specifical vas an employee of the Air force in Japan who was removed from his position for various violations of regulations. Sixteen months is ter he filed suit contesting his removel, of i ing the reason for the delay was his abject noverty. The facts of the case were undisputed even as to the search of the accused's off-base

ll?. Lest v. United States, 184 F.2d 131 (1950), cert. denied, 340 U.S. 939 (1951); Grewe v. France, 75 F. Supp. 433 (1948); nited States v. Grigsby, 335 F.2d 652 (1964).

be an appropriate the better than the property of the party of the par well less with a complete and all formal administration - The second sec MARKET AND REPORT OF THE PARTY THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON NAMED IN THE PERSON NAMED IN ADDRESS ON THE RESIDENCE OF A PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADD and the property of the section of t per out any little oil; they between a set of the first principles in settings. The board work may present the constitute would see apply the old limited products they all to have perfectly the former of antificial and one of fulfill mile to be of the substitution of the substitu A DE LES MAN MAN MAN AND REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY NAMED AND ADDRESS OF A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR to complete on the description on prescaling Market SE THE WILLIAM SERVICE CONTRACTOR OF THE SERVIC the sales of the contract of t mit makes and printed a December of antisoners and anti-

were taken both the shared but a companion building the companion and

contests with married and the Arrest of the first form to be supplied.

AND THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR

private dwelling. Armed with a Japan se anarch warrant obtained pursuant to a request by the Air large office of special Investigations, the OSI spents and Japanese officers searched appellant's home. The search are a general one, the Japanese warrant reciting that objects to be seized in the search included, "typewriters, United States property, official documents, memos, diary, documents, everything in relation to the case." The arents went through thousands of his private papers including letters from his deceased mother. Five charges were subsequently pressed against appellant. The first and third charges were proved by evidence or affidavits based on evidence seized from appellant's home despite objection by counsel that the search and seizure was unlawful. Appellant had objected to the search and seizure once during the hearing.

The court citing <u>Saylor v. United States</u> and the Fourth Amendment said that the Fourth Amendment is violated by a general search such as the one in this case.

The Government's position is that the search was made lawful by paragraph 6a, Article XVII, Agreement under Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, 11 U.S.T. 115, which provides:

The military authorities of the United States and the authorities of Japan shall assist each other

entries around the response of the trace around the state of the state

provided the galact halos, as maked addition were bus forces and assessment and the contract of the contract o

TALLY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR

the sagard border up to authorities translate will quelte dans totals from plant to mid-restrict midin the carrying out of all necessary investigations into offenses, and in the collection and roduction of evidence, including the seizure and, in proper cases, handing over of objects connected ith an offense.113

This, appelled contends, made lawful the presence of Air

Force agents 'as observers during the execution of a valid

Japanese search warrant for appellant's off-base residence."

Citing Reid v. Covert, as in the Saylor case, the obvious

answer was made that no agreement with a foreign nation can

confer power on the Congress or on any other branch of Gov
ernment which is free from the restraints of the Constitution.

In holding for the appellant the court held that the record conclusively demonstrated that OSI agents requested the search and actually conducted it.

Clearly these two cases stand for the rule that the Fourth Amendment overshadows in importance any international agreement, Air Force or other regulation as well as the Uniform Code of Military Justice at least as far as civilian employees are concerned when the issue of search and seizure is raised.

One wonders for what reason have we entered into treaties and agreements throughout the world when it was fairly obvious that the agreed upon provisions might well be declared

^{113.} This provision is identical with para 6a of Article VII of PATO-SOFA.

THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE

These agrees an experiment the contract of a provider of a vertical and a second of the contract of the contra

Annual with the control of the contr

restricted to the relation of the relations of the set of the set

to be seen over the beautiful at sometimes what there were not be seen to be seen the seen and t

unconstitutional in their application to recricen citizens, be they in uniform or not. Of what value are such agreements which while conforming to the standards of the host country limit the constitutional rights of our citizens and if when the test is made, the treaty must fall to the Constitution! Thy not enter into agreements which conform to the Constitutional safeguards in the first instance? Are not the drafters of our international agreements aware of Article VI of the Constitution which reads:

This Constitution, and the Lews of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Is this another example of Constitution-bending to seek a temporary solution or a desired result?

manding Officer overservicemen is necessary. It is necessary for the morale and discipline of the armed forces. But what effect on that same morale does the fact that the Constitutional guarantees apply to the civilians accompanying the military overseas while they do not apply to the servicemen who works alongside that same civilian at a much lower rate of pay?

81

The state of the s

The true description of the season of the country o

IN THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PART

Application of the parties and description of the second o

"hat then is the solution to there problems" it is doubtful that the United States could ever impose the recul rement upon the receiving states of the world that our Constitutional sefeguards to our citizens must be complied with when those nations do not apply those same safe-uards to their own nationals. Since as a practical matter we cannot "up date" our Constitution or that we would want to, why not amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice, or better yet, reverse those poor decisions which have altered the already existing provisions of the Uniform Code of lilitary Justice by restoring to the Commanding Officer the power to take what action he deems necessary in regard to search and seizure. As insurance, let us require him to comply with the same mandates a judge in the United States is required to meet, that is, that the search warrant be based upon probable cause with the limits of search set forth in the document itself. Additionally, let us adhere to Article 2, Uniform Code of Military Justice, as originally written and once again make it applicable to civilians and dependents, not only during time of war, but whenever they accompany our armed services. Since the United States is entirely a creature of the Constitution, it can only act in accordance with all the limitations imposed by the

NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXABLE PARTY. was not become more known makes had a few many forthands ages people below out the include appropriate will be 10 for over 100 Ballooms of Total countries of the street of the state of manufacture was worse against the six world in their restriction ne will me finite a fin word . Minoritan me winds of and after the fact the sales and the sales are also the sales are the wind that the coldinar cold all their cold and the cold and the cold and bearing one office and decided that the court of the first the field will be used covided and be seeing voted and the winners will had subject to restory to the community of self-ter year and becomes and productional message and another course which are proved or and extends or fall accompanies of approximation and plants spinite coving and the panel a spinite amount of the planet no recognic country and that the part bearing the sales of you consider to safely one often among affining moon board obligation and said of manager FORTH LE DIS SOCIETATION STREET, alluminary on yearnest consilly to also excited at minimum of Arm heartflyin and advictions his more often your loss welffre dependently not any united to held and the few principles that BE BREATH ROLLING THE PROPERTY OF THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF SHE CAN BEEN A COURSE OF REAL CONTRACTOR, IN SEE SING SALE AND and the parameter of the part of the parameter of the par

Constitution. Cur Constitution gives the power and authority to the United States, but let us interpret its provisions in a same and logical manner as its drafters intended:

- June 1997 Ages Sample and April 1997 April 1997 April 1997 April 1997 April 1997 MACHINES AND RESIDENCE OF THE WAY THE WAY TO SEE THE WAY regiment approved the terms for building the man a gar

VI. SECURING THE ATTENDANCE OF FORLIGH CIVILIAN MITTERSES

It is the duty of the trial counsel to insure the presence of those witnesses who are necessary to the trial of the issues involved in the case. 114 These witnesses include those requested by the defense. The trial counsel is authorized to subpoena as a witness, at government expense, any civilian who is to be a material witness and who is within any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and can compel the attendance of such a civilian. 115 Civilian witnesses usually are willing to attend a trial voluntarily when it is clearly understood that their expenses plus a fee will be paid. Consequently, unless there is reason to believe that the witness will not attend without personal service of a subpoena, all that is necessary is that subpoena in duplicate be mailed to him with a request that he sign his acceptance of service on the copy and return the signed copy to the trial counsel. Tender of fees and mileage may be made in advance. Personal service

^{114.} MCM 1951, para 115.

^{115.} UCMJ art. 46.

BANKSONTA WAS DISPOSED UZA

and arment of the bring comming to traver the fully I got all grandeles was one takennade stand to autowers of the heavy involved by the case, the property of the point of the party of Ladinde Lines required by the defense, the trial possing As intensitived to subseems as a represent its provinced an-Data committee to be an anticyted of the committee of the and is white my year of the Datted Leader, has Torrithman, a flow to acceptable out legent con-line , one flowerses have creatition of alignment of the continue of the continue to athems a brief relumenting some it is closely metersoid that their community olds a fee will be said, Commencedly, the filty breatly wid finit by the to proper the proper that we til fast Ifw ,associan a to sofyres Account Toniffs Sendin als of tolles of manifolds of appropriate that of transferre and on regress to enontenoon this saids on dark common a galact "Inches forms on your broads and course for your Under T of four and ellerge may be made in changes, respond service

^{116,} cm 1931, were 115,

should be made upon the witness in those cases in which it is believed that the witness will be unwilling to attend trial voluntarily.

before a court-martial convened in the 'hited States, its
Territories, and possessions seems a rather elementary exercise, such is not the case when the witnesses required are
foreign nationals in their own country for obviously the
trial counsel has no subposna power over them. Now then
are witnesses secured in a receiving state? A survey of
Judge Advocate Officers located in seven countries in which
we have servicemen stationed was conducted by the writer to
find the practical approach to this and other questions. The
major conclusion which the writer was able to deduce was
that a different situation arose not only in different countries but also within different areas of the same country.

Article VII, 1(a) of the NATO Agreement provides that "the military authorities of the sending State shall have the right to exercise within the receiving State all criminal and disciplinary jurisdiction conferred on them by the law of the sending State over all persons subject to the military law of

^{116.} Supra note 114.

th believed that the william will, by contiling to street at the bringing of the best for the bringing of the best first transfer at the bringing th

Theorem a construction of the obligation of server, like approve a construct that in the leafest all server, like the server and posteristons server a relief all converts that a server all server and the server all server and the server all servers and the server at the server at the server at the server at the server as the server at the server and the server and

Article VII, 114) of the last Agranant brailed that the line of the last of th

Mr. Sugar coles This.

that Itate.' This means the right of courts-martial of the sending states to sit in the receiving state has been considered and provided for.

In the case of civilian employees whose presence is desired at a court-martial, they are merely asked to appear at a designated time. Usually the superior of the individual is approached and arrangements made for his release without penalty from his work. None of the commands surveyed indicated they had ever had any difficulty in these situations.

The attendance of dependents as witnesses at a courtmartial appears to be no special problem. Usually a request from the appropriate authority is all that is necessary to insure their presence.

As noted earlier in this paper, Article VII, paragraph 6(a) contains a general provision which requires reciprocal assistance "in the collection and production of evidence."

One author on this subject has stated that it was contemplated that under this provision receiving states would be obligated to compel the attendance of their nationals. 117

It appears that only the United States 118 and the United

^{117.} Snee and Pye, Status of Forces Agreement: Criminal Jurisdiction at 95 (1957).

^{118.} Service Courts of Friendly Foreign Forces Act, 22 U.S.C. 703.

To the contract of attitude of attitude to the second of a second statement of a second

There is a little of the state of the state

Interpretation of the contraction of the contract of the contr

Line and the state of the state

AND ADDRESS TOURS OF PRODUCE PRODUCE POWER AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS

Lingdon 119 have implemented the obligation. One tass Judge Advocate replied to the above matter by attains,

On rare occasions when witnesses are needed, to just ask them if they will attend, which they usually do and of course we pay those authorized allowances to them. If the witnesses were not willing to attend we would request the aid of the police in obtaining a subpoena. There does not appear to have been any problems in this field.

Another Staff Judge Advocate in Spain replied:

With regard to witnesses we do have problems. Spanish nationals have a reluctance to testify at our courts-martial and unless they are vital, we normally don't use them. When we must have them to perfect a case, the local police or Guardia Civil have been most cooperative and helpful in accordance with our agreement with then. The witnesses are of course compensated in accordance with our regulations for witness fees, etc. In actual practice, if the Spanish "victim" doesn't come willingly, we tend to use Commanding Officers Non-Judicial Punishment as an expedient wherever possible. Quite naturally we try not to raise any major issues, but where we must have a witness and he refuses to cooperate, we forward a request to the Mixed Commission via the country representative.

Where a member of a visiting force is tried in a court of the receiving state he is, on the other hand, entitled "to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, if they are within the jurisdiction of the receiving state."

The receiving state can summon members of the

^{119.} Snee and Pye, supra note 117 at 97.

^{120.} See Art. VII, para 9(d) Appendix A.

Alessand Torre Service and a children of the later for the state of the later and the later of t

The test of the state of the second s

AMERICA STATE OF STREET, STREE

Alta tepung to viltoesses or do many proteon, System on the bare a peliantaking to bettley and some post of the part of the case of t we nevently don't use them, will be used first with tre negling front and pasts a fingling of anyth AME SYNTHETION AND THAT THE SOUTHWEST, WAS of it is according to the samples of the less the Minimiser of Selection and of Selection Selections inseries with the promption of the application of Tends, vot. In action I consider, 17 the species really then in Albertilly our Paper belief Designation Officers for a fair faithful building as and security of the colorest substitute and colorest and STAGE THE ADDRESS OF THE SELECT OF THE PERSON SEED OF and appropriate and naturally and have naturally a property and we formed a vocated to the mand comment of the _britishmanners triamed and

Dense of the contract of the property property of the contract to the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract to the contract of the contract

Live does not you page 9(0) doesed in you.

visiting force as rell as its own notionals, though it may need the assistance of the commanding officer to effect service on a base. 121 It would seem then, a member of a force may be more effectively protected when tried by a foreign court than when tried by a court-martial.

United States court-martial refuse to testify on the grounds that his testimony may tend to incriminate him? In a 1956 case tried in Japan, 122 a Forean national called as a witness did just that. The Korean had charges bending against him in a Japanese court. The law officer properly overruled the witness and ordered him to testify pointing out that Article 31 extends only to prosecution under the laws of the United States, that the witness was not subject to the territorial jurisdiction of any American court, and that the privilege is bersonal to the witness and the accused cannot complain. This holding appears to be logically sound for several reasons: First, it is not the duty or power of one State, or of its courts, to be concerned in the criminal law of another State. It could not be otherwise!

^{121.} Snee and Pye, supra note 117 at 94.

^{122.} Cf., United States v. Murphy, 7 U.S.C.M.A. 32 21 C.M.R. 158 (1956).

The PI Assembly pales of the cent APP or clean as been a solitable of the cent and the cent and

The state of the s

THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE

cies and rules of other legal systems even though those
States any have civil or common law histories; further, a
State risks error and adds great burdens in attempting to
master another State's systems. Thirdly, the Constitution
prohibits an invasion of privacy only in those proceedings
over which the Sovernment has control. Our Government has
no control over the proceedings, say, in Japan. Lastly, a
law officer cannot as a practical matter judicially note
Korean, Japanese or the law of any other foreign sovereignty.
To attempt to do so would not only be foothardy but it would
impose too great a burden on our military judges.

Under the MATO Agreement, the United States has assumed the obligation of assisting the authorities of the receiving State in the collection and production of evidence for use in trials by the receiving State. Certainly it can be argued that orders to give such testimony to a foreign court is either actually or potentially in compliance with the obligations assumed under the treaty to assist the foreign authorities in the collection and production of such evidence. In the case of United States v. Murphy, 123 Judge Quinn expressly referred

^{123.} Supra note 122.

WHEN AND REAL PROPERTY AND REAL PROPERTY AND REAL PROPERTY. THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS. IN ACCUMANT TRANSMISSION OF PERSONS NAMED AND ADDRESS. the appropriate the state of the last two power states \$2000. THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE professions where the part of the property of the property of the profession of the and Johnson and Archive on a community and adding them the desired one loss reconstituences to be a least of the Man patholists with the land of the same of the same ANY OF TAXABLE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDR bindy All the Whymiden by the law Lord on all of mendance? promise that the new part of their test because DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDRES and whom one to make the common our authorizes to regard our way MANUEL TO THE ENGINEERING AND INSCRIPTION OF SPECIMEN AND ADDRESS OF SPECIMEN ADDRESS OF SPECIMEN AND ADDRESS OF SPECIMEN to became and more of all alleged. "Organ providence and an alleged at Made orders the eight made leavisating by a foreign many in editory AND THE PARTY OF STREET, AND SPECIAL PROPERTY AND SECTION. BUT BARRY AND ADDRESS AND PARKAGE OF TAXABLE AND TAXABLE PROPERTY. while off the proposition where he introduces you in front her wife Description of the same of the

AND MINE WAR AND ALLE

Igreement 124 in recorving judgment on this precise question.

The Administrative Agreement under Article III of the Security

Treaty with Japan provides that "the authorities of the United

States and Japan shall cooperate in making vailable witnesses"

for criminal proceedings in their respective tribunals. Judge

minn, in referring to this provision, said:

If this provision extends to the use of the process of one government to compel a witness, not otherwise amendable to the process of the other government, to appear and testify, I doubt that such a witness can be forced to incriminate himself.

Certainly to cooperate in making available witnesses does not contemplate requiring those witnesses to testify, for to do so would be a clear violation of our Fifth Amendment. Judge Quinn is absolutely correct.

^{124.} Sunra note 12, 3 U.S.T. 3354, Art. XVII, sec. 3(e).

and to me out of plants of the to make the same of the

distability no community to many a continue of termine there procontinue this security them without no termine, for the come well or a clear violence of our filts assument, Junea Selves to assume the contribution of our filts assument, Junea

AND HERE ADDR AND AREA APPEALANCE AND APPLANTAGE APPLANTAGE

VII. CONCLUTIONS

The fears and doubts that our servicemen would be tried by "kangaroo courts" or that the signatories to the NATO-50FA would refuse to waive jurisdiction in concurrent jurisdiction type situations, as well as a host of other imagined evils did not materialize when the NATO-50FA came into effect. These doubts were expressed not only in Congress but throughout the United States wherever Americans gathered because these same doubts were reflected in our news media.

While the agreements have not proven to be the panacea for all of the problems which have arisen as a result of the global dispersion of our armed forces, all available evidence indicates our visiting forces have been treated fairly, impartially and often more leniently than they might have been at home. The agreements have done the job for which they were intended. Thus the early attacks on SOFA have been proven to be unjustified.

The SOFA have at least provided a workable device with which our visiting military forces have been able to function although sometimes only because of the combined efforts of host State officials and our military representatives. As

^{125.} Supra note 63 at 18.

which and his addressing the first english has been appeared by the first and his addressing and had be the tenture or properly by the first and the first errors and market alone a first trained to take a sa first all addressing and the first and the fir

The self-of the residence and or prover to the common of the feet of the first of the residence and the self-of the self-of the residence of our residence and the self-our states of our residence, and residence of our residence of the self-our states and the self-our states of the self-our states and the self-our states are self-our states and the self-our states and the self-our states

to a training the contract of the property of the contract of

THE REPRESENTED AND ASSESSED.

subjected to unfair treatment or incarcerated for acts
which violate our own principles of justice, these agreements are in the best interests of the United States. In
almost every instance the agreements while taking into consideration local problems, have evolved into mutually satisfactory arrangements.

Istration and implementation of the treaties and agreements should not be unexpected for this is a relatively new kind of law. New to all who must work with it. The area of waivers, it seems clear to the writer, is one which may well be improved. Possibly a clearer definition or classification of offenses would expedite the determination as to which country has jurisdiction, and thus dispel the occasional difficulties which have arisen over this question in the past. All too often the factthat the SOFA resolve problems of jurisdiction and not the guilt or innocence of the accused is overlooked. However, it is now clear substantial justice is achieved and this was the primary goal.

In case after case one fact is most apparent, and that is the outstanding performance of duty of the service lawyers.

Tone of the set of the

The constraint has been encountered in the electron and encounter laboration and keylonders and the laboration and keylonders and the second and the contract of the second at the contract of the second at the sec

CANT DESCRIPTION AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY AND TH

As lone as the armed forces of this country continue to utilize the competent service lawyers in the implementation of these agreements, the cooperation of foreign officials will continue to be nutured and problems minimized!

and michigan quantities and the server amount of the server and th

APPENDIX A

Article VII, NATO SOFA Agreement

- 1. Subject to the provisions of this Article,
 (a) the military authorities of the sending State
 shall have the right to exercise within the
 receiving State all criminal and disciplinary
 jurisdiction converred on them by the law of
 the sending State over all persons subject to
 the military law of that State;
 - (b) the authorities of the receiving State shall have jurisdiction over the members of a force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to offences committed within the territory of the receiving State and punishable by the law of that State.
- 2. (a) The military authorities of the sending State shall have the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over persons subject to the military law of that State with respect to offences, including offences relating to its security, punishable by the law of the sending State, but not by the law of the receiving State.

(b) The authorities of the receiving State shall have the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over members of a force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to offences, including offences relating to the security of that State, punishable by its law but not by the law of the sending State.

(c) For the purposes of this paragraph and of paragraph 3 of this Article a security offense against a State shall include

- (i) treason against the State;
 (ii) sabotage, espionage or violation of any law relating to official secrets of that State, or secrets relating to the national defence of that State.
- 3. In cases where the right to exercise jurisdiction is concurrent the following rules shall apply:

 (a) The military authorities of the sending State

shall have the primary right to exercise

arthole Wil, MATO ENVA Aprecents

- 1. septest to the convertion of the initial convertion of the conv
- tar such control of the control of the following of the following of the control of the control
- 3. (a) The cilibry entropy of the mending standard was any care that are the mending standard that are the test of the mending to the cilibration of the cilibration of the colour that the court that, cando of the colour that are the colour than of the colour that are the colour than of the mending of the colour than of the mending of the colour than the colour th

have the state of the model of the control of the c

(c) For the parameter this parameter affects of the contract a State

(1) tremmon mentres the fate (1) cabolines of any (1) cabolines, carponage of shall have been considered of the fate, or remarks followed to the methods deficient of the fate.

Occupantions the following relate to everyse destination to concentrate the following relate small somites of the somites the state of the somiting black when the originary right to contains

jurisdiction over a member of a force or of a civilian component in relation to

(i) offences solely against the property or security of that State, or offences solely against the person or property of another member of the force or civilian component of that State or of a dependent:

(ii) offences arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official

duty.

(b) In the case of any other offence the authorities of the receiving State shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction.

- (c) If the State having the primary right decides not to exercise jurisdiction, it shall notify the authorities of the other State as soon as practicable. The authorities of the other State having the primary right shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other State for a waiver of its right in cases where that other State considers such waiver to be of particular importance.
- 4. The foregoing provisions of this Article shall not imply any right for the military authorities of the sending State to exercise jurisdiction over persons who are nationals of or ordinarily resident in the receiving State, unless they are members of the force of the sending State.
- 5. (a) The authorities of the receiving and sending States shall assist each other in the arrest of members of a force or civilian component or their dependents in the territory of the receiving State and in handing them over to the authority which is to exercise jurisdiction in accordance with the above provisions.

(b) The authorities of the receiving State shall notify promptly the military authorities of the sending State of the arrest of any member of a force or civilian component

or a dependent.

(c) The custody of an accused member of a force or civilian component over whom the receiving State is to exercise jurisdiction shall, if he is in the hands of the sending State, remain with that State until he is charged by the receiving State.

turisdiction ones a maner of a form or un a pirilian paragraph in selling a (1) offwarene maintenance and report of amountly to ... where four to warepower tribute to oregon and fonface violes - Ilyio to recol of to wedge vertame to a learn education of Physicians are at a , they become b.

ילן הו ירוכנו בר בותם פעד של שון דות כדי ני... talotive is someroured and all and motal with.

-/Your end esentio tento the to see out of and the design of the second and the party

- Artenes richt to execte jurioitetion. It the first marine the crimery that weekless not to marcine jurishing on it whall motify an more the selection of the original and wends and to me!AltorDim exT to mines when avia liane and a receipt the private state sympacimatic commiserables to a cenusual from the extraction of the color of the color The court was transfer of the city of the court was Initiation to ad or invited made and the column state .10700700701
- and from all the state of this latter and an an amount and and to add to the state of the al column and another are no helpolotical electric electrical of of the or or ingrify realist in to resign a manual real rewater miles of the rest of the medical sta

(0)

5. (a) The subjustition of the recording and conding to trained to reasts one of today of the manage of and all this temporary that to some the little to so to the termitter of the reseiving State and in handles the over to and round of milerosites asignment at rolly threaten and with the start provided the

Alarm and my/water and to anidigowith and (4) which will be and to sold branches over 114s and place or all 100 per of the appropriate of a restant of the restant to the restant to , instruction a yo

to about to in thomas beaution on to about my (a) salving of all oders contribute and spoty two descends asilivin jurgedischen soull, if he is the bound of the state of the middle their . Made politically will be presented at Illiner wheth daily allowers 6. (a) The authorities of the receiving and sending States shall assist each other in the carrying out of all necessary investigations into offences, and in the collection and production of evidence, including the seizure and, in proper cases, the handing over of objects connected with an offence. The handing over of such objects may, however, be made subject to their return within the time specified by one authority delivering them.

(b) The authorities of the Contracting Parties shall notify one another of the disposition of all cases in which there are concurrent rights to exercise jurisdiction.

7. (a) A death sentence shall not be carried out in the receiving State by the authorities of the sending State if the legislation of the receiving State does not provide

for such punishment in a similar case.

- (b) The authorities of the receiving State shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the sending State for assistance in carrying out a sentence of imprisonment pronounced by the authorities of the sending State under the provision of this Article within the territory of the receiving State.
- 8. Where an accused has been tried in accordance with the provisions of this Article by the authorities of one Contracting Party and has been acquitted, or has been convicted and is serving, or has served, his sentence or has been pardoned, he may not be tried again for the same offence within the same territory by the authorities of another Contracting Party. However, nothing in this paragraph shall prevent the military authorities of the sending State from trying a member of its forces for any violation of rules of discipline arising from an act or omission which constituted an offence for which he was tried by the authorities of another Contracting Party.
- 9. Whenever a member of a force or civilian component or a dependent is prosecuted under the jurisdiction of a receiving State he shall be entitled-

(a) to a prompt and speedy trial;

(b) to be informed, in advance of trial, of the specific charges made against him;

(c) to be confronted with witnesses against him;

S. (a) 'An abrogation of the control of the control

(E) The outlier of the Cart store in the continue of the Cart store in the cart to a state of the cart to a state

?. (e) A double remember well met be arried cut in the receifur blace by the authorities of the mallocation if the legislation of the secondar state cost on arotic for such a miniment is at list one.

() The there is a function of the first of the second of t

- - or a department is prospected under the jorialistics of a re-

Larry throng bus demons a by (a) -- --

and to farth to accepte of , heart but of (a)

THE STEEL STREET WHEN ADMINISTRAL

The Profess comments of the Endocrines at an (o)

(d) to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his from, if they are within the jurisdiction of the receiving State;

to have legal representation of his own choice for his defence or to have free or assisted legal representation under the conditions prevailing for the time being in the receiving State:

(f) if he considers it necessary, to have the services of a competent interpreter; and

- to communicate with a representative of the Government of the sending State and, when the rules of the court permit, to have such a representative present at his trial.
- (a) Regularly constituted military units or formations of a force shall have the right to police any camps, establishments or other premises which they occupy as the result of an agreement with the receiving State. The military police of the force may take all appropriate measures to ensure the maintenance of order and security on such premises.
- (b) Outside these premises, such military police shall be employed only subject to arrangements with the authorities of the receiving State, and in liaison with those authorities, and in so far as such employment is necessary to maintain discipline and order among the members of the force.
- 11. Each Contracting Party shall seek such legislation as it deems necessary to ensure the adequate security and protection within its territory of installations, equipment, property, records and official information of other Contracting Parties, and the punishment of persons who may contravene laws enacted for that purpose.

- Die getatenje von nessent producen een een (e) DIE sliefer en took Ti voers nie zij seen en gevaal getalenve en na degraafs van

to into the strong and an interest of all and of the least of the least of the least of the strong of the least of the strong of

The second of th

10. (a) manufactor comeditated will been united for triesbiome of a form epolit increased right to replace any comedactions of a common or other common of a common of a common of the common of t

(h) Extende the entries minimum minimum and military collections of male and military collections of the extension of the entries of the entr

PO A	275 FT 1	19.22	73 0 CT	63	AND	c 199 a	PST 2 5 PST	0
1 . 42	1 4 5 1	5 5 56'	I Fr how I	04,	23 757 5 6	12 . 3 . 23	(3,5) (4)	34
1 43	Sandhard Taril	11/1	V 23.50 F	40 20	67-64 L.S	A. P. A. E. E.	I had be had	200

THOMAS OF STREET WAS STREET FOR	AGI.
United States Supreme Court	
Abel v. United States, 362 U.S. 217 (1960)	59
Cleary v. Solger, 371 U.S. 392 (1963)	74
Coleman v. Tennessee, 97 U.S. 509 (1878)	7
Dow v. Johnson, 100 U.S. 158 (1879)	7
Kinsella v. Krueger, 354 U.S. 1 (1957)	8
Rea v. United States, 350 U.S. 214 (1955)	73
Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1 (1957)	8
The Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon, 11 U.S. 116 7 Cranch (1812)	36
United States v. Grigsby, 335 F.2d 652 (1964)	78
Wilson v. Girard, 354 U.S. 524 (1957)8, 12,	34
United States Courts of Appeals	
Best v. United States, 184 F.2d 131 (1950), cert. denied, 340 U.S. 939 (1951)	78
Grewe v. France, 75 F. Supp. 433 (1948)	78
Keefe v. Dulles, 222 F.2d 390 (D.C. Cir. 1954) cert. denied, 348 U.S. 952 (1955)	14

CONTROL OR CASE NO SCIENTISE

	Francia provide a partial
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
j=	12 05 001 001 000 000 000 000 000 000 000
7-	(1975)
8.1	Come w. Jaconson, 198 0.5. 159 (1879)
1	1957) ************************************
77	11255
	Ne1d v. commey 750 D.J. I (17)7)
ic	The solution of the control of the solution of
79	10160 50 200 V 000 10 00 00 65
0	17 con 20 (17)
	believed to throat swarps worked
14	200 v. Cultur Seeten, 181 r. 34 131 (1950), on t.
1	Green v. Vrance. 75 V. Depp. A55 (1948)
KLI	acte v. 1012-0, 525 105 (0.0, 647, 1054)

PAG
Powell v. Zuckert, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit No. 19,793 decided July 28, 1956 75
Saylor v. United States, 35 U.S. L. Week 2006 (Ct. Claims June 15, 1966)
United States ex rel Demrois v. Farrell, 87 F.2d 957 (8th Cir. 1937), cert. denied, 302 U.S. 683 (1937)
United States v. Grigsby, 335 F.2d 652 (1964) 78
United States Court of Military Appeals
United States v. Biesak, 3 U.S.C.N.A. 714, 14 C.M.R. 132 (1954)
United States v. Cadenhead, 14 U.S.C.M.A. 271, 34 C.M.R. 51 (1963)
United States v. Carter, 15 U.S.C.M.A. 277, 36 C.M.R. 433 (1966)
United States v. Crawford, 15 U.S.C.M.A. 31, 35 C.M.R. 3 (1964)
United States v. Culley, 12 U.S.C.M.A. 704, 31 C.H.R. 290 (1962)
United States v. Curtin, 9 U.S.C.M.A. 427, 26 C.M.R. 207 (1958)
United States v. DeLeo, 5 U.S.C.M.A. 148, 17 C.M.R. 148 (1954)
United States v. Dial, 9 U.S.C.M.A. 700, 26 C.M.R. 480 (1958)
United States v. Doyle, 1 U.S.C.M.A. 545, 4 C.M.R. 137 pet. denied, 4 C.M.R. 174 (1952) 59, 60
United States v. Ekenstam, 7 U.S.C.M.A. 168, 21 C.M.B. 294 (1956)

	to those setsoid intimal processor of figure
	Cathorine no. This and they have all the resident
25	and hour can all and it grants too in an outral
	SC. VE .fireng .v wacened is an autore raind .v. v.
	Name of the Associate of the Party of the State of the St
	Sinema restitit by Just and my today
ήž	74 104 104
	detend Skeine vicketennerig it D.B.dinie. 273, No. 128531
	G.F.T. 432 (1956)
(2)	Cara and an analysis of the contract of the co
m.	Tradition of the Cold of the C
	28 70 42 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
18	73,738 (101,0,000) (101,000) (101,000) (101,000) (101,000) (101,000) (101,000)
	101 100 7 101 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
	Contract orange of Contract of Contract Contract of Co
	TO SEAL ASSESSMENT TO SEATING THE PARTY TO THE PARTY OF T

	PAGL
United States v. Grasso, ? U.S.C.M.A. 566, 23 C.M.R. 30 (1957)	24
United States v. Grisham, 4 U.S.C.M.A. 694, 16 C.M.R. 268 (1954)	15
United States v. Rauffman, 14 U.S.C.M.A. 283, 34 C. R. 63 (1963)	41
United States v. Kirchner, 1 U.S.C.M.A. 477, 4 C.M.R. 69 (1952)	, 50
United States v. Murphy, 7 U.S.C.M.A. 32, 21 C.M.R. 158 (1956)	88
United States v. Rhodes, 3 U.S.C.M.A. 73, 11 C.M.R. 73 (1953)	59
United States v. Schultz, 1 U.S.C.M.A. 512, 4 C.M.B. 104 (1952)	52
United States v. Sinigar, 6 U.S.C.M.A. 330, 20 C.M.R. 46 (1955)	31
United States v. Smith, 13 U.S.C.M.A. 553, 33 C.M.H. 85 (1963)	70
United States v. Summers, 13 U.S.C.M.A. 573, 33 C.M.R. 105 (1963)	58
United States v. Volante, 4 U.S.C.M.A. 689, 16 C.M.R. 263 (1954)	60
Board of Review Decisions	
ACM 11674, Copeland, 21 C.M.R. 838 (1956)	37
ACM 16766, Frischolz, 29 C.M.R. 852 (1960)	26
NCM 58-00130, Hillan, 26 C.M.R. 771 (1958)	58
CM 397481, Hunt, 27 C.M.B. 557 (1958)	49
CM 407757, Lowe, 32 C.M.R. 597 (1962) pet. denied, 32 C.M.R. 472 (1962)	48

IS	Oracle Total Control of the Control
pi	We get and the control of the second second
30	/ 27/ 1. U. U. T.
	10 pt
100	When being versees, 3 C. S. C. M. J. J. G. W.
鼓	Walted Otesans of Santa of Santa Colored Color
DC.	
04	Mothed andres = relate, 35 C.C.C.T.A. 553, 73
70	United Atlanta . 19 to 19 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
100	native States v. majear A. W. L. C 539, Ide
	tontules regret to brand
77	Aca 17674, com tong 21 Com. a. 838 (1956)
188	MUN 16765, Principa, 29 C.M.R. 352 (1986)
	NEW 38-80190, Gillow, SC C.N.S. 799. (1950)
	C# 797431, Demo, 37 G.H.T. 597 (1950)
10	28 409757, toom, 32 0,8,8, 597 (1961) <u>265</u>

Hearings

(22 U.S.C. 703)....

Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee on Operation of Article VII NATO Status of Forces Treaty, 89th Cong. 2nd Sess. (1966)

Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, 84th Cong. 1st Sess. on the Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Agreement (1955)

Hearings on H.R. 3744 and H.R. 7646, Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, 84th Cong., 2d Sess. (1956)

Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee on Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1960)

Senate Committee on Armed Services Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty, S. Report #1041, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1961)

Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services United States Senate 89th Congress, 2nd Sess. on the Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Agreement (1966)

	6 4 5 4 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
500	THE SETTING MAY BE CALLED AND LINES AND
	THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TO PERSON ASSESSED IN
68	
	Section 1/2 The Party Control of the Party Control
II.	server to a server de la
68	don named to be a visit to be

CHARLES THE

Desgrage Unions a resonalities of the lemans level copess Countries on Countries of Latel VII mile Viatories of Lord Series Cons. 2nd Series (1956)

Howelfur Tolors State of the Countries on Live of the Countries on Live of the Countries of Articles of Articles

Constant un n.T. 37/14 and M.P. 7646, Daboos 15ten of the boun Constant on march Eurole s. 2018 tens. 24 ans. (1976)

Torons County to to the place of the Sanaka America Torons County the County of Article VII, walke

Manual Carelline on Accessor Depoted on Association of Association (11) UATO Statem of Former Treaty, 5, Report Fills, Dry Word, July Seen, (1961)

destrict being a constant of the destrict on a second of the destrict of the second of

Unifo	ora Co	ode	of	P.	1	1 t	27	77	Ĵ	7.7.5	rt	: 3 :	ce	100												PA	N dat
UC J	Art. Art. Art.	2				• •	0 0		• •		• •		• •		• •		• •			• •			0	1	9,	, 13	
anus	ol for	· Co	ur	5.5	- 15	ar	ti	8		(19	5	1)														
Para	12 39(b) 152	• • •	• • •	• • •		• •	• •			• •	• •	•	• •			•	• •	•	 •	• •	•	•	•	• •		3	12 17 34

Texts

Myde, International Law 819 (2d ed., 1945)

Oppenheim, International Law (Vol. I, 8th ed., Lauterpacht 1955)

Perkins, Criminal Law (1957)

Snee and Pye, Status of Forces Agreement: Criminal Jurisdiction (Oceans Publications, 1957)

Para 115...........

U. S. Dep't of Army Pamphlet, No. 27-9, Military Justice Handbook, The Law Officer (1958)

Articles

King, Jurisdiction Over Friendly Armed Porces, 35 Am. J. Int'1. L. 539 (1942).

> Further Developments Concerning Jurisdiction Over Priendly Foreign Armed Forces, 40 Am. J. Int'l. L. 257 (1946).

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement and International Law, 50 Nw. U. L. Rev. 349 (1955). Re.

Rouse and Baldwin, The Exercise of Criminal Jurisdiction Under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, 51 Am. J. Int'l L. 29 (1957).

STATE .
CONTROL COLL DE STANKET FORMER
— р. породно пород в продости по вод в в в в в в в в в в в в в в в в в
I Dell Julius - Warms for I work
Lyder, incompressed law 81 (16 ed., 10AS)
Apperbale, International Let (001. I. 8th ed., Lasternathe
restant, granted toy (1957)
Some and dye, finite of Parent erroment: Criminal Littletter, 1997 to a Littletter (Described Colors, 1997)
V. S. Lette W. Complete vo. 22-2, Caltron value
nololera
thing Just all the tree Patently trees to the fail of
Term of the land o
In malescaped the framework secret to prince OTAR out and
all little in the last of all appropriate to appropriate the second of the last of the las

tanger, Criminal Jurisdiction Over Visiting Armed Forces, 52 U.S. Naval War College, International Law Studies, 1957-1958 (1965).

Trial Observer, U. S. Dep't of Army Pamohlet, No. 27-100-34, Military Law Review - Volume 34 (1956)

Student lotes

Poreign Jurisdiction and the American Soldier, 1958 Wis. L. Rev. 52 (1958)

Criminal Jurisdiction Over American Armed Forces Abroad, 70 Harv. L. Rev. 1043 (1957)



thesP935
Some aspects of the impact of a status o

3 2768 000 99543 5
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY