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Concerning Sentences pronounced by Foreign Tribunals.

By Dr. E. Zürcher, Professor of Law, University of Zurich, Switzerland.

Ought an individual condemned in one country for a crime to escape the consequences of that condemnation, direct and indirect, by going to another country? It seems to us that categorical one may reply to that question with an unreserved negative. The interest of the state in which the judge has pronounced the sentence of condemnation requires that that sentence should be respected and executed in all circumstances. The interest of the state where the criminal has taken refuge, on the other hand, requires that its population should be purged, as far as possible, of those criminal elements which are a menace to the life and property of its people and are a source of moral contamination as well. Consequently, that country must protect itself as well as the country where the sentence was pronounced. Not only is each country to be protected, but the common interests of civilization ought to be safeguarded. Nevertheless, cases which might arise must put the question in a different way. The application of the principle just laid down may vary.

The execution of sentences which deprive the accused of liberty is assured in the most important cases by the laws of extradition. In federated states the execution of the penalty can be deferred. The Swiss law on extradition says that the federal council, with the consent of all interested, authorize the penalty to be carried out in a prison of the country of sentence imposed abroad.
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Besides penalties involving the loss of liberty the new codes for Switzerland, Austria and Germany provide for certain measures of protection consisting in part of deprivation of liberty: for habitual criminals, for irresponsible persons, and for sending to proper institutions vagrants and drunkards. If one of these measures has been pronounced in a sentence declaring the author of a crime guilty, for which extradition is granted, this can be demanded, provided the obligation to extradite is according to the crime and not according to the nature of the punishment or the measure pronounced. It follows, that the law of extradition cannot be invoked, for example, if the person has been sent to the insane asylum as a dangerous individual, against whom prosecution must be suspended.

If measures of protection are assured up to a certain point it is to be feared that courts may apply them only to natives and content themselves with simply expelling foreigners. Thus the proposed code of Austria provides only for the imprisonment of natives who are habitual criminals: for foreigners it is expulsion. Between countries having the same kind of laws agreements might be concluded by virtue of which the country of origin would be charged with itself applying the ulterior curative treatment to dangerous criminals, to tramps and drunkards. That would be preferable to simply expelling them.

But the most important and the most complex question is how to proceed with reference to accessory penalties and the judicial consequences of a penalty which restrains for a time the exercise of civil rights.

The question of recidivism would seem more simple. The laws differ greatly on this point. They recognize two sorts, simple recidivism and repeated recidivism.
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Another subject to be considered is the retention of enunciation
of sentence to the principle under consideration. A condemnation abroad ought to be taken into consideration as well as a penalty pronounced in the country. Experience shows that the conditional delay of sentence exercises a happy influence on the condemned and leads to reform if the conditions are carefully observed. The judge may well be left to decide in each individual case when this is to be taken into consideration.

(The paper contains many references to Swiss and other laws which must necessarily be omitted here.)
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Criminal Sentences in Foreign Countries.

By A. Le Poittevin, Professor of Law.

University of Paris.

1. Crime knows no frontier, but the frontiers limit the domain of penal law and repressive sentences. A nation does not carry out the sentences of an alien country. A sentence passed by a tribunal is executed only in the country where it is passed. But in this discussion we are not to consider the executions of sentences, nor extradition, nor the competency of one or more states in dealing with the same criminal act. We are supposing that the person convicted of crime by any given state has suffered the penalty before venturing into other lands. The country in which he now finds himself has no judicial motive to prosecute him anew for the crime which caused the sentence elsewhere.

2. But even after the expiration of the sentence the judgment lasts, and brings, or may bring, certain consequences in its train:

   In the first place the convict is affected in his rights, because of the moral unfitness that his crime has betrayed. In the next place, he is threatened with more severe punishment should he again break the law.

3. These consequences may occur only in the country that condemned, and not elsewhere. No sovereignty recognizes any penal sentences which have not been pronounced in its name; at least it does not attach to them any positive effect. Consequently, officially an alien judgment does not count. In going to another country, the convict arrives in an integrated status, with all the rights of an honest man. Legally he will be a first offender if some day, (which unfortunately
Criminal Sentences in Foreign Countries

A. E. Pottington, Professor of Law

University of Toronto
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If these old principles are outgrown we shall see that an effort has been made to improve upon them. Several remedies have been proposed to meet this situation, which neither satisfies the idea of justice nor gives social security.

4. If the convict is an alien in the country which he wishes to enter he may run the risk of not being admitted, or of being expelled, as an "undesirable immigrant". Several legislatures have showed a tendency to preserve themselves from a dangerous immigration and have affirmed the right to keep out persons who have been convicted of felony, or any other crime implying moral turpitude. (Art. 2 law of Feb. 20, 1907, U.S. and the English law Aug. 11, 1905, article.)

5. Our problem then must confine itself to the native-born, since we cannot turn them back whatever their past has been. Besides, they are the ones who will exercise the most rights, unless their previous convictions elsewhere shall make that impossible. For cause seeing that all legislatures even now limit, more or less, the legal rights of foreigners, because of their quality as aliens.

In considering the native-born then we will consider them in three divisions:

I. Disqualification.

II. Recidivism.

III. International exchange of sentences pronounced for penal offenses.

I. It is evidently a grave imprudence to allow an ex-convict, on his return to his own country, to have a complete exercise of his rights, but at the same time it seems difficult to give effect to an alien sentence in that which concerns forfeitures and disqualifications which might be the result of his crime. . This
It is not improbable (as Lallemand into crime).

If these principles are not known, we shall see that no effort has been made to improve upon them. Several amendments have been proposed to meet this situation, which threaten a serious lack of social security.

It is the complaint to be made in the country, which is wise to enter upon an essay on the risk of not being satisfied with the general legislative changes that have shown a tendency to preserve freedom from a general immobility and have allowed the right to keep one's pastimes, who have been concerned.

It is to be seen of any other crime implying money to the Act of 1690, U.E., and the county law, Act of 1709, Art. 8 and our examples that cannot relate to the late-penal codes.

Even if our present, past member, their part, or the other, there is one who will exercise the most rights, unless their true position or condition is such that it is impossible for the present situation to be one of the rights of transfer that they may become, more or less, the same.

In considering the matter, we will consider the same.
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Benedicto multum alinux.
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is the more difficult because one cannot know the circumstances of the crime and a priori cannot always have absolute faith in the decision of a court differently organized.

There is another consideration: penal disqualifications vary according to different codes.

7. All this is expressed in a special action which has often been called "l'action en déchéance", by which the court may pronounce against the nativeborn, who has been convicted of crime abroad, the same disqualifications that he would have incurred had he been convicted in his own country. This action has been approved by the International Prison Congress. The vote passed by the Congress of Paris, and which it is to be hoped will be passed by the Washington Congress, is as follows.

"First Section; third question. Response. It is desirable that the nativeborn convicted of crime or offense against the common law abroad should incur, in his own country the same forfeitures, disqualifications and deprivations that he would have incurred had he been convicted there. In the present state of international law the Congress does not demand that these forfeitures, disqualifications, and deprivations shall be the direct result of the alien sentence, but that they shall be pronounced as the consequence of special action in the courts of his own country."

There are precedents for this: vix. Art 24 Prussian Code, 1851; Art. 7, Italian penal Code; French laws, Nov. 30, 1892, Art. 25 and March 21, 1905, Art. 4, 5. ; Art. 32 of Norwegian penal Code; Art. 12, Russian Code; Bill of Swiss penal Code, 1908 Art. 8.

8. There are variations in the texts of these codes. It is more just to the condemned and more in conformity with the reciprocal independence of the jurisdictions of different countries if this
In the more difficult because one cannot know the circumstances of the crime and a priori cannot being have speculating in the recision of a court differently anymore.
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In consideration of the introduction of different countries in the
action should include the verification of the foreign procedure, the estimation of the offense, legal designation of the crime, and that it should discuss the guilt of the offender, if he can present good grounds for such discussion. The action ought to leave the judges free to pronounce, or not to pronounce, the penal disqualifications; or to pronounce those less severe than the foreign sentence might have imposed. In a word the judicial decision of the action en dechecance ought to be optional. (facultatif).

The essential thing is that all legislatures should adopt this special action. It is relatively a secondary matter that they should have a variety of expression. It is even desirable that they should modify their decisions according to the countries where the sentence was given.

9. The principle being admitted, the action en dechecance is susceptible of extension. First, when private individuals bring a suit they may invoke a previous sentence against a person already convicted of crime in his own country. It would be logical that they might also invoke a sentence against the person in another country.

10. Second, the convicted person, in addition to forfeiting certain rights, may also be the subject of measures meant to reform him, to prevent his relapse into crime: surveillance of the police, prohibition of certain places of residence, etc. One does not see why he should escape these severities if they are needed for the general good of the public, simply because he has been found to be discovered abroad that he was a dangerous character.

11. Third, The preceding is on the supposition that the nativeborn returns to his own country. There is no reason why the same theories should not be applied to the foreigner, in such cases as it would advantageous.

12. Here the attention must be called to the case of a person,
a stranger here in France, for example, who had been previously convict-
ed in his own country. This has been discussed by the International
Prison Congress and the Paris Congress voted, "Section I. question
3: It is desirable that the disqualifications incurred by a person,
by reason of judgments pronounced against him for crime or offenses
against the common law by the p. tribunals of his own country, should
follow him by law into all countries."

II. 14. In considering recidivism it must be remembered that
although a former crime is the basis for it, yet there are distinc-
tions and exceptions in the construction of the conditions of re-
cidivism. A first offender may have the benefit of conditional
liberation, "la loi Berenger, as we like to say in France— and out
of France. The recidivist cannot have it. What if the first offence
has been in another country? What if the previous judgment has been
pronounced by a foreign tribunal?

15. There is one reply to make. If the foreign sentence has been
followed by an action en decheance in the country where the convict
has committed another crime the judgment of decheance has, so
to speak, naturalized the maxim first sentence; becomes
the effect is that another crime is recognized as re-
cidivism.

16. Let us look at the different codes. The Italian Code declares
that in the recognition of recidivism sentences pronounced by
alien courts are not to be counted. The French laws,
by their silence on the point, put no legal obstacle to obtaining
conditional liberation on account of foreign sentences. Reci-
divism is considered a national, not an international thing.

17. But there are other laws. According to the Norwegian law, art
61, "The court can recognize as a reason for increase of penalty
those penalties inflicted before by a foreign court as well as those pronounced at home."

The idea of an international recidivism would seem to have penetrated into Swiss penal law in a very positive way. The penal law of the canton of Geneva (Feb. 10, 1904) permits the judge to suspend sentence when the incriminated has not previously been sentenced in Switzerland or abroad. The code of Neuchâtel permits it where the accused has not been previously convicted in any other canton or in any country with which Switzerland has a treaty of extradition. Recidivism is internationalized. It might be expressed thus: The courts may declare a person to be a recidivist even though he has been convicted previously by a foreign court.

It is not however incumbent on these Congresses, whose purpose is to formulate universal principles, to embarrass itself with the details of these questions, which without the least trouble may be settled by each country for itself. But we maintain that this legal declaration of an international recidivism should be optional, as we have done for the action en dechance.

Progress is slow, but sure. The sentiment of universal human justice is a very elevated conception, but practice cannot soar so high. The universe is divided up into nations with different civilizations and even though there might be similarity of ideas yet with legal customs, and perhaps prejudices, they cannot act alike. A remnant of distrust in regard to foreign convictions survives, in spite of the need of collective organization to combat international crime. It is wiser therefore to begin with modest reforms without trying to reach the ideal with a single bound. We may, however reach the desired reform by gradual steps. The first step might be to have all accept the idea that this
declaration of recidivism should be optional. That would be the first and important stage. The judges in each country would then grow accustomed to welcome more frequently the normal results of foreign sentences. We might wish that this should become imperative, but step by step we may reach that ideal, in the course of years.

III. Whatever may be the effects that one wishes to attach in the future to sentences passed in foreign countries, it is first of all needful that they be known. There exist conventions by virtue of which two countries may transmit to each other bulletins of the sentences passed on the natives of either on the territory of the other. France, for example, thus receives reports of the sentences passed on Frenchmen by the courts of such countries with which it has concluded such a treaty. Our laws recognize this exchange, so that our courts are not ignorant of what is passing beyond our borders. But this ought to be general. Whatever our theories there can be no practical results till there is general acceptance of the formulas of international law concerning convictions. It is shocking to think that delinquents are unequally treated according to whether a countries exchange, or do not exchange, information about convictions; that convicts are known, or not known, according to the chance of their committing their first crime in one country or another.

This generalization is comparatively easy when it concerns the native-born. Each country might receive information of all the convictions of its subjects in other lands. We do not say that there would not be errors and omissions and that it would involve much clerical labor, but this is at the basis of the replies that must be given to the question. It is the first step in effective joint judicial proceedings in the domain of criminal law.

The theory is more difficult to carry out if it concerns foreigners convicted in some one country who then go on to other
III. Whatever may be the structure of the means to attack
in the future to cement union or to relieve contractions, it is at least
of no importance that they do not know. There is no consequence of any
result which cannot be known. The question is one of science of the
condition and power of the union. For example, the reception of a new
country or a new state. Our laws receive this experience, as that
country cannot be a treaty. What receives the most of such contractions, with which it is
connected, such a treaty. Our laws receive this experience, as that
country cannot be a treaty. What receives the most of such contractions, with which it is
connected, such a treaty. Our laws receive this experience, as that
country cannot be a treaty. What receives the most of such contractions, with which it is
connected, such a treaty. Our laws receive this experience, as that
lands. How to organize a method to meet these cases and to find out where they have been convicted will be difficult. But if each country had lists of all its natives convicted in other countries, by knowing the birthplace of the convict his history could be learned in this particular.

We have said that each country should receive notice of all sentences pronounced on its nativeborn. It should be added that it should send to others the court record of its native born on request of the judicial authorities. A central bureau might be organized which could furnish the necessary data to the different countries. It may be said that this is too vast a project. Nevertheless it is worth studying. If foreign criminal sentences are to have any international effect they must be known methodically.
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I am writing to inquire if you have any experience in the field of mechanics. I am especially interested in learning more about the practical applications of the concept of mechanics.

We have been planning on expanding our company's operations into new areas. It would be helpful to have some advice on how to prepare the necessary infrastructure and equipment to support this expansion.

It may be early to think about it now, but we are considering a potential move to a new location. Any information or suggestions would be greatly appreciated.

I look forward to hearing from you.
Sentences Pronounced by Foreign Tribunals.

By Dr. Alfred de Doleschall,
Professor in the University of Budapest.

Strictly speaking extradition is an act of international loyalty, a manifestation of the confidence of one country in the penal justice of another. The question under consideration is not new. More than six hundred years ago they discussed whether in case of recidivism account should be taken of sentences incurred abroad. According to our view — admitting that the question is concerning countries occupying about the same round in the ladder of civilization — there is no serious objection, either doctrinally or historically, why the question should not be answered in the affirmative. And there are good practical reasons why it should not be answered in the negative. The more international crime becomes, the less should it know any frontier. In the presence of this imperious necessity it would be puerile to hold obstinately to the principle of judicial sovereignty, to the differentiation of public law from private law. It has long been proved that in judicial matters you make no progress if you cling to formulas, dogmas, ideas, which are in a sense fossil. The difficulty is in the details.

According to the laws of the United States immigrants who have been convicted of felony can be deported. The deportation takes entirely on account of the penalty passed by that other country, and not in the least because the immigrant has come in conflict with American penal law. That is a respect for the power of foreign tribunals as could possibly be found. But that is a
preventive measure. It corresponds to the expulsion by administra-
trative process in some European countries of individuals
who would compromise the safety of the state. This shows that
extraterritorial sentences are recognized.

The question to be considered bears upon two points: ought
a sentence inflicted by a foreign country to be of effect out-
side of that country; and second, ought such a sentence to count
in the person's own country? The practical
question is whether a penalty inflicted abroad shall be consider-
ed an aggravating circumstance, as leading to a sentence provid-
ed for recidivism and is it necessary to take account of it in
an application for suspension of sentence? That is a much
more complicated question.

When it is necessary to know, in the country of the convict
if the sentence pronounced abroad ought or not, to have an ef-
fect as to the disabilities that it inflicts, he has an
undoubted right to demand that the question be decided in the
meaning of the laws of his own country, to the exclusion of the
laws of the the country in which he was convicted.
The question presents less practical interest when the convict
finds himself in another country of which he is not a
native. Still no country that admits him would grant that any
other country had a right to decide what public rights he might
have in the country in which he should find refuge.

The withdrawal of the right to exercise a liberal profession,
or one requiring special knowledge, as for example, medicine
midwifery, pharmacy etc. - the withdrawal of paternal right s,
are not repressive, but preventive measures. When through ig-
norance or by abuse of his knowledge, or powers, an person
has committed some act which reveals his moral unworthiness, the disability which is inflicted is not properly speaking a penalty, but a precaution that society takes against ignorance, unworthiness, moral weakness, or intellectual incapacity, in that person. For a long time it has been admitted that in this domain sentences rendered in foreign countries up to a certain point are of force in the land of the man's nativity. Crime ignores frontiers, so the more universal and international crime is the less should penal action be considered as being national in character, with effects limited to the territory of the country that condemns. On the other hand it must be remembered that there are great differences in penal legislation, even in countries most closely related by civilization, and that we cannot yet abandon the principle of territorial rights in the matter of penal law. It is especially impossible in all that concerns accessory penalties which have a national character.

It seems extraordinary and almost inexplicable that the most of the penal laws actually in force do not recognize in principle, either in all cases or only when the criminal is a habitual offender, that there should be no distinction between penalties the at home and the abroad so far as the purpose of the penalty is concerned. We complain with good right of the universality of crime, but what are we doing to prevent it? Here and there timid remedies are undertaken to repress certain crimes and to combat the great flood of crime and vagabondage. But one seeks in vain, in the different penal systems, for a truly international attempt to overcome cosmopolitan banditism. Yet it would not be difficult to change
international
this state of things. To begin with there should be a recognition
of penal sentences and their consequences. With a little uni-
formity in the different codes that would not be a serious matter.
We boast of our progress in penal law in modern times, but do
we not see poverty in our conceptions in the fact that even to-
day we are obliged to adopt as an axiom what was proclaimed six
hundred years ago, that in determining recidivism the penalties
incurred abroad should be of the same effect as national
penalties. For ourselves, we hold that penalties or sentences
incurred abroad should be taken into absolute consideration
intraterritorial as of the same value as sentences or penalties; and that in all
cases the recidivism must be proved, or the existence of an
aggravating circumstance, and it must be ascertained whether
suspension of sentence is applicable. In these last three
points resides the interest of the question. If a person shows
a determination to continue in wrong-doing what does it matter
which side of the frontier first developed the evil?

There is one way to arrive at the knowledge between coun-
try and country as to these matters, except through an inter-
national police register, or an exchange of penal sentences.
When such a system has been adopted there will be no more need
to depend on chance to know the criminal record of any
person. Those who profit most by the present lack of system are
the hardened offenders who are careful not to betray the
sentences they have received in other lands.
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Foreign Sentences.

By Mr. Brück-Faber, Luxembourg.

If a person has been convicted of a serious crime in another country, which would deprive him of civil rights at home, what will be the effect on his return to his own land? The exercise of those rights by antisocial persons may be dangerous to social order. A person, for instance, convicted abroad of swearing falsely, should be sufficiently suspicious in his own country to prevent his acting as a witness etc. Another person convicted of highway robbery should not be permitted to carry weapons; a father who has abused his children would not be worthy of paternal authority. It depends on circumstances then as to the deprivation of civil rights. It is certainly for the interest of government to protect the society and the family against persons with such antisocial tendencies. Whether he has been indicted at home or abroad the individuality of the person is not modified thereby. Still, it would be contrary to the ruling principles of national sovereignty to directly execute sentences imposed abroad. To reconcile these principles with public order two things may be proposed: 1. that the deprivation of civil rights pronounced by a foreign court if conformable to the laws of the country of the person condemned may be carried out there if public interest demands. 2. that it belongs to the magistrates to secure this measure in the civil courts, pertaining to foreign sentences. To this end there should be an exchange between nations of sentences which carry the deprivation of civil rights. As to those
persons who go abroad after they have been deprived of civil rights in their own country, there need be no trouble for every country has the right to expel such foreigners as dangerous to public order.

If a native who has incurred such a penalty in another country again commits a crime which would demand an aggravation of crime sentence can the former sentence be regarded as constituting an aggravation? In theory a sentence does not cross the frontier. On the basis of existing law the answer would be in the negative. The real question is should not that law be modified? To that the answer is affirmative.
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To our community, a strike which might amount
time
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