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MESSAGE
FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
TRANSMITTING
A DRAFT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ENTITLED THE "MILITARY
COMMISSIONS ACT OF 2006".

SEPTEMBER 7, 2006.—Message and accompanying papers referred to the
Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and International Re-
lations and ordered to be printed
To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit for the consideration of the Congress draft legislation entitled the “Military Commissions Act of 2006.” This draft legislation responds to the Supreme Court of the United States decision in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (2006), by establishing for the first time in our Nation’s history a comprehensive statutory structure for military commissions that would allow for the fair and effective prosecution of captured members of al Qaeda and other unlawful enemy combatants. The Act also addresses the Supreme Court’s holding that Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions applies to the conflict with al Qaeda by providing definitions rooted in United States law for the standards of conduct prescribed by Common Article 3.

The military commission procedures contained in this draft legislation reflect the result of an extended deliberation both within the executive branch and between representatives of my Administration and Members of Congress. The draft legislation would establish a Code of Military Commissions that tracks the courts-martial procedures of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, but that departs from those procedures where they would be impracticable or inappropriate for the trial of unlawful enemy combatants captured in the midst of an ongoing armed conflict, under circumstances far different from those typically encountered by military prosecutors.

Five years after the mass murders of 9/11, it is time for the United States to begin to prosecute captured al Qaeda members for the serious crimes that many of them have committed against United States citizens and our allies abroad. As we provide terrorists the justice and due process that they denied their victims, we demonstrate that our Nation remains committed to the rule of law.

I ask that the Congress carefully consider this legislation and respectfully urge its speedy passage for enactment into law.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 2006.
SUMMARY OF “MILITARY COMMISSIONS ACT OF 2006”

The Military Commissions Act of 2006 responds to the Supreme Court’s decision in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (2006), by establishing military commissions for the trial of captured members of al Qaeda and other unlawful enemy combatants. The procedures establishing commissions under the Act take the Uniform Code of Military Justice (“UCMJ”) as a starting point, but depart from those procedures to reflect the unique context of the prosecution of unlawful enemy combatants captured all over the globe under circumstances far different from those encountered by domestic law enforcement. The commissions established under this Act will provide full and fair trials to unlawful enemy combatants accused of serious offenses and will satisfy all relevant provisions of United States law and international treaties. In addition, the Act addresses the implications of the Supreme Court’s holding that Common Article 3 applies to the conflict with al Qaeda by providing definitions rooted in United States law as to the standards of conduct that will apply in United States courts.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This section provides that the title of the Act shall be the “Military Commissions Act of 2006.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. The findings explain the circumstances that occasion the need for the Act.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS. This section provides the explicit statutory authorization for the establishment of the military commissions described by this Act. The section makes clear that the affirmative establishment of commissions here does not deprive the President of his general authority, recognized by Article 21 of the UCMJ, to establish commissions under other circumstances as dictated by military necessity.

SEC. 4. MILITARY COMMISSIONS. Subsection (a) creates procedures governing commissions that parallel those in the UCMJ, Chapter 47 of Title 10, United States Code. Subsection (b) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives supplemental regulations promulgated to govern the procedures and rules of evidence to be applied before military commissions. It is anticipated that the Department of Defense will issue a Manual for Military Commissions generally tracking the Manual for Courts-Martial. The Secretary is also required to submit any modifications to the initial manual 60 days before they go into effect. The Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (“DTA”) imposed a similar reporting requirement on the procedures governing Combatant Status Review Tribunals.

The provisions of subsection (a) are detailed below. That subsection establishes the “Code of Military Commissions,” which will be codified after the UCMJ as Chapter 47A of Title 10, United States Code, §§ 948a-950x.
CHAPTER 47A—MILITARY COMMISSIONS
SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

§ 948a. Definitions. This section defines terms for Chapter 47A. Most significant is the definition of “unlawful enemy combatants,” which identifies those alien enemy combatants subject to prosecution by military commissions. This definition largely tracks the one employed in the context of Combatant Status Review Tribunals, but it is broader, in that it includes not only al Qaeda members, but also those who are part of or associated with any force or organization (including an international terrorist organization) engaged in armed conflict against the United States in violation of the laws of war. At the same time, the definition expressly excludes those who abide by the laws of war, such as members of legitimate armed forces, as well as non-combatants under the Geneva Conventions.

§ 948b. Military commissions generally. This section outlines the purpose of this chapter and makes clear that while the procedures here track the UCMJ, there are material differences reflecting the new challenges arising out the prosecution of international terrorists. Therefore, courts should not treat existing court-martial procedures, or court precedents interpreting them, as binding authority, nor should they otherwise be unduly influenced by those precedents. In addition, the section makes clear that the procedures for military commissions satisfy Common Article 3’s requirement of “regularly constituted courts” for all purposes under federal law.

§ 948c. Persons subject to military commissions. This section describes the category of persons subject to trial by military commission. While courts-martial try the uniformed members of the Armed Services, commissions established under this chapter try unlawful combatants as defined by section 948a. This section parallels UCMJ Art. 2.

§ 948d. Jurisdiction of military commissions. This section sets out the jurisdiction of military commissions. Military commissions shall have personal jurisdiction over alien unlawful enemy combatants as that term is defined in section 948a and subject matter jurisdiction over all offenses provided for in this chapter. This section parallels UCMJ Art. 17 and 18.

SUBCHAPTER II—COMPOSITION OF MILITARY COMMISSIONS

§ 948h. Who may convene military commissions. This section parallels UCMJ Art. 22, which provides that courts-martial may be convened by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or any commanding military officer. The military commissions under this Act will be convened by the Secretary of Defense or a person operating pursuant to his authority.
§ 948i. Who may serve on military commissions. This section closely parallels UCMJ Art. 25 and provides that the members of a military commission shall be commissioned officers in the Armed Forces.

§ 948j. Military judge of a military commission. This section provides that the same military judges who preside over courts-martial shall preside over military commissions. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 26 and contains the same protections for judicial independence. The section departs from existing practice under military commissions by providing that the military judge is not a voting member of the commission for any purpose, and he may not consult with members of the commission outside the presence of counsel and (except for circumstances described in section 949d) the accused.

§ 948k. Detail of trial and defense counsel. This section provides for the appointment of JAG attorneys to serve as the prosecution ("trial counsel") and defense counsel. The section makes clear that defense counsel shall be appointed for the accused as soon as practicable after charges are sworn. The qualifications and modes of appointment of counsel parallel UCMJ Art. 27 with the exception that, for military commissions, civilian prosecutors may also participate, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense.

§ 948l. Detail of employment of reporters and interpreters. This section provides for the appointment of court reporters and interpreters for commission proceedings. The section closely parallels UCMJ Art. 28 but makes clear that the accused shall have the right to an interpreter to assist him in working with defense counsel.

§ 948m. Number of members; excuse of members; absent and additional members. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 29 in requiring a minimum of five members of the commission (except for death penalty cases, where twelve are required) and providing for the replacement of members who are excused based on disability or good cause.

SUBCHAPTER III—PRE-TRIAL PROCEDURE

§ 948q. Charges and specifications. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 30 in requiring that the charges and specifications against the accused be sworn. Under the UCMJ, the swearing of charges leads to an Article 32 investigation, a pre-charging proceeding that is akin to, but considerably more protective than, the civilian grand jury. Such a proceeding is unnecessary and inappropriate for the trial of captured terrorists, who are already subject to detention under the laws of war. Upon swearing of charges, the accused shall be informed of the charges and provided with counsel as soon as practicable.

§ 948r. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited; statements obtained by torture. This section makes clear that the accused shall not be required to testify
against himself at a commission proceeding. UCMJ Art. 31 provides even broader protection than exists in civilian investigations, requiring that the accused be given Miranda warnings before facing any interrogation at all. This generous protection is provided to those who serve in our Nation’s armed forces, but it is inappropriate for the trial of terrorists and could frustrate interrogations that are necessary for the national security. This section therefore does not include a Miranda requirement.

The section also provides the statements obtained by torture shall not be admissible against the accused before a military commission. Consistent with United States treaty obligations, subsection (b) makes clear that evidence obtained by torture shall be inadmissible, except against a person accused of torture as evidence that the statement was made.

Subsection (c) addresses statements obtained by allegedly coercive tactics falling short of torture. This section provides that a statement allegedly obtained by coercion shall not be admitted if the military judge finds that the circumstances under which the statement was made render it unreliable or lacking in probative value. Because “coercion” is a notoriously difficult concept to define under the law, this subsection directs the military judge to focus upon how the circumstances impact the statement’s reliability and relevance, rather than whether or not those circumstances would satisfy any particular legal test for “coercion.”

§ 948s. Service of charges. Tracking UCMJ Art. 35, this section requires that trial counsel serve upon the accused a copy of the charges in English and in the accused’s native language.

SUBCHAPTER IV—TRIAL PROCEDURE

§ 949a. Rules. This section makes clear that, as under UCMJ Art. 36, the procedures established in this Act are only a starting point. The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate a Manual for Military Commissions, akin to the Manual for Courts-Martial, which will supplement the Act with rules of procedure and evidence that to be employed in military commissions.

UCMJ Art. 36 requires court-martial procedures to track the civilian rules so far as the President deems practicable. Because civilian rules, particularly evidentiary rules, often will not be practicable, section 949a does not contain a specific requirement. The Manual for Military Commission will likely track existing procedures in the military justice system in many instances, but the Act does not provide for a “uniformity” requirement that would make the practicality of any such departure from court-martial procedures subject to litigation. Congress also will be able to review these procedures, because section 4(b) requires the Secretary to submit the initial Manual for Military Commissions and
any subsequent modifications to the Armed Services Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Although most rules of evidence will be left to regulation, subsection (b) makes clear that military commissions generally shall apply a broad rule of admissibility, admitting all evidence that would have a probative value to a reasonable person. As in courts-martial and civilian courts, the judge may exclude otherwise admissible evidence where its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

A broad rule of admissibility is necessary because commissions must try crimes based on evidence collected everywhere from the battlefields in Afghanistan to foreign terrorist safe houses. Rules of evidence that may be workable under peacetime circumstances may break down during the exigencies of war. International war crimes tribunals, such as the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, have similarly recognized that broad rules of admissibility are appropriate when dealing with evidence gathered in the midst of an armed conflict. This section therefore provides for the introduction of all probative evidence, including hearsay evidence where such evidence is reliable. It is imperative that military commissions have the opportunity to consider reliable hearsay statements because many witnesses are likely to be foreign nationals who are not amenable to process, and other witnesses may be unavailable because of military necessity, incarceration, injury, or death.

§ 949b. Unlawfully influencing action of military commission. To ensure the independence of the commission, this section protects members, military judges, and counsel from any adverse consequences based upon actions undertaken during the military commission. The provisions here are identical in substance to those set out under UCMJ Art. 37, which apply to courts-martial.

§ 949c. Duties of trial counsel and defense counsel. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 38 in laying out the duties of trial counsel and defense counsel. The accused shall be represented by a detailed military lawyer and may be represented by a civilian counsel, if retained by the accused. To ensure that civilian counsel may be trusted in dealing with the accused and with the sensitive and potentially classified evidence that will often be at issue, the section requires that civilian counsel be a United States citizen admitted to the practice of law and in good standing, be eligible for a security clearance of Secret or higher, and have signed a written agreement to comply with the rules of the military commission proceedings. This section also makes clear that defense counsel shall have the right to cross-examine all witnesses who testify before the commission.

§ 949d. Sessions. This section is adapted from UCMJ Art. 39. Like the UCMJ, this section provides that the military judge may call the commission into session, outside the presence of its members, to address motions, receive the pleas of the accused, and to rule on evidentiary and procedural issues. The members shall
deliberate and vote on guilt and sentences in closed session, outside the presence of anyone but the members. Except as expressly provided in this section, all other proceedings before the commission shall be open and in the presence of the members, counsel, and the accused.

Because military commissions may have to consider highly sensitive intelligence that cannot reasonably be shared with captured terrorists, the bill also contains special procedures that, under narrowly defined circumstances, would permit the introduction of classified evidence outside the presence of the accused. Unlawful enemy combatants should not be allowed to exploit court procedures to gain information that might assist them or their associates in perpetrating future attacks against the United States and its allies.

International war crimes tribunals have similarly recognized that it is appropriate to protect information against disclosure to the accused where it is necessary to protect the safety of others. For instance, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has ruled that the accused’s rights to a fair trial and to cross-examination are not violated when, out of concern for the safety of a witness, the court permits a witness to testify before the court while shielding the identity of the witness from the accused and defense counsel.

Military Rule of Evidence 505, which permits the substitution of redacted or summarized evidence for classified information in courts-martial, would not be practicable for military commissions. That rule does not permit the judge under any circumstance to admit classified evidence that is not also shared with the accused. If the Government cannot substitute redacted or summarized evidence for classified evidence, then the Government must choose between disclosing classified evidence to the accused or avoiding introducing the evidence altogether. Putting the Government to that choice may be entirely appropriate when it comes to the trial of American soldiers in courts-martial, but it is neither necessary nor appropriate for trials of unlawful enemy combatants for violations of the law of war. This section therefore grants the military judge the discretion, under carefully defined and extraordinary circumstances, to admit classified evidence that is not shared with the accused.

Excluding the accused under this subsection will be an extraordinary occurrence and is to be carefully limited. There will be no “secret trials” without the accused. Instead, the section provides that before any classified evidence may be introduced outside the accused’s presence, the head of the department or agency responsible for classifying that information must personally certify that the disclosure of the information to the accused could reasonably be expected to harm national security and that the information at issue has been declassified to the maximum extent possible. The military judge then must make specific findings to confirm that the exclusion is warranted to protect classified information; that the contemplated exclusion is no broader than necessary; and that the exclusion would not violate the accused’s right to a full and fair trial. The accused’s
defense counsel will remain present and able to represent the accused in all proceedings, and the accused will be provided with unclassified summaries or a redacted transcript of the proceedings, whenever possible. In addition, this provision makes clear that the accused must always be given access to any statements that he himself made during an interrogation if the Government wishes to use such statements in the proceedings.

§ 949e. Continuances. This section provides the military judge with the authority to grant continuances, as is provided at courts-martial by UCMJ Art. 40.

§ 949f. Challenges. This section provides for the challenges of members of the commission. It is substantially the same as that provided for courts-martial under UCMJ Art. 41.

§ 949g. Oaths. This section closely tracks UCMJ Art. 42 and requires that commission officers take oaths prior to their respective duties.

§ 949h. Former jeopardy. This section grants the accused the protection against double jeopardy that is provided by UCMJ Art. 44. Art. 44 provides that double jeopardy should prevent a retrial if a case is dismissed because of the failure of available evidence. Because of the difficulties associated with gathering and presenting evidence for military commissions, this section avoids a blanket rule requiring jeopardy to attach under all such circumstances.

§ 949i. Pleas of the accused. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 45 and addresses the receipt of the accused’s pleas. UCMJ Art. 45 prohibits the accused from pleading guilty to an offense for which the death penalty may be adjudged. This additional restriction, however, is not a feature of federal criminal trials and is not a necessary safeguard should the accused seek to plead guilty to avoid a trial by military commission. Where the accused pleads guilty to an offense for which the death penalty is sought, however, the commission would still have to conduct a trial as to sentence is contemplated that there would still have to be a formal proceeding to allow the military commission to determine whether death is the appropriate sentence.

§ 949j. Opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence. UCMJ Art. 46 provides that the prosecution and defense shall have an “equal opportunity” to obtain witnesses and other evidence, but leaves the exact discovery procedures to regulation. Because it is unclear what “equal opportunity” would mean in the military commission context, subsection (a) guarantees defense counsel a “reasonable opportunity” to obtain witnesses and other evidence. Like the UCMJ, however, this section leaves the exact contours of the discovery rules to elaboration in the rulemaking process.

Subsection (b) requires that trial counsel disclose to the defense the existence of any exculpatory evidence known to trial counsel. The Act’s express inclusion of
a disclosure obligation with respect to exculpatory evidence is not intended, and should not be understood, to suggest that this is the only disclosure or discovery obligation that the United States will have to the accused. To the contrary, it is expected that the Secretary of Defense will issue a comprehensive set of rules delineating the disclosure and discovery obligations that the parties will have in military commission proceedings.

Trial counsel’s obligation to disclose exculpatory evidence includes any exculpatory classified evidence. Such evidence shall not be provided to the accused in classified form, but rather shall be provided in redacted or summary form to the extent possible. Before any classified evidence is withheld from the accused, the original classification authority must certify that it has been declassified to the maximum extent possible. At least one defense counsel shall have access to any exculpatory evidence withheld from the accused. Subsection (c)(5) makes clear that defense counsel may not share classified evidence with the accused, overriding any duty of communication that may be imposed by federal or state law.

§ 949k. Defense of lack of mental responsibility. This section permits the accused to raise the defense of lack of mental responsibility and provides standards and procedure for when that defense is raised. It is identical in substance to UCMJ Art. 50A.

§ 949l. Voting and rulings. Subsection (a) makes clear that members of the commission shall vote on the findings and sentences by secret ballot. Subsection (b) provides the military judge with the same authority that the judge has at a court-martial to issue rulings on questions of law and the admissibility of the evidence. Subsection (c) requires the military judge to instruct the commission, before deliberations, that the accused shall be presumed innocent unless trial counsel proves the case beyond reasonable doubt. These instructions are the same as are applied in the court-martial process, as codified under UCMJ Art. 51.

§ 949m. Number of votes required. This section tracks UCMJ 52 and provides, as in courts-martial, that two-thirds of the members of the commission must vote for conviction to find the accused guilty of an offense. With respect to the sentence, this section tracks the UCMJ by requiring that no person may be sentenced to life imprisonment or confinement for more than ten years except with the concurrence of three-fours of the members of the commission. No person may be sentenced to death without the unanimous vote of the commission on both guilt and sentence, and absent military exigency, the commission must have a minimum of twelve members where in cases in which the death penalty is sought, as is provided for courts-martial by UCMJ Art. 25A.

§ 949n. Commission to announce action. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 53 in requiring the commission to announce its finding and sentences as soon as it is determined.
§ 949o. Record of trial. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 54 and requires that the commission keep an authenticated, substantially verbatim record of commission proceedings.

§ 949s. Cruel or unusual punishments prohibited. This section tracks UMCJ Art. 55 and prohibits cruel or unusual forms of punishment, such as flogging, branding, and the use of irons.

§ 949t. Maximum limits. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 56 and requires that punishments imposed by military commissions not exceed those limits imposed by the statute or by regulation.

§ 949u. Execution of confinement. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 58 and provides that the Secretary shall, by regulation, prescribe how and where a sentence of confinement may be carried out.

SUBCHAPTER VI—POST-TRIAL PROCEDURE AND REVIEW OF MILITARY COMMISSIONS

§ 950a. Error of law; lesser included offense. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 59 and provides that military commission decisions shall not be overturned based upon errors of law unless the error materially prejudices the rights of the accused. A reviewing authority that sets aside a guilty finding shall have the authority to impose a lesser included offense, where applicable.

§ 950b. Review by the convening authority. This section permits the convening authority to modify the findings and sentence of a military commission to the benefit of the accused. The accused’s right to seek such discretionary action is in addition to his appellate rights and parallels the procedures established under UCMJ Art. 60.

§ 950c. Waiver or withdrawal of appeal. This section, which parallels UCMJ Art. 61, recognizes the accused’s right to waive or withdraw his appeals to the Court of Military Commission Review, except in cases in which the accused has been sentenced to death.

§ 950d. Appeal by the United States. This section, which parallels UCMJ Art. 62, grants the United States the right to take an interlocutory appeal based upon the military judge’s decision to terminate commission proceedings on any charge, to exclude evidence that is substantial proof of a military fact, or to decline to close the proceeding and/or to exclude the accused under section 949d(c). The United States may not appeal a judgment of acquittal.

§ 950e. Rehearings. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 63 in providing for procedures for rehearing, should the accused be successful on appeal. The
commission shall be composed of new members, and the commission may not find guilt or impose a greater sentence as to any offense previously adjudged on the merits by the prior commission.

§ 950f. Review by Court of Military Commission Review. This section creates a Court of Military Commission Review within the Department of Defense. This court functions like the Court of Criminal Appeals under Article 66 of the UCMJ. The members of that court shall be military judges or civilians with comparable qualifications, and the court shall review questions of law arising from interlocutory appeals or final decisions of the military commission.

§ 950g. Review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States. This section grants the accused the right to appeal his conviction to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit under the standard established by DTA. UCMJ Art. 67 places appellate review in the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces ("CAAF"). Congress, however, has already determined that review of military commission judgments should lie in the D.C. Circuit, which in contrast to the CAAF, is an Article III court. The D.C. Circuit has acquired experience in recent years handling cases brought by individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay, such as the Hamdan case, and it is anticipated that the most important appellate questions to come will involve military commission procedures, such as those concerning the limited exclusion of the accused, that may have no clear analogue with the UCMJ procedures that are the special expertise of the CAAF. Therefore, the Act preserves existing review procedures under the DTA, but expands the right to permit an appeal regardless of the length of his sentence. The Supreme Court shall have authority to review decisions of the D.C. Circuit through petitions for certiorari.

§ 950h. Appellate Counsel. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 70 and provides for the appointment of appellate counsel to represent the accused and the United States in any appeal or review under this chapter.

§ 950i. Execution of sentence; suspension of sentence. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 71 and provides that a death sentence may not be executed until the judgment is final and approved by the President.

§ 950j. Finality of proceedings, findings, and sentences. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 76 and provides that a judgment under this chapter is final and conclusive in any tribunal in the United States. This chapter provides the exclusive procedures for review of any claims relating to the prosecution, trial, or judgment of a military commission.

SUBCHAPTER VII—PUNITIVE MATTERS

§ 950p. Substantive offenses generally. UCMJ subchapter X codifies a list of offenses triable by courts-martial. Although the offenses subject to trial by
military commissions have generally been identified based upon the common law of armed conflict, this Act codifies a list of offenses triable by military commissions. The list of offenses tracks those provided for under Military Commission Instruction No. 2, which in turn relied upon international treaties and U.S. criminal law. The offenses defined here are not new crimes, but rather reflect the codification of the law of war into the United States Code pursuant to Congress’s constitutional authority to “Define and Punish ... Offences against the Law of Nations.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 8. Because the provisions are declarative of existing law, they should not preclude trial for crimes that occurred prior to the Act’s effective date.

§ 950q. Principals. This section, which tracks UCMJ Art. 77, provides that an individual may be guilty as a principal if he commits an offense, is an accessory to an offense, or directs the commission of an offense. In addition, under the principle of "command responsibility," a commander may be guilty of a war crime where he knew, or should have known, that his subordinate was about to commit, or had committed, an offense, yet failed to take the necessary and reasonable measures to prevent or punish the offense.

§ 950r. Accessory after the fact. This section, which tracks UCMJ Art. 78, provides for punishment as an accessory after the fact.

§ 950s. Conviction of a lesser offense. This section, which tracks UCMJ Art. 79, provides that an individual may be convicted of a lesser include offense, where appropriate.

§ 950t. Attempts. This section, which tracks UCMJ Art. 80, provides for the circumstances under which an individual may be convicted of an attempt to commit an offense under this chapter.

§ 950u. Solicitation. This section, which tracks UCMJ Art. 81, provides that an individual may be convicted for the crime of solicitation if he solicits or advises another to commit one or more substantive offenses triable by military commission.

§ 950v. Crimes triable by military commission. This section enumerates twenty-seven substantive offenses triable by military commission. In light of the common law origins of war crimes, no list of offenses is likely to be entirely complete. But this list represents an effort to codify offenses hitherto recognized as offenses triable by military commissions or international courts. Most of the listed offenses constitute clear violations of the Geneva Conventions and/or the Hague Convention. Several constitute "modern-day war crimes," such as hijacking and terrorism, which constitute practices contrary to the law of nations that can, and hereby do, have the same status as traditional war crimes.
In *Hamdan*, the Supreme Court left open the question as to whether conspiracy to commit a war crime itself constituted a substantive offense. For the reasons stated in Justice Thomas’s opinion, the bill views conspiracy as a separate offense punishable by military commissions.

§ 950w. Perjury and obstruction of justice. As an incident to the power to protect the integrity of their proceedings, the military commission shall have the authority to try perjury and obstruction of justice related to military commissions and offenses triable by commission. This section tracks UCMJ Art. 131.

§ 950x. Contempts. This section provides for the commission’s authority to punish contempt of its proceedings, tracking UCMJ Art. 48.

SEC. 5. JUDICIAL REVIEW. This section responds to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hamdan* by amending the judicial review provisions of the Detainee Treatment Act, which are now codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The Detainee Treatment Act provided that the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have jurisdiction over determinations of Combatant Status Review Tribunals and final judgments of military commissions, and that courts otherwise shall be foreclosed from hearing habeas petitions or other civil actions brought by enemy combatants in United States custody. This section makes clear that the limits of review apply to all petitions and civil actions, no matter whether they are pending or filed after the enactment of this Act, relating to the detention, transfer, treatment, or conditions of confinement of any alien detained by the United States as an unlawful combatant subject to this Act. Except for the specific review provided by the Act, this section forecloses any legal claim whatsoever, including applications for writ of habeas corpus, brought by or on behalf of detainees. Although it is not clear that the Suspension Clause of the Constitution applies in this context, the writ of habeas corpus would not be suspended by this provision; instead, judicial review of detention and military commission decisions is channeled through the adequate alternative procedures provided by this Act and the DTA.

SEC. 6. SATISFACTION OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS. In order to implement the treaty obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions, subsection (a) establishes that compliance with the so-called McCain Amendment, section 1003 of the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005, fully satisfies the obligations of the United States with regard to section 1 of Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. Like the McCain Amendment, Common Article 3 provides a baseline standard for detainees in armed conflicts where it applies. Several of its provisions are vague, however, particularly its prohibition upon “outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment.” This measure defines Common Article 3’s treatment standards by reference to the McCain Amendment, which is based upon the familiar standards of the U.S. Constitution. Subsection 1(b), concerning the taking of hostages, and subsection 1(d), concerning the passing of sentences by regularly constituted courts, do not concern detainee treatment and therefore are specifically excepted from this provision.
Subsection (b) prohibits any court from treating the Geneva Conventions as a source of rights, directly or indirectly, making clear that the Geneva Conventions are not judicially enforceable in any court of the United States. This provision does not affect the obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions; to the contrary, the political branches of the United States remain fully bound by, and will continue to honor, the Conventions whenever and wherever they apply.

SEC. 7. WAR CRIMES ACT AMENDMENT. This section is designed to clarify subsection (c) of the War Crimes Act of 1996, 18 U.S.C. § 2441. United States treaty obligations require that the United States criminalize the grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, which include certain serious violations of Common Article 3. The War Crimes Act goes further and makes any violation of Common Article 3 a war crime. The statutes, however, gives no more specific guidance as to what conduct constitutes a violation. The Supreme Court held in Hamdan that Common Article 3 applies to the conflict against al Qaeda; therefore, it is imperative that the statute provide clear notice to United States personnel charged with interrogating detainees. This section therefore provides clarity and certainty with respect to the serious violations of Common Article 3 that are punishable as war crimes under 18 U.S.C. § 1441(c). Those offenses include torture, cruel, or inhuman treatment, murder, mutilation or maiming, intentionally causing great suffering, and the taking of hostages. The Act does not specifically provide for a general crime of “outrages upon personal dignity,” because it nearly impossible define an “outrage” as a general matter without resorting to the very kind of vague language that this provision seeks to replace. Instead, this section identifies and criminalizes three serious and clear outrages upon personal dignity: biological experimentation, rape, and sexual assault. The statute similarly does not criminalize the passing of a sentence absent a regularly constituted court because of the difficulty in defining what constitutes a “regularly constituted court”; an execution carried out pursuant to the sentence of an irregular tribunal would clearly be proscribed under this section as murder.

SEC. 8. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS. This section makes a series of amendments to other parts of the United States Code in order to resolve inconsistencies created by the Act. In particular, this section makes several amendments to the DTA. These amendments include replacing references to the President’s Military Commission Order No. 1 of August 31, 2005 with references to military commissions constituted under this Act. Other provisions expand judicial review to the final orders of Combatants Status Review Tribunals or military commissions when the persons affected are detained in places other than Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to provide for review in the event that detainees are moved from the Guantanamo Bay facility to other facilities in the United States.

This section also amends references to military commission in the UCMJ to take into account the extensive statutory procedures provided by this Act. Section 821 of Title 10 is amended to make clear that the savings clause preserves jurisdiction over military commissions without restriction. Section 836 of title 10 is amended explicitly to exempt military commissions from any requirement that its procedures be uniform with those of
the UCMJ. This uniformity provision was intended to require that courts-martial be as uniform as possible among the armed services, but the Supreme Court in *Hamdan* applied that language to military commission procedures as well. This amendment makes clear that, particularly in light of this Act’s detailed prescription of military commission procedures, such a restriction is not warranted.

**SEC. 9. RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.** This section makes clear that the Act retroactively applies “to any aspect of detention, treatment or trial of any alien detained at any time since September 11, 2001.” This section further states that the Act applies to any case, pending or not, whether filed before or after the effective date of the Act. This provision is designed to make clear that jurisdiction inconsistent with this Act is removed for all pending cases and that the standards prescribed in this Act shall apply to all future cases, no matter when the conduct at issue occurred.

**SEC. 10. SEVERABILITY.** This section explicitly provides that if any application of a provision of this Act is held to be unconstitutional, it shall not result in the invalidation of any other application or provision of this Act.
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A BILL

To facilitate bringing to justice terrorists and other unlawful enemy combatants through full and fair trials by military commissions, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Military Commissions Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) For more than 10 years, the al Qaeda terrorist organization has waged an unlawful war of violence and terror against the United States and its allies. Al Qaeda was involved in the bombing

(2) Following the attacks on the United States on September 11th, Congress recognized the existing hostilities with al Qaeda and affiliated terrorist organizations and, by the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Joint Resolution (Public Law 107-40), recognized that “the President has authority under the Constitution to take action to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States” and authorized the President “to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or per-
sons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001 . . . in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

(3) The President’s authority to convene military commissions arises from the Constitution’s vesting in the President of the executive power and the power of Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. As the Supreme Court of the United States recognized in Madsen v. Kinsella, 343 U.S. 341, 346-48 (1952), “[s]ince our nation’s earliest days, such commissions have been constitutionally recognized agencies for meeting many urgent governmental responsibilities related to war. . . . They have taken many forms and borne many names. Neither their procedure nor their jurisdiction has been prescribed by statute. It has been adapted in each instance to the need that called it forth.”

(4) In exercising the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the Authorization for Use of Military Force Joint Resolution, and in accor-
dance with the law of war, the President has detained enemy combatants in the course of this armed conflict and issued the Military Order of November 13, 2001, to govern the “Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War Against Terrorism.” This Order authorized the Secretary of Defense to establish military commissions to try individuals subject to the Order for any offenses triable by military commission that such individuals are alleged to have committed.

(5) The Supreme Court in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (2006), held that the military commissions established by the Department of Defense under the President’s Military Order of November 13, 2001, were not consistent with certain aspects of United States domestic law. The Congress may by law, and does by enactment of this statute, eliminate any deficiency of statutory authority to facilitate bringing terrorists with whom the United States is engaged in armed conflict to justice for violations of the law of war and other offenses triable by military commissions. The prosecution of such individuals by military commissions established and conducted consistent with
this Act fully complies with the Constitution, the
laws of the United States, treaties to which the
United States is a party, and the law of war.

(6) The use of military commissions is par-
ticularly important in this context because other al-
ternatives, such as the use of courts-martial, gener-
ally are impracticable. The terrorists with whom
the United States is engaged in armed conflict have
demonstrated a commitment to the destruction of
the United States and its people, to the violation of
the law of war, and to the abuse of American legal
processes. In a time of ongoing armed conflict, it
generally is neither practicable nor appropriate for
combatants like al Qaeda terrorists to be tried be-
fore tribunals that include all of the procedures as-
associated with courts-martial.

(7) Many procedures for courts-martial
would not be practicable in trying the unlawful en-
emy combatants for whom this Act provides for
trial by military commission. For instance, court-
martial proceedings would in certain circum-
stances—

(A) compel the Government to share
classified information with the accused,
even though members of al Qaeda cannot be
trusted with our Nation’s secrets and it
would not be consistent with the national se-
curity of the United States to provide them
with access to classified information;

(B) exclude the use of hearsay ev-
dence even though such evidence often will
be the best and most reliable evidence that
the accused has committed a war crime. For
example, many witnesses in military com-
mission trials are likely to be foreign nation-
als who are not amenable to process or may
be precluded for national security reasons
from entering the United States or Guan-
tanamo Bay to testify. Other witnesses may
be unavailable because of military necessity,
incarceration, injury, or death. In short, ap-
plying the hearsay rules from the Manual for
Courts-Martial or from the Federal Rules of
Evidence would make it virtually impossible
to bring terrorists to justice for their viola-
tions of the law of war;

(C) specify speedy trials and technical
rules for sworn and authenticated statements
when, due to the exigencies of wartime, the
United States cannot safely require members
of the armed forces to gather evidence on
the battlefield, including civilian eye-
witness testimony, as though they were po-
lice officers. Nor can the United States di-
vert members from the front lines and their
duty stations to attend military commission
proceedings. Therefore, strict compliance
with such rules for evidence gathered on the
battlefield would be impracticable, given the
preeminent focus on military operations and
the chaotic nature of combat.

(8) The exclusive judicial review for which
this Act, and the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005,
provides is without precedent in the history of
armed conflicts involving the United States, ex-
ceeds the scope of judicial review historically pro-
vided for by military commissions, and is chan-
eled in a manner appropriately tailored to—

(A) the circumstances of the conflicts
between the United States and international
terrorist organizations; and

(B) the need to ensure fair treatment
of those detained as enemy combatants, to
minimize the diversion of members of the
armed forces from other wartime duties, and
to protect the national security of the United States.

(9) In early 2002, as memorialized in a memorandum dated February 7, 2002, the President determined that common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions did not apply with respect to the United States conflict with al Qaeda because al Qaeda was not a party to those treaties and the conflict with al Qaeda was an armed conflict of an international character. That was the interpretation of the United States prior to the Supreme Court’s decision in Hamdan on June 29, 2006. Hamdan’s statement to the contrary makes it appropriate to clarify the standards imposed by common Article 3. This Act makes clear that the prohibitions against cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment found in the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 fully satisfy the obligations of the United States with respect to the standards for detention and treatment established by section 1 of common Article 3, except for those obligations arising under paragraphs (b) and (d). In addition, the Act makes clear that the Geneva Conventions are not a source of judicially enforceable individual rights, thereby reaffirming that enforcement of the obligations im-
posed by the Conventions is a matter between the
nations that are parties to them.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to
establish military commissions for violations of the law
of war and other offenses triable by military commissions
as provided in section 4 of this Act (chapter 47A of title
10).

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The authority granted in
subsection (a) shall not be construed to limit the authority
of the President under the Constitution of the United
States or the laws thereof to establish military commis-
sions on the battlefield, in occupied territories, or in other
armed conflicts should circumstances so require.

(c) SCOPE OF PUNISHMENT AUTHORITY.—A mili-
tary commission established pursuant to subsection (a)
shall have authority to impose upon any person found
guilty after a proceeding under this Act a sentence that is
appropriate to the offense or offenses for which there was
a finding of guilt, which sentence may include death
where authorized by this Act, imprisonment for life or a
term of years, payment of a fine or restitution, or such
other lawful punishment or condition of punishment as
the commission shall determine to be proper.
(d) Execution of Punishment.—The Secretary of Defense shall be authorized to carry out a sentence of punishment decreed by a military commission pursuant to subsection (a) in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary may prescribe.

(e) Annual Report on Trials by Military Commission.—

(1) Annual Report Required.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Armed Services Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate an annual report on the conduct of trials by military commissions established pursuant to subsection (a) during such year.

(2) Form.—Each such report shall be submitted in unclassified form, with classified annex, if necessary and consistent with national security.

Sec. 4. Military Commissions

(a) Military Commissions.—

(1) In General.—Subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 47 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 47A—MILITARY COMMISSIONS

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.
“948a. Definitions.
“948b. Military commissions generally.
§ 948a. Definitions

"In this chapter:

"(1) ALIEN.—The term ‘alien’ means an individual who is not a citizen of the United States.

"(2) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The term ‘classified information’ means the following—

"(A) Any information or material that has been determined by the United States Government pursuant to statute, Executive order, or regulation to require protection against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national security.

"(B) Any restricted data, as that term is defined in section 11 y. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y)).

"(3) COMMISSION.—The term ‘commission’ means a military commission established pursuant to chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code.

"(4) CONVENING AUTHORITY.—The term ‘convening authority’ shall be the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

"(5) LAWFUL ENEMY COMBATANT.—The term ‘lawful enemy combatant’ means an individual determined by or under the authority of the
President or Secretary of Defense (whether on an individualized or collective basis) to be: (i) a member of the regular forces of a State party engaged in hostilities against the United States or its co-belligerents; (ii) a member of a militia, volunteer corps, or organized resistance movement belonging to a State party engaged in such hostilities, which are under responsible command, wear a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance, carry their arms openly, and abide by the law of war; or (iii) a member of a regular armed forces who professes allegiance to a government engaged in such hostilities, but not recognized by the United States.

“(6) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Defense.

“(7) UNLAWFUL ENEMY COMBATANT.—The term ‘unlawful enemy combatant’ means an individual determined by or under the authority of the President or the Secretary of Defense—

“(A) to be part of or affiliated with a force or organization—including but not limited to al Qaeda, the Taliban, any international terrorist organization, or associated forces—engaged in hostilities against the
United States or its co-belligerents in violation of the law of war;

"(B) to have committed a hostile act in aid of such a force or organization so engaged; or

"(C) to have supported hostilities in aid of such a force or organization so engaged.

"This definition includes any individual determined by a Combatant Status Review Tribunal, before the effective date of this Act, to have been properly detained as an enemy combatant, but excludes any alien determined by the President or the Secretary of Defense (whether on an individualized or collective basis), or by any competent tribunal established under their authority, to be (i) a lawful enemy combatant (including a prisoner of war), or (ii) a protected person whose trial by these military commissions would be inconsistent with Articles 64-76 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12, 1949. For purposes of this section, the term “protected person” refers to the category of persons described in Article 4 of the Ge-

“(6) GENEVA CONVENTIONS.—The term ‘Geneva Conventions’ means the international conventions signed at Geneva on August 12, 1949, including common Article 3.

§ 948b. Military commissions generally

“(a) PURPOSE.—This chapter codifies and establishes procedures governing the use of military commissions to try unlawful enemy combatants for violations of the law of war and other offenses triable by military commissions. Although military commissions traditionally have been constituted by order of the President, the decision of the Supreme Court in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld makes it both necessary and appropriate to codify procedures for military commissions as set forth herein.

“(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The procedures for military commissions set forth in this chapter are modeled after the procedures established for courts-martial in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. However, it would be neither desirable nor practicable to try unlawful enemy combatants by court-martial procedures. The trial of such persons by military commission presents new challenges that require that interpretations of this Act not be unduly influenced by the rules and procedures developed
for courts-martial. Therefore, no construction or application of chapter 47 of this title shall be binding in the construction or application of this chapter.

“(c) Alien unlawful enemy combatants may be tried for violations of the law of war and other offenses triable by military commissions committed against the United States or its co-belligerents before, on, or after September 11, 2001.

“(d) A military commission established under this chapter is a regularly constituted court, affording all the necessary ‘judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples’ for purposes of common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions.

“§ 948c. Persons subject to military commissions

“Alien unlawful enemy combatants, as defined in section 948a of this title, shall be subject to trial by military commissions as set forth in this chapter.

“§ 948d. Jurisdiction of military commissions

“(a) Military commissions shall have jurisdiction to try any offense made punishable under this chapter, when committed by an alien unlawful enemy combatant. Military commissions shall not have jurisdiction over lawful enemy combatants. Lawful enemy combatants who violate the law of war are subject to chapter 47 of Title 10, United States Code. Courts-martial established
under chapter 47 shall have jurisdiction to try a lawful
enemy combatant for any offense made punishable under
this chapter.

“(b) Military commissions shall not have jurisdic-
tion over any individual determined by the President or
the Secretary of Defense (whether on an individualized
or collective basis), or by any competent tribunal estab-
lished under their authority, to be a “protected person”
whose trial by these military commissions would be in-
consistent with Articles 64-76 of the Geneva Convention
Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of
War of August 12, 1949. Such persons shall be tried in
courts-martial or other tribunals consistent with their
status under the Geneva Conventions. For purposes of
this section, the term “protected person” refers to the
category of persons described in Article 4 of the Geneva
Convention Relative to the Protected of Civilian Persons

“(c) Military commissions may, under such limita-
tions as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, adjudge
any punishment not forbidden by this chapter, including
the penalty of death where authorized by this chapter.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COMPOSITION OF MILITARY
COMMISSIONS

“Sec.
“948b. Who may convene military commissions.
“948i. Who may serve on military commissions.
"§ 948h. Who may convene military commissions

(a) The Secretary may issue orders convening military commissions to try individuals under this chapter.

(b) The Secretary may delegate his authority to convene military commissions or to promulgate any regulations under this chapter.

"§ 948i. Who may serve on military commissions

(a) In General.—Any commissioned officer of the United States armed forces on active duty is eligible to serve on a military commission. Eligible commissioned officers shall include, without limitation, reserve personnel on active duty, National Guard personnel on active duty in Federal service, and retired personnel recalled to active duty.

(b) Detail of Members.—When convening a commission, the convening authority shall detail as members thereof such members of the armed forces as, in his opinion, are fully qualified for the duty by reason of age, education, training, experience, length of service, and judicial temperament. No member of an armed force shall be eligible to serve as a member of a commission
when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution or
has acted as an investigator or counsel in the same case.

“(c) EXCUSE OF MEMBERS.—Before a commission
is assembled for the trial of a case, the convening author-
ity may excuse a member of the commission from par-
ticipating in the case.

“§ 948j. Military judge of a military commission

“(a) DETAIL OF A MILITARY JUDGE.—A military
judge shall be detailed to each commission. The Secret-
tary shall prescribe regulations providing for the manner
in which military judges are detailed to such commis-
sions. The military judge shall preside over each com-
mission to which he has been detailed. The convening
authority shall not prepare or review any report concern-
ing the effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency of the military
judge so detailed relating to his performance of duty as a
military judge.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A military judge shall be a
commissioned officer of the armed forces who is a mem-
ber of the bar of a Federal court or a member of the bar
of the highest court of a State, and who is certified to be
qualified for duty as a military judge by the Judge Advo-
cate General of the armed force of which such military
judge is a member. A commissioned officer who is certi-
fied to be qualified for duty as a military judge of a
commission may perform such other duties as are assigned to him by or with the approval of that Judge Advocate General or his designee.

“(c) INeligibility of Certain Individuals.—No person is eligible to act as military judge in any case in which he is the accuser or a witness or has acted as investigator or a counsel in the same case.

“(d) Consultation with Members; Ineligibility to Vote.—Except as provided in section 949d of this title, the military judge detailed to the commission may not consult with the members of the commission except in the presence of the accused, trial counsel, and defense counsel, nor may he vote with the members of the commission.

“§ 948k. Detail of trial counsel and defense counsel

“(a) Detail of Counsel Generally.—

“(1) Trial counsel and military defense counsel shall be detailed for each commission.

“(2) Assistant trial counsel and assistant and associate military defense counsel may be detailed for each commission.

“(3) Military defense counsel shall be detailed as soon as practicable after the swearing of charges against the person accused.
“(4) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations providing for the manner in which counsel are detailed for military commissions and for the persons who are authorized to detail counsel for such military commissions.

“(b) TRIAL COUNSEL.—Subject to subsection (d), trial counsel detailed for a military commission under this chapter must be—

“(1) a judge advocate (as that term is defined in section 801 of this title) who is—

“(A) a graduate of an accredited law school or is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State; and

“(B) certified as competent to perform duties as trial counsel before general courts-martial by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member; or

“(2) a civilian who is—

“(A) a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State; and

“(B) otherwise qualified to practice before the commission pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(c) MILITARY DEFENSE COUNSEL.—Subject to subsection (d), military defense counsel detailed for a
military commission under this chapter must be a judge advocate (as so defined) who is—

“(1) a graduate of an accredited law school or a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State; and

“(2) certified as competent to perform duties as defense counsel before general courts-martial by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member.

“(d) INELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—No person who has acted as an investigator, military judge, or member of a military commission under this chapter may act later as trial counsel or defense counsel in the same case. No person who has acted for the prosecution may act later in the same case for the defense, nor may any person who has acted for the defense act later in the same case for the prosecution.

“§ 948l. Detail or employment of reporters and interpreters

“(a) COURT REPORTERS.—Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the convening authority of a military commission shall detail or employ qualified court reporters, who shall record the proceedings of and testimony taken before that commission.
“(b) INTERPRETERS.—Under like regulations the convening authority may detail or employ interpreters who shall interpret for the commission, and, as necessary, for trial counsel and defense counsel.

“(c) TRANSCRIPT; RECORD.—The transcript shall be under the control of the convening authority, which is responsible for preparing the record of the proceedings.

“§ 948m. Number of members; excuse of members; absent and additional members

“(a) NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—(1) A military commission under this chapter shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), have at least five members.

“(2) In a case in which the death penalty is sought, the military commission shall have the number of members prescribed by section 949m(c) of this title.

“(b) EXCUSE OF MEMBERS.—No member of a military commission may be absent or excused after the commission has been assembled for the trial of the accused unless excused—

“(1) as a result of challenge;

“(2) by the military judge for physical disability or other good cause; or

“(3) by order of the convening authority for good cause.
“(c) ABSENT AND ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—
Whenever a military commission is reduced below the requisite number of members, the trial may not proceed unless the convening authority details new members sufficient to provide not less than the requisite number. The trial may proceed with the new members present after the recorded evidence previously introduced before the members of the commission has been read to the commission in the presence of the military judge, the accused (except as provided by section 949d of this title), and counsel for both sides.

“SUBCHAPTER III—PRE-TRIAL PROCEDURE

“Sec.
“948q. Charges and specifications.
“948r. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited; statements obtained by torture.
“948s. Service of charges.

“§ 948q. Charges and specifications
“(a) CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS.—Charges and specifications against an accused shall be signed by a person subject to chapter 47 of this title under oath before a commissioned officer of the armed forces authorized to administer oaths and shall state—

“(1) that the signer has personal knowledge of, or reason to believe, the matters set forth therein; and

“(2) that they are true in fact to the best of his knowledge and belief.
“(b) Notice to Accused.—Upon the swearing of the charges and specifications in accordance with subsection (a), the accused shall be informed of the charges and specifications against him as soon as practicable.

§ 948r. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited; statements obtained by torture

“(a) In General.—No person shall be required to testify against himself at a commission proceeding.

“(b) Statements Obtained by Torture.—A statement obtained by use of torture, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2340, whether or not under color of law, shall not be admissible against the accused, except against a person accused of torture as evidence the statement was made.

“(c) Statements not Obtained by Torture.—No otherwise admissible statement may be received in evidence, including statements allegedly obtained by coercion, if the military judge finds that the circumstances under which the statement was made render it unreliable or lacking in probative value.

“§ 948s. Service of charges

“The trial counsel assigned to the case shall cause to be served upon the accused and counsel a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had in English and, if appropriate, in another language that the accused under—
stands, sufficiently in advance of trial to prepare a de-

fense.

“SUBCHAPTER IV—TRIAL PROCEDURE

"Sec.
"949a. Rules.
"949b. Unlawfully influencing action of military commission.
"949c. Duties of trial counsel and defense counsel.
"949d. Sessions.
"949e. Continuances.
"949f. Challenges.
"949g. Oaths.
"949h. Former jeopardy.
"949i. Pleas of the accused.
"949j. Opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence.
"949k. Defense of lack of mental responsibility.
"949l. Voting and rulings.
"949m. Number of votes required.
"949n. Military commission to announce action.
"949o. Record of trial.

“§ 949a. Rules

“(a) PROCEDURES.—Pretrial, trial, and post-trial procedures, including elements and modes of proof, for cases triable by military commission under this chapter shall be prescribed by the Secretary, but may not be con-

trary to or inconsistent with this chapter.

“(b) RULES OF EVIDENCE.—Subject to such excep-

tions and limitations as the Secretary may provide by regulation, evidence in a military commission shall be admissible if the military judge determines that the evi-

dence would have probative value to a reasonable person.

“(c) HEARSAY EVIDENCE.—Hearsay evidence is admissible, unless the military judge finds that the cir-

cumstances render it unreliable or lacking in probative
value, provided that the proponent of the evidence makes
the evidence known to the adverse party in advance of
trial or hearing.

"The military judge shall exclude any evidence the
probative value of which is substantially outweighed by
the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or
misleading the members of the commission, or by con-
siderations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless
presentation of cumulative evidence.

"§ 949b. Unlawfully influencing action of military
commission

"(a) In general.—(1) No authority convening a
military commission under this chapter may censure, repre-
mand, or admonish the commission or any member,
military judge, or counsel thereof, with respect to the
findings or sentence adjudged by the commission, or with
respect to any other exercises of its or his functions in the
conduct of the proceedings.

"(2) No person may attempt to coerce or, by any
unauthorized means, influence the action of a commis-
sion or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or
sentence in any case, or the action of any convening, ap-
proving, or reviewing authority with respect to his judi-
cial acts.
“(3) The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to—

“(A) general instructional or informational courses in military justice if such courses are designed solely for the purpose of instructing members of a command in the substantive and procedural aspects of military commissions; or

“(B) statements and instructions given in open proceedings by the military judge or counsel.

“(b) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS ON COMMISSION IN EVALUATION OF FITNESS. In the preparation of an effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency report or any other report or document used in whole or in part for the purpose of determining whether a commissioned officer of the armed forces is qualified to be advanced, in grade, or in determining the assignment or transfer of any such officer or in determining whether any such officer should be retained on active duty, no person may—

“(1) consider or evaluate the performance of duty of any member of a military commission under this chapter; or

“(2) give a less favorable rating or evaluation to any commissioned officer because of the zeal with which such officer, in acting as counsel,
represented any accused before a military commission under this chapter.

§ 949c. Duties of trial counsel and defense counsel

(a) Trial Counsel.—The trial counsel of a military commission shall prosecute in the name of the United States.

(b) Defense Counsel.—(1) The accused shall be represented in his defense before a military commission as provided in this subsection.

(2) The accused shall be represented by military counsel detailed under section 948k of this title.

(3) The accused may be represented by civilian counsel if retained by him, provided that civilian counsel—

(A) is a United States citizen;

(B) is admitted to the practice of law in a State, district, territory, or possession of the United States, or before a Federal court;

(C) has not been the subject of any sanction of disciplinary action by any court, bar, or other competent governmental authority for relevant misconduct;

(D) has been determined to be eligible for access to information classified at the level Secret or higher; and
“(E) has signed a written agreement to comply with all applicable regulations or instructions for counsel, including any rules of court for conduct during the proceedings.

“Civilian defense counsel shall protect any classified information received during the course of their representation of the accused in accordance with all applicable law governing the protection of classified information, and shall not divulge such information to any person not authorized to receive it.

“(4) If the accused is represented by civilian counsel, military counsel detailed shall act as associate counsel.

“(5) The accused is not entitled to be represented by more than one military counsel. However, the person authorized under regulations prescribed under section 948k of this title to detail counsel in his sole discretion may detail additional military counsel.

“(6) Defense counsel may cross-examine each witness for the prosecution who testifies before the commission.

§ 949d. Sessions

“(a) Sessions Without Presence of Members.—

(1) At any time after the service of charges which have been referred for trial by military commission, the mili-
A military judge may call the commission into session without the presence of the members for the purpose of—

"(A) hearing and determining motions raising defenses or objections which are capable of determination without trial of the issues raised by a plea of not guilty;

"(B) hearing and ruling upon any matter which may be ruled upon by the military judge under this chapter, whether or not the matter is appropriate for later consideration or decision by the members of the commission;

"(C) if permitted by regulations of the Secretary, receiving the pleas of the accused; and

"(D) performing any other procedural function which may be performed by the military judge under this chapter or under rules prescribed pursuant to section 949a of this title and which does not require the presence of the members of the commission.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (e), any proceedings under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in the presence of the accused, defense counsel, and trial counsel, and shall be made part of the record.

"(b) PROCEEDINGS IN PRESENCE OF ACCUSED.—

Except as provided in subsections (c) and (e), all pro-
ceedings of a military commission under this chapter shall be in the presence of the accused, defense counsel, and trial counsel, and shall be made a part of the record.

"(c) DELIBERATIONS OR VOTE OF MEMBERS.—When the members of the commission deliberate or vote, only the members may be present.

"(d) PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS.—(1) The military commission shall hold open and public proceedings.

"(2) The military judge may close to the public all or a part of the proceedings of a military commission under this chapter only upon making a specific finding that such closure is necessary to—

"(A) protect information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to cause identifiable damage to the public interest or the national security, including intelligence or law enforcement sources, methods, or activities; or

"(B) ensure the physical safety of individuals.

"(e) LIMITED EXCLUSION OF THE ACCUSED FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—(1) The military judge may, subject to the provisions of this subsection, permit the admission in a military commission under this chapter of classified information outside the presence of the accused.
“(2) The military judge shall not exclude the accused from any portion of the proceeding except upon a specific finding that extraordinary circumstances exist such that—

“(A) the exclusion of the accused—

“(i) is necessary to protect classified information the disclosure of which to the accused could reasonably be expected to cause identifiable damage to the national security, including intelligence or law enforcement sources, methods, or activities; or

“(ii) is necessary to ensure the physical safety of individuals; or

“(iii) is necessary to prevent disruption of the proceedings by the accused; and

“(B) the exclusion of the accused—

“(i) is no broader than necessary; and

“(ii) will not deprive the accused of a full and fair trial.

“(3)(A) A finding under paragraph (2) may be based upon a presentation, including an ex parte or in camera presentation, by either trial counsel or defense counsel.

“(B) Before trial counsel may make a presentation described in subparagraph (A) requesting the admission
of classified evidence outside the presence of the accused, the head of the executive or military department or governmental agency which has control over the matter (after personal consideration by that officer) shall certify in writing to the military judge that—

“(i) the disclosure of such classified information to the accused could reasonably be expected to prejudice the national security; and

“(ii) such evidence has been declassified to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the requirements of national security.

“(4)(A) No evidence shall be admitted if the accused is not present for its admission or the evidence is not otherwise provided to the accused, unless the evidence is classified information and the military judge makes a specific finding that—

“(i) consideration of the evidence by the commission, without the presence of the accused, is warranted; and

“(ii) admission of an unclassified summary or redacted version of that evidence would not be an adequate substitute and, in the case of testimony, alternative methods to obscure the identity of the witness are not adequate; and
“(iii) admission of the evidence would not deprive the accused of a full and fair trial.

“(B) If the accused is excluded from a portion of the proceeding, the accused shall be provided with a redacted transcript of the proceeding and, to the extent practicable, an unclassified summary of any evidence introduced. Under no circumstances shall such a summary or redacted transcript compromise the interests warranting the exclusion of the accused under this subsection.

“(5)(A) Military defense counsel shall be present and able to participate in all trial proceedings, and shall be given access to all evidence admitted under subparagraph (4).

“(B) Civilian defense counsel shall be permitted to be present and to participate in all trial proceedings, and shall be given access to evidence admitted under subparagraph (4), provided that civilian defense counsel has obtained the necessary security clearances and that such presence and access are consistent with regulations that the Secretary may prescribe to protect classified information.

“(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any defense counsel who receives classified information admitted pursuant to subparagraph (4) shall not be obli-
gated to, and may not, disclose that evidence to the accused.

"(f) ADMISSION OF STATEMENTS OF ACCUSED.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision in this chapter, no statement made by the accused during an interrogation, even if otherwise classified, may be admitted into evidence in a military commission under this chapter unless the accused is present for its admission or the evidence is otherwise provided to the accused.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, a 'statement' is a statement communicated knowingly and directly by the accused in response to questioning by foreign or United States military, intelligence, or criminal investigative personnel. This paragraph shall not be construed to prevent the redaction of intelligence sources or methods, which do not constitute statements of the accused, from any document provided to the accused or admitted into evidence.

"§ 949e. Continuances

"The military judge may, for reasonable cause, grant a continuance to any party for such time, and as often, as may appear to be just.

"§ 949f. Challenges

"(a) CHALLENGES AUTHORIZED.—The military judge and members of the commission may be chal-
lenged by the accused or the trial counsel for cause stated
to the commission. The military judge shall determine
the relevance and validity of the challenges for cause,
and may not receive a challenge to more than one person
at a time. Challenges by the trial counsel shall ordinarily
be presented and decided before those by the accused are
offered.

“(b) **Peremptory Challenges.**—Each accused
and the trial counsel is entitled to one peremptory chal-
lenge, but the military judge may not be challenged ex-
cept for cause.

“(c) **Challenges Against Additional Members.**—Whenever additional members are detailed to the
court, and after any challenges for cause against such ad-
ditional members are presented and decided, each ac-
cused and the trial counsel are entitled to one peremptory
challenge against members not previously subject to per-
emptory challenge.

“§ 949g. Oaths

“(a) **In General.**—(1) Before performing their re-
spective duties, military judges, members of commis-
sions, trial counsel, defense counsel, reporters, and inter-
preters shall take an oath to perform their duties faith-
fully.
“(2) The form of the oath required by paragraph
(1), the time and place of the taking thereof, the manner
of recording the same, and whether the oath shall be
taken for all cases in which these duties are to be per-
formed or for a particular case, shall be as prescribed in
regulations of the Secretary. These regulations may pro-
vide that—

“(A) an oath to perform faithfully duties as a
military judge, trial counsel, or defense counsel,
may be taken at any time by any judge advocate or
other person certified to be qualified or competent
for duty; and

“(B) if such an oath is taken it need not
again be taken at the time the judge advocate, or
other person is detailed to that duty.

“(b) WITNESSES.—Each witness before a military
commission under this chapter shall be examined on
oath.

“(c) OATH DEFINED.—As used in this section,
“oath” includes an affirmation.

“§ 949h. Former jeopardy

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may, without his
consent, be tried by a commission a second time for the
same offense.
"(b) Scope of Trial.—No proceeding in which the accused has been found guilty by military commission upon any charge or specification is a trial in the sense of this section until the finding of guilty has become final after review of the case has been fully completed.

"§ 949i. Pleas of the accused

(a) Plea of Not Guilty.—If an accused after a plea of guilty sets up matter inconsistent with the plea, or if it appears that he has entered the plea of guilty through lack of understanding of its meaning and effect, or if he fails or refuses to plead, a plea of not guilty shall be entered in the record, and the commission shall proceed as though he had pleaded not guilty.

(b) Finding of Guilt After Guilty Plea.—With respect to any charge or specification to which a plea of guilty has been made by the accused and accepted by the military judge, a finding of guilty of the charge or specification may be entered immediately without a vote. This finding shall constitute the finding of the commission unless the plea of guilty is withdrawn prior to announcement of the sentence, in which event the proceedings shall continue as though the accused had plead not guilty.
§ 949j. Opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence

(a) In General.—(1) Defense counsel in a military commission under this chapter shall have a reasonable opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence, including evidence in the possession of the United States, as specified in regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(2) Process issued in military commissions to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of other evidence—

(A) shall be similar to that which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue; and

(B) shall run to any place where the United States shall have jurisdiction thereof.

(b) Treatment of Certain Items.—The military judge in a military commission under this chapter may, upon a sufficient showing, authorize trial counsel in making documents available to the defense through discovery conducted pursuant to such rules as the Secretary shall prescribe—

(1) to delete specified items of classified information from such documents;

(2) to substitute an unclassified summary of the information for such classified documents; or
“(3) to substitute an unclassified statement admitting relevant facts that classified information would tend to prove.

“(c) Disclosure of Exculpatory Evidence.—

(1) As soon as practicable, trial counsel in a military commission under this chapter shall disclose to the defense the existence of any evidence known to trial counsel that reasonably tends to exculpate the accused.

“(2) Exculpatory evidence that is classified may be provided solely to defense counsel, and not the accused, after in camera review by the military judge.

“(3) Before classified evidence may be withheld from the accused under this subsection, the executive or military department or governmental agency which has control over the matter shall ensure and shall certify in writing to the military judge that the disclosure of such evidence to the accused could reasonably be expected to prejudice the national security and that such evidence has been declassified to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the requirements of national security.

“(4) Any classified exculpatory evidence that is not disclosed to the accused under this subsection—

“(A) shall be provided to military defense counsel; and
“(B) shall be provided to civilian defense counsel, provided that civilian defense counsel has obtained the necessary security clearances and access to such evidence is consistent with regulations that the Secretary may prescribe to protect classified information; and

“(C) shall be provided to the accused in a redacted or summary form, if it is possible to do so without compromising intelligence sources, methods, or activities, or other national security interests.

“(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any defense counsel who receives evidence under this subsection shall not be obligated to, and may not, disclose that evidence to the accused.

“§ 949k. Defense of lack of mental responsibility

“(a) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It is an affirmative defense in a trial by military commission that, at the time of the commission of the acts constituting the offense, the accused, as a result of a severe mental disease or defect, was unable to appreciate the nature and quality or the wrongfulness of the acts. Mental disease or defect does not otherwise constitute a defense.
“(b) BURDEN OF PROOF.—The accused has the burden of proving the defense of lack of mental responsibility by clear and convincing evidence.

“(c) FINDINGS FOLLOWING ASSERTION OF DEFENSE.—Whenever lack of mental responsibility of the accused with respect to an offense is properly at issue, the military judge shall instruct the members of the commission as to the defense of lack of mental responsibility under this section and shall charge them to find the accused—

“(1) guilty;
“(2) not guilty; or
“(3) not guilty only by reason of lack of mental responsibility.

“(d) MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED FOR FINDING.—The accused shall be found not guilty only by reason of lack of mental responsibility under subsection (c)(3) only if a majority of the members of the commission at the time the vote is taken determines that the defense of lack of mental responsibility has been established.

“§ 949f. Voting and rulings

“(a) VOTE BY SECRET WRITTEN BALLOT.—Voting by members of a military commission on the findings and on the sentence shall be by secret written ballot.
“(b) Rulings.—(1) The military judge shall rule upon all questions of law, including the admissibility of evidence, and all interlocutory questions arising during the proceedings.

“(2) Any such ruling made by the military judge upon any question of law or any interlocutory question other than the factual issue of mental responsibility of the accused is conclusive and constitutes the ruling of the commission. However, the military judge may change his ruling at any time during the trial.

“(c) INSTRUCTIONS PRIOR TO VOTE.—Before a vote is taken of the findings, the military judge shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the members of the commission as to the elements of the offense and charge them——

“(1) that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond reasonable doubt;

“(2) that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt must be resolved in favor of the accused and he must be acquitted;

“(3) that, if there is reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower
degree as to which there is no reasonable doubt; and

“(4) that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt is upon the United States.

§ 949m. Number of votes required

“(a) CONVICTION.—No person may be convicted of any offense, except as provided in section 949i(b) of this title or by concurrence of two-thirds of the members present at the time the vote is taken.

“(b) SENTENCES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), sentences shall be determined by a military commission by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present at the time the vote is taken.

“(2) No person may be sentenced to suffer death, except insofar as—

“(A) death has been expressly authorized under this Act for an offense of which the accused has been found guilty;

“(B) the charges referred to the commission expressly sought the penalty of death;

“(C) the accused was convicted of the offense by the concurrence of all the members of the military commission present at the time the vote is taken; and
“(D) all members of the military commission present at the time the vote was taken concurred in the sentence of death.

“(3) No person may be sentenced to life imprisonment or to confinement for more than 10 years, except by the concurrence of three-fourths of the members at the time the vote is taken.

“(c) Number of Members Required for Penalty of Death.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), in a case in which the penalty of death is sought, the number of members shall be not less than 12.

“(2) In any case described in paragraph (1) in which 12 members are not reasonably available because of physical conditions or military exigencies, the convening authority shall specify a lesser number of members for the military commission (but not fewer than 5 members), and the military commission may be assembled and the trial held with not fewer than the number of members so specified. In such a case, the convening authority shall make a detailed written statement, to be appended to the record, stating why a greater number of members were not reasonably available.

“§ 949n. Military commission to announce action

“A military commission shall announce its findings and sentence to the parties as soon as determined.
§949o. Record of trial

(a) RECORD; AUTHENTICATION.—Each military commission shall keep a separate, substantially verbatim, record of the proceedings in each case brought before it, and the record shall be authenticated by the signature of the military judge. If the record cannot be authenticated by the military judge by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be authenticated by the signature of the trial counsel or by that of a member of the commission if the trial counsel is unable to authenticate it by reason of his death, disability, or absence. Where appropriate, and as provided by regulation, the record of the military commission may contain a classified annex.

(b) COMPLETE RECORD REQUIRED.—A complete record of the proceedings and testimony shall be prepared in every military commission established under this chapter.

(c) PROVISION OF COPY TO ACCUSED.—A copy of the record of the proceedings of each military commission shall be given to the accused as soon as it is authenticated. Where the record contains classified information, or a classified annex, the accused shall receive a redacted version of the record. The appropriate defense counsel shall have access to the unredacted record, as provided by regulation.
“SUBCHAPTER V—SENTENCES

“Sec.
“949s. Cruel or unusual punishments prohibited.
“949u. Execution of confinement.

“§ 949s. Cruel or unusual punishments prohibited

“Punishment by flogging, or by branding, marking, or tattooing on the body, or any other cruel or unusual punishment, may not be adjudged by a military commission or inflicted upon any person subject to this chapter. The use of irons, single or double, except for the purpose of safe custody, is prohibited.

“§ 949t. Maximum limits

“The punishment which a military commission may direct for an offense may not exceed such limits as the President or Secretary may prescribe for that offense.

“§ 949u. Execution of confinement

“(a) In General.—Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, a sentence of confinement adjudged by a military commission may be carried into execution by confinement—

“(1) in any place of confinement under the control of any of the armed forces; or

“(2) in any penal or correctional institution under the control of the United States or its allies or which the United States may be allowed to use.
“(b) TREATMENT DURING CONFINEMENT BY OTHER THAN THE ARMED FORCES.—Persons confined under subsection (a)(2) in a penal or correctional institution not under the control of one of the armed forces are subject to the same discipline and treatment as persons confined or committed by the courts of the United States or of the State, Territory, District of Columbia, or place in which the institution is situated.

“SUBCHAPTER VI—POST-TRIAL PROCEDURE AND REVIEW OF MILITARY COMMISSIONS

“Sec.
“950a. Error of law; lesser included offense.
“950b. Review by the convening authority.
“950c. Waiver or withdrawal of appeal.
“950d. Appeal by the United States.
“950e. Rehearings.
“950f. Review by Court of Military Commission Review.
“950g. Review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States.
“950h. Appellate counsel.
“950i. Execution of sentence; suspension of sentence.
“950j. Finality of proceedings, findings, and sentences.

“§ 950a. Error of law; lesser included offense

“(a) ERROR OF LAW.—A finding or sentence of a military commission may not be held incorrect on the ground of an error of law unless the error materially prejudices the substantial rights of the accused.

“(b) LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE.—Any reviewing authority with the power to approve or affirm a finding of guilty may approve or affirm, instead, so much of the finding as includes a lesser included offense.