

Summer 1960

The Privilege against Self-Incrimination: An International Symposium: Introduction

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

The Privilege against Self-Incrimination: An International Symposium: Introduction, 51 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 129 (1960-1961)

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

The Journal of
CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE

VOL. 51

JULY-AUGUST 1960

NO. 2

**THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION: AN
INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM**

On February 19 and 20, 1960, Northwestern University School of Law conducted an International Conference on Criminal Law Administration. With the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation, lawyers and professors from the United States and seven foreign countries were brought to the Law School for this meeting, which was one of a series of conferences and lectures during 1959 and 1960 sponsored by the school in observance of its one-hundredth anniversary.

The general objectives of the International Conference were (1) to discuss and analyze the laws or rules prevailing in the United States with

respect to certain troublesome areas of criminal law administration and (2) to appraise such laws and rules in light of the practices and procedures of other countries.

One of the subjects discussed at the International Conference was "The Concept of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination." In this connection, four general questions were posed:

- (1) Is the privilege worthy of retention?
- (2) If retained, what should be its scope, and what limitations, if any, should be applied in its interpretation?
- (3) Under a system of dual sovereignties (e.g.



The participants in the International Conference on Criminal Law Administration sponsored by Northwestern University School of Law are shown above. They are (left to right, seated): Haruo Abe (Japan); Glanville L. Williams (England); G. Arthur Martin (Canada); Walter R. Clemens (Germany); Haim H. Cohn (Israel); Anders Bratholm (Norway); Robert Vouin (France); Louis C. Wyman (New Hampshire Attorney General); John T. McNaughton (Harvard Univ.); Caleb Foote (Univ. of Pennsylvania); Frank J. Remington (Univ. of Wisconsin); O. W. Wilson (Supt. of Police, Chicago); Bernard Weisberg (ACLU Counsel, Chicago); Francis A. Allen (Univ. of Chicago); Gerhard O. W. Mueller (New York Univ.). Standing (left to right): Claude R. Sowle (Northwestern Univ.); Fred E. Inbau (Northwestern Univ.); John Ritchie, III (Dean, Northwestern Univ. Law School). Not present for picture: Monrad G. Paulsen (Columbia Univ.); Frank J. McGarr (Chicago attorney).

federal and state), should each sovereign include within the privilege granted by it the possibility of incrimination under the laws of other sovereigns?

- (4) To what extent does this concept prevail in foreign countries? Is its absence compensated for in any other way? Has its absence led to abuses by police and prosecution?

The papers of the conference participants dealing with these and related problems are reproduced in the following pages. A brief summary of the American law with respect to the privilege appears at the outset. This is followed by the policy-

oriented papers of the two American participants in the Conference who discussed self-incrimination, Professor John T. McNaughton of the Harvard Law School and Attorney General Louis C. Wyman of New Hampshire. The symposium concludes with reports by the seven foreign participants concerning the status of the privilege against self-incrimination in their countries.

Subsequent numbers of the Journal will contain the papers of the American and foreign participants in the Conference dealing with the problems of "Police Arrest Privileges," "Police Interrogation Privileges and Limitations," and "The Exclusionary Rule Regarding Illegally Seized Evidence."—EDITOR.