

Fall 1961

The Exclusionary Rule Regarding Illegally Seized Evidence: An International Symposium

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 Exclusionary Rule Regarding Illegally Seized Evidence: An International Symposium, 52 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 245 (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. 52

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1961

No. 3

**THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE REGARDING ILLEGALLY SEIZED
EVIDENCE: AN INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM**

During 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 sponsored by the school in observance of its one-hundredth anniversary.

One of the Conference sessions was devoted to the topic, "The Exclusionary Rule Regarding Illegally Seized Evidence." In this connection, the participants were asked to consider the following questions: (1) Does the exclusionary rule accomplish its usually stated purpose, i.e., to protect Constitutional rights by indirectly penalizing police failure to comply with prescribed search and seizure requirements? (2) If the rule does not accomplish that objective, can it nonetheless be supported on the ethical ground that any evidence obtained in violation of the Constitution should not be used to convict an accused person? (3) In countries which have no such rule, are citizen rights adequately protected by other prevailing rules and practices?

The papers of the Conference participants dealing with the above questions and related problems are reproduced in the following pages. A summary of the American law relating to the topic, prepared by Professor Francis A. Allen of the Law School of the University of Chicago, appears at the outset. Professor Allen's report is followed by policy-oriented papers delivered by the two American participants in the Conference who discussed the exclusionary rule, Professor Monrad G. Paulsen of Columbia Law School and Frank J. McGarr of the Chicago Bar. The symposium concludes with reports by the seven foreign participants concerning the law of their countries with respect to the admissibility of illegally seized evidence.

Although the American participants recently revised their papers to reflect post-Conference developments in this area of American law, the manuscripts were submitted to the printer prior to the historic decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Mapp v. Ohio*, 81 S. Ct. 1684 (1961), which held that the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires all states to exclude illegally seized evidence. The American authors have, however, prepared brief comments on this important case, and these comments appear at the end of each of the American articles.

Conference papers dealing with "The Concept of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination" appeared in Volume 51, Number 2 (July-August, 1960), of the *Journal* at pages 129-188. Papers concerning "Police Detention and Arrest Privileges" were published in Volume 51, Number 4 (November-December, 1960), at pages 385-440. Manuscripts relating to "Police Interrogation Privileges and Limitations" may be found in Volume 52, Number 1 (May-June, 1961), at pages 1-73.—EDITOR.