ABSTRACT
The law should cohere with its rationale. But often, if not always, there are multiple rationales and they point in different directions. Tensions then arise. I suggest that this is true of the law on confession evidence. There are at least three different concerns at play here: the reliability of the confession, the autonomy of the confessor (the accused person) and the legitimacy of the method by which the confession was obtained (sometimes expressed as a matter of integrity in the administration of criminal justice). I trace how these interests or values interact and compete to shape (judicial interpretation of) the rules in the Criminal Procedure Code governing the admissibility of confession evidence.
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