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FOREWORD: DO WE REALLY WANT TO KNOW THE DEFENDANT?

Dale A. Nance*

The philosopher David Hume may have been right that we cannot logically infer anything about the future from the past. Yet the common sense of the matter is otherwise. And most scientists, not known for naivete in matters of inference, would readily concede that the best indicator of the future is the pattern of the past. Indeed, in some sense it is the only indicator. In terms of human behavior, this compelling intuition is reflected in the fact that we commonly speak of a person's traits of character, ideas that are inevitably based on the person's patterns of past behavior and which are used in turn to anticipate future conduct. Put in the context of the allegation of a crime or other serious wrongdoing, the common sense of the matter — and the scientists' working postulate — suggests that one of the best indicators of the likelihood that the defendant committed the alleged act is the person's history of similar misconduct.

The Rules Governing Other Misconduct Evidence

It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the most controversial aspects of modern Anglo-American evidence law is the rule, or set of rules, that generally prohibits the use of evidence of a person's character to make inferences about the probability that the person has committed a breach of duty. To the uninitiated, this rule sounds absurd on its face. And indeed, the law on the subject reflects the tension between the rationales that have been given for the rules and the ordinary understanding of the way we act on our knowledge of someone's

---

* Professor of Law and Norman & Edna Freehling Scholar, Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology.

1. Philosophers continue to wrestle with the problem, which is known in the literature simply as "the problem of induction." Two classics of the modern literature are Nelson Goodman, Fact, Fiction, and Forecast (3d ed. 1979), and A.J. Ayer, Probability and Evidence (1972). For simplicity, I have referred to projections of future events. The philosophical dilemma applies not only to projections about future events, but also to projections about unknown past events from other known past events, a context obviously more common in litigation settings. Inferences at trial are still inductive in character. See generally 1A John H. Wigmore, Evidence § 30 (Tillers' rev. 1983).

2. See 1A Wigmore, supra note 1, § 55. Cf. id. § 64 (in many civil controversies, character traits are largely irrelevant).

propensities. Numerous exceptions to, and circumventions of, the prohibition have been developed, and applied in ways that reflect in part the less than complete confidence we have in the rationales themselves.

One of the most important stress points in this history has been the problem of sexual violence. So compelling has been the belief in character propensities, when it comes to sexual inclinations, that the common law routinely, if somewhat fitfully, has allowed evidence of traits of sexual perversion to show that the defendant engaged in the alleged sexual misconduct. Though sometimes explained as not violating the prohibition of propensity based inferences, more candid opinions, as well as academic commentary, have recognized the category as genuinely exceptional.

This exception was apparently rejected in the adoption of the Federal Rules of Evidence in 1975. Those rules, since used as the basis for codification in most states, provide for the usual list of exceptions to the prohibition, but do not endorse the idea that sexual violence is exceptional. The governing provision is Rule 404, which now states:

(a) **Character evidence generally.** Evidence of a person's character or a trait of character is not admissible for the purpose of proving action in conformity therewith on a particular occasion, except:

   (1) **Character of accused.** Evidence of a pertinent trait of character offered by an accused, or by the prosecution to rebut the same;

   (2) **Character of victim.** Evidence of a pertinent trait of character of the victim of the crime offered by an accused, or by the prosecution to rebut the same, or evidence of a character trait of peacefulness of the victim offered by the prosecution in a homicide case to rebut evidence that the victim was the first aggressor;

   (3) **Character of witness.** Evidence of the character of a witness, as provided in Rules 607, 608, and 609.

(b) **Other crimes, wrongs, or acts.** Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident, provided that upon request by the accused, the prosecution in a criminal case shall provide reasonable notice in advance of trial, or during trial if the court excuses pretrial notice on good

4. *Id.* §§ 189-195.
5. Those rationales are briefly outlined *infra* at notes 21-25 and accompanying text.
cause shown, of the general nature of any such evidence it intends to introduce at trial.

Though not without serious ambiguities, nowhere does this rule suggest any difference between the treatment of sexual misconduct cases and other classes of cases. And some of the appellate case law since adoption of the Rules seems to be taking this omission seriously, eliminating the common-law exception.\(^7\)

The resulting exclusionary rule has come under attack in the wake of several highly publicized cases, and in a context of increasing concern about sexual violence against women and children. With the encouragement of the Department of Justice, Congress recently acted to address these concerns. In the crime bill passed last August, Congress added three new rules to the Federal Rules of Evidence, designed to restore and articulate the common-law exception. Section 320935 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994,\(^8\) entitled "Admissibility of Evidence of Similar Crimes in Sex Offense Cases," provides:

(a) The Federal Rules of Evidence are amended by adding after Rule 412 the following new rules:

"Rules 413. Evidence of Similar Crimes in Sexual Assault Cases"

"(a) In a criminal case in which the defendant is accused of an offense of sexual assault, evidence of the defendant's commission of another offense or offenses of sexual assault is admissible, and may be considered for its bearing on any matter to which it is relevant.

"(b) In a case in which the Government intends to offer evidence under this rule, the attorney for the Government shall disclose the evidence to the defendant, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.

"(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.

"(d) For purposes of this rule and Rule 415, "offense of sexual assault" means a crime under Federal law or the law of a State (as

7. See, e.g., Getz v. State, 538 A.2d 726 (Del. 1988); State v. Zybach, 761 P.2d 1334 (Or. Ct. App. 1989), rev'd on other grounds, 775 P.2d 318 (Or. 1989). To be sure, other courts have not found the omission to be so determinative. See, e.g., State v. Day, 715 P.2d 743, 747 (Ariz. 1986); State v. Charles L., 398 S.E.2d 123, 131-33 (W. Va. 1990). States that have not formally adopted the Federal Rules may have been affected by them nonetheless, as some have since rejected the exception in question by decisional law. See, e.g., Lannan v. State, 600 N.E.2d 1334 (Ind. 1992); Pendleton v. Commonwealth, 685 S.W.2d 549 (Ky. 1985). The continuing controversy over the issue is reflected in occasional legislative intervention. See, e.g., IND. CODE ANN. § 35-37-4-15 (1994) (overruling Lannon); MO. REV. STAT. § 566.025 (1994) (inclusionary rule for child molestation).

defined in section 513 of title 18, United States Code) that involved—

“(1) any conduct proscribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code;

“(2) contact, without consent, between any part of the defendant’s body or an object and the genitals or anus of another person;

“(3) contact, without consent, between the genitals or anus of the defendant and any part of another person’s body;

“(4) deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from the infliction of death, bodily injury, or physical pain on another person; or

“(5) an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraph (1)-(4).

"Rule 414. Evidence of Similar Crimes in Child Molestation Cases

“(a) In a criminal case in which the defendant is accused of an offense of child molestation, evidence of the defendant’s commission of another offense or offenses of child molestation is admissible, and may be considered for its bearing on any matter to which it is relevant.

“(b) In a case in which the Government intends to offer evidence under this rule, the attorney for the Government shall disclose the evidence to the defendant, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.

“(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.

“(d) For purposes of this rule and Rule 415, “child” means a person below the age of fourteen, and “offense of child molestation” means a crime under Federal law or the law of a State (as defined in section 513 of title 18, United States Code) that involved—

“(1) any conduct proscribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, that was committed in relation to a child;

“(2) any conduct proscribed by chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code;

“(3) contact between any part of the defendant’s body or an object of the genitals or anus of a child;

“(4) contact between the genitals or anus of the defendant and any part of the body of a child;

“(5) deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from the infliction of death, bodily injury, or physical pain on a child; or

“(6) an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraphs (1)-(5).

"Rule 415. Evidence of Similar Acts in Civil Cases Concerning Sexual Assault or Child Molestation

“(a) In a civil case in which a claim for damages or other relief is predicated on a party’s alleged commission of conduct constitut-
ing an offense of sexual assault or child molestation, evidence of that party’s commission or another offense or offenses of sexual assault or child molestation is admissible and may be considered as provided in Rule 413 and Rule 414 of these rules.

“(b) A party who intends to offer evidence under this Rule shall disclose the evidence to the party against whom it will be offered, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.

“(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.”

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective pursuant to subsection (d).

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS BY JUDICIAL CONFERENCE.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall transmit to Congress a report containing recommendations for amending the Federal Rules of Evidence as they affect the admission of evidence of a defendant’s prior sexual assault or child molestation crimes in cases involving sexual assault and child molestation. The Rules Enabling Act shall not apply to the recommendations made by the Judicial Conference pursuant to this section.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—

(1) If the recommendations described in subsection (c) are the same as the amendments made by subsection (a) then the amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective 30 days after the transmittal of the recommendations.

(2) If the recommendations described in subsection (c) are different than the amendments made by subsection (a), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective 150 days after the transmittal of the recommendations unless otherwise provided by law.

(3) If the Judicial Conference fails to comply with subsection (c), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective 150 days after the date the recommendations were due under subsection (c) unless otherwise provided by law.

(e) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after the effective date of such amendments.

Several points are worth noting. First, the new rules confirm the common-law exception only with respect to prior acts constituting an “offense,” a defined term; other forms of evidence of character, such as the defendant’s reputation or the opinions of others with regard to his character, remain subject to the Rule 404 exclusion. Second, the new rules cover only sexual assault and sexual molestation of children under the age of 14 years, thus leaving prosecutions for criminal acts
between consenting adults to be governed by the pre-existing system of rules. Third, the new rules allow the admission of "prior act" character evidence in both criminal and civil cases.9 And fourth, the effective date for the new rules is delayed for up to 300 days in order to obtain and evaluate a report of the Judicial Conference on the issue.

THE SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

This Symposium consists of four, relatively short papers. Its genesis indicates its justification. In 1992, while an earlier effort to enact this legislation was working its way through Congress, I was elected Chair of the Evidence Section of the Association of American Law Schools. In that capacity, I asked David Karp, principal drafter of the new rules on behalf of the Department of Justice, to speak to the Evidence Section at the annual meeting of the Association in January 1993. The paper then presented by Mr. Karp is reproduced here for its value in considering the new rules.10 That value is considerably heightened by the fact that the principal legislative sponsors of the new rules, Senator Robert Dole and Representative Susan Molinari, subsequently referred to Mr. Karp's address as "a detailed account of the views of the legislative sponsors and the Administration concerning the proposed reform," which "should also be considered an authoritative part of its legislative history."11

Also presented here is the response that was invited from Professor Edward Imwinkelried, of the University of California, Davis. Professor Imwinkelried is the author of numerous articles and a thorough treatise on the subject of "other misconduct" evidence.12 He argues that the new rules go too far toward one extreme, failing to give adequate weight to the legitimate interests of the defendant.13 The third

9. Similarly, the crime bill also extended to civil cases the "rape shield" rule, protecting alleged victims of sexual misconduct from the admission of evidence of the victim's prior sexual conduct or predisposition. See id. § 40141.


piece is a brief reply by Mr. Karp, as befitted the circumstances.  

Exception as indicated, the three articles are reproduced here essentially in the form originally presented, without taking into account subsequent thoughts or events.

As the reader will discover, Professor Imwinkelried's discussion of the new rules is informed by his study of the evolution of English rules dealing with character propensity evidence. The comparative focus suggested a further extension, addressing the treatment of this kind of evidence in continental European jurisprudence. Interestingly, there turns out to be very little written on the continental treatment of uncharged misconduct evidence generally, much less on the narrower category of sexual misconduct evidence. Consequently, I invited Mirjan Damaška, Professor of Law at Yale University, to provide some insight on this point. Unfortunately, competing commitments precluded his attendance at the AALS meeting, but Professor Damaška graciously agreed to provide written comments to supplement the presentations made by Mr. Karp and Professor Imwinkelried. Thus, the fourth piece in this Symposium is Professor Damaška's paper, in which he explains the much greater exposure of continental judges to character and propensity evidence.

**Preliminary Comments on the Merits of the New Rules**

Even a casual reading of the new rules suggests a host of questions about their interpretation. For example, the rules are phrased so that the described evidence "is admissible, and may be considered for its bearing on any matter to which it is relevant." The rules do not say simply that such evidence is excepted from the propensity ban of Rule 404. That seems to imply that the evidence may not be excluded for any reason except perhaps irrelevance,  

\[16\] which would, in particular, preclude exclusion under Rule 403, the rule allowing discretionary exclusion of excessively prejudicial or cumulative evidence.  

\[17\] However, according to their supporters, the new rules are not to be read this

---


16. Actually, the rule says that such evidence is admissible even if it is completely irrelevant, although it also implies, for example, that a judge could instruct the jury not to consider such evidence for any purpose once it is admitted. That, of course, would be quite silly; if it may not be used for any purpose, it certainly should be excluded, though the rule does not permit this as worded.

17. That rule provides: "Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or mislead-
way. "Admissible" is to be read as "may be admitted," not "must be admitted," so that exclusion under Rule 403 or on other grounds remains a possibility. 18

This, however, is contrary to the usual understanding of the term "admissible." Ordinarily, when a judge or trial lawyer says evidence is "admissible," she means that a judge may not refuse admission. For example, when Rule 402 says that relevant evidence "is admissible, except as otherwise provided," it does not mean that the trial judge may admit relevant evidence not otherwise excluded by some rule, but rather that the trial judge must admit such evidence. And when a judge has discretion under Rule 403 to admit a given piece of evidence, depending upon the balance of probative value and prejudicial potential, we do not say that evidence is "admissible" because of the existence of discretion, even though it may or may not be admitted. Rather, we say that it is admissible or inadmissible as a conclusion after the indicated balance between probative value and prejudice has been determined. Until that judgment is made, and indeed until all other necessary judgments about the applicability of admissibility rules have been made, the evidence cannot be said to be either admissible or inadmissible. 19 Given the stated goals of the drafters, the new rules should beworded simply as exceptions to the propensity prohibition in Rule 404(b). 20

Presumably, this kind of problem will be handled by the Judicial Conference in its consideration of the new rules. Our concern here is less technical. The essential question is whether such an exception for sexual assaults should be incorporated in the rules, assuming that the

18. Karp, supra note 10, at 19 ("these rules are rules of admissibility, and not mandatory rules of admission"). This point is reiterated by Senator Dole, see Statement of Sen. Dole, supra note 11, and Represenative Molinari. See Statement of Rep. Molinair, supra note 11.

19. There is, of course, a sense in which the word "admissible" denotes permissiveness, but that is because there is more than one person involved. When we say evidence is admissible, we do not mean that it must be placed in evidence, only that it must be admitted (by the judge) if it is offered (by an appropriate party). There is a choice here, but it is that of the offering party, not the judge.

20. It must be acknowledged that the Federal Rules of Evidence are not entirely clear or consistent in their mode of expression, but those contexts in which the "is admissible" locution does not denote a mandatory admission more obviously represent only exceptions to designated exclusionary rules. See, e.g., Fed. R. Evid. 1004 (exceptions to original document rule; secondary evidence said to be "admissible"). Even here, it would be better if the confusion were avoided. Similar, but more serious, problems can be found elsewhere. See, e.g., Fed. R. Evid. 609(a) (evidence of conviction of crime "shall be admitted" under certain circumstances, suggesting the ridiculous result that hearsay evidence of criminal conviction satisfying Rule 609 requirements cannot be excluded under Rule 802).
exception can be appropriately worded. This requires us to examine
the rationales of the usual prohibition, instantiated by Rule 404, and
the extent to which the special context of sexual assault presents pos-
sibilities for defeating those rationales. Fortunately, the rationales of
the general exclusion, and the question of their application to sexual
assault cases, are taken up directly in the papers that follow. For pres-
ent purposes, I want only to point out that the arguments fall into
three broad categories. 21

First, and most commonly, there are arguments based on the dan-
ger of other misconduct evidence to the truth-finding function of the
tribunal. These arguments come in two analytically distinct forms:
those concerning the probatively misleading nature of character trait
evidence, and those concerning the potential for prejudice against the
defendant because of the trier's hostile reaction to other misconduct.
The former address the possibility that the trier will inaccurately as-
seSS the probability that the defendant committed the charged offense,
whereas the latter address the possibility that the trier will not apply
the correct standard of proof to the probability it determines, even if it
determines it accurately.22

Second, there are arguments based on the distraction and waste
of time that is inherent in disputing the claims of other misconduct.
This is distinct from the first category because it does not depend
upon the notion that an additional risk of inaccuracy is thereby in-
jected into the present proceeding. Even if any unwarranted preju-
dice against the defendant, and any misleading inferences from the
uncharged acts, can be eliminated, the net result is to spend much
time considering matters that may be of little probative value to the
present case. 23

21. For an excellent yet brief account, see RICHARD O. LEMPERT & STEPHEN A.
SALTZBURG, A MODERN APPROACH TO EVIDENCE 216-19 (2d ed. 1982).

22. Addressing the former argument raises in turn two distinguishable empirical issues, one
having to do with recidivism rates, psychological theories of character traits, and other indicia of
the probative value of the misconduct evidence, the other having to do with the predictability of
jury misuse of the misconduct evidence. It is, after all, one thing to say that social scientists
overestimate the value of character evidence, quite another to say that lay jurors do. Professor
Imwinkelried seems to conflate these issues in his discussion. See Imwinkelried, supra note 13,
at 43-46.

23. The argument, often encountered, that raising the issue of uncharged misconduct might
"unfairly surprise" the defendant at trial may be either an argument about wasting resources of
the tribunal and the parties, as the defendant takes appropriate steps to meet the issue, or as an
argument about induced inaccuracy, assuming the defendant is unable to present appropriate
and extant counter evidence in the limited time available at trial. It will be noticed that the latter
concern is addressed in section (b) of each of the new rules by a requirement of notice to the
defendant.
Third, there are arguments based on the liberal premise that once a person has been prosecuted for a crime, and punished if the result is a judgment of guilty, he has "paid his debt to society" and should not be plagued further by the history of the offense. This kind of argument, though occasionally articulated,\textsuperscript{24} is decidedly weak, since it begs the question of what the punishment is to be. It is entirely plausible to say that various adverse consequences, beside formal punishment by the state, attach to conviction of crime, including exclusion from certain professions, loss of the right to carry weapons, and so on. Similar, though less serious, consequences may attach to mere suspicion of crime. One of these consequences may well be that the police are likely to use one's criminal history, including mere allegations of wrongdoing, as the basis for shaping their search for the culprit. And it is arguable that the same reasoning should permit the trier of fact to use such information without violating some political right of the defendant.\textsuperscript{25}

In the papers that follow, one should attend to the nature of the arguments presented with regard to sexual assault and attempt to understand them in terms of some such taxonomy of arguments. That may prove difficult at times, but the struggle to understand the arguments in these terms can be illuminating. To take one example, running through Mr. Karp's arguments is a theme to the effect that there is a special need for evidence of prior sexual assaults. One should be especially careful about such arguments. They can mean at least two different things.

On the one hand, they can mean that there is a special need to suppress sexual assault. Before that can be accepted as an argument for admitting evidence, one must answer the question of why the best way to suppress a given type of crime is by making it easier to convict that class of defendants, as opposed, for example, to stiffening penalties or otherwise encouraging prosecutions. Unless the social need argument is tied in some way to countering one or more of the three types of arguments for exclusion articulated above, it may be morally equivalent to an argument that the burden of proof for conviction

\textsuperscript{24} See Lempert & Saltzburg, supra note 21, at 219.

\textsuperscript{25} Of course, using the information in this way, in view of the fact that the police will have also so used it, may pose a danger to accuracy by virtue of a kind of double counting. See id. at 217-18 (suggesting reasons that criminal record may be given too much weight unless effects of plea bargaining are taken into account). But this is a different type of argument, aimed at the question of the balance between probative value and potential to mislead.
should be lowered for allegations of sexual violence. This conclusion might be circumvented to the extent that the general rationale for exclusion is thought to be avoiding the waste of resources rather than avoiding risks of inaccuracy, since one can then argue that even a small probative value in the evidence of prior offenses is worth the expense and effort of consideration.

On the other hand, the argument from special need can be aimed at the peculiar epistemic features of the cases under consideration. Mr. Karp’s argument seems focused primarily in this direction, as he addresses the special problems of the availability of probative evidence that occur in many sexual assaults and child molestation cases. But even here, we must press ourselves to answer why it is that the weakness of other available evidence is a reason to admit evidence that would otherwise be considered too prejudicial or misleading. Does the paucity of other evidence somehow make propensity evidence less prejudicial, less misleading? If anything, one would expect the opposite relation, since the trier will be forced to dwell all the more upon the alleged prior offenses. But again, one way to avoid this conclusion would be to see the special need argument as linked to the proposition that the general exclusionary rule is based on efficiency concerns.

These considerations point to a more general problem. If the law is to have integrity, the proposal to exempt other misconduct evidence in sexual offense cases must assume that the rationales of the general exclusion are correct, at least in the sense of justifying on balance the prohibition of other misconduct evidence when used to set up a pro-

26. This could be articulated as a call for either lowering the standard of proof to some level below the usual, and still constitutionally mandated, “beyond reasonable doubt” standard, or—more subtly—for modifying the usual meaning of “reasonable” in that standard. For a discussion of the ultimate source of the constitutional guarantee, see Dale A. Nance, Civility and the Burden of Proof, 17 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol’y 647 (1994).

27. In the last part of Mr. Karp’s address, he relies on the history of the general prohibition to argue, seemingly, that it has less to do with avoiding prejudice than with avoiding unfair surprise and unnecessarily protracted trials. See Karp, supra note 10, at 27-30.

28. Of course, the matter is different if the “other evidence,” though available, is not presented to the trier of fact. Another way to avoid the dilemma indicated in the text would be to see the exclusionary rule as designed, at least in part, to induce prosecutors to develop and present more particular evidence about the charged crime, and not to rely on the trier of fact to convict simply because of the defendant’s criminal history. Such an argument has been used in support of the suggestion of an inclusionary exception limited to acquaintance rapes, in the context of which prior offense evidence is claimed to be both more probative and less prejudicial than in other types of cases. See David P. Bryden & Roger C. Park, “Other Crimes” Evidence in Sex Offense Cases, 78 Minn. L. Rev. 529, 575-82 (1994). It is thought that in such cases, there may be no need to try to induce the presentation of better evidence by an exclusionary rule, because commonly none will exist. Id. at 578-79.
pensity inference; otherwise, the proper response is to repeal the pro-
hibition entirely. Of course, it is quite plausible to see the new rules
as reflecting a political alliance between anti-crime political forces,
favoring total repeal of Rule 404 (or at least of 404(b)), and political
forces we might call interest group feminist, concerned only (or pri-
marily) with crime as it adversely affects women and their children.
But such a compromise does not generate a law consistent in principle
unless a reasonable theoretical difference can explain the resulting
distinction between sexual violence and other serious crime, such as
clandestine murder, where the social need and paucity of evidence
factors are also in play.29

In the final analysis, it may be that the new rules are simply in-
consistent in underlying principle with the general prohibition. Even
so, it is still possible to argue for the new rules as a kind of experi-
ment. That is, liberalized admissibility for a politically accessible cate-
gory of cases may be found, in the wake of experience, to be a
workable and satisfactory arrangement. That would make it easier at
a still later date to repeal, or substantially water down, the whole pro-
pensity inference prohibition. This may be a laudable goal, one Euro-
pean jurisdictions have largely achieved already. However, on the
assumption of incoherence in principle, it is not obvious that alleged
sexual offenders, however unsympathetic they may be, have no plausi-
ble complaint about unequal treatment.30 On the other hand, perhaps
it is pointless to look for a principled scheme here. The pre-existing
scheme, at least as it has been applied, may already be so arbitrary
and incoherent that the addition of the sexual propensity exception
will have little impact on the integrity of the system as a whole.31

29. I do not mean to say that proponents of the new rule are being inconsistent unless they
also believe that the general prohibition is justified in cases not covered by these or other excep-
tions. They can consistently believe that the general prohibition is unjustifiable, but that the
prohibition as applied to sexual assaults is even less justifiable. The problem here is not with
hypocrisy within the contending factions, but with the implications of different kinds of political
compromise. See Bryden & Park, supra note 28, at 572-75 (criticizing the inconsistency of a
sexual assault exception). See generally RONALD DWORKIN, LAW'S EMPIRE 176-84 (1986)
describing integrity of underlying principle as an account of the basic mandate to "treat like
cases alike," and differentiating between compromises that do and those that do not preserve
the integrity of the resulting scheme of law).

30. Cf. Dworkin, supra note 29, at 185-86 (contrasting inconsistency among discrete jurisdic-
tions, as among states in a federal system, with inconsistency within a particular jurisdiction's
laws).

31. See 1A WIGMORE, supra note 1, § 54.1 (lamenting the hypocrisy and unprincipled na-
ture of the 'compromises represented by the character evidence rules).