I believe the decision of the Court represents poor constitutional law and entails harmful consequences for the country at large. How serious these consequences may prove to be only time can tell, but the basic flaws in the Court's justification seem to me readily apparent now once all sides of the problem are considered.

I. Introduction

At the outset, it is well to note exactly what is required by the Court's new constitutional code of rules for confessions. The foremost requirement, upon which later admissibility of a confession depends, is that a fourfold warning be given to a person in custody before he is questioned, namely, that he has a right to remain silent, that anything he says may be used against him, that he has a right to have present an attorney during the questioning, and that if indigent he has a right to a lawyer without charge. To forgo these rights, some affirmative statement of rejection is seemingly required, and threats, tricks, or cajolings to obtain this waiver are forbidden. If before or during questioning the suspect seeks to invoke his right to remain silent, interrogation must be forgone or cease; a request for counsel brings about the same result until a lawyer is procured. Finally, there are a miscellany of minor directives, for example, the burden of proof of waiver is on the State, admissions and exculpatory statements are treated just like confessions, withdrawal of a waiver is always permitted, and so forth.

While the fine points of this scheme are far less clear than the Court admits, the tenor is quite apparent. The new rules are not designed to guard against police brutality or other unmistakably banned forms of coercion. Those who use third-degree tactics and deny them in court are equally able and destined to lie as skillfully about warnings and waivers. Rather, the thrust of the new rules is to negate all pressures, to reinforce the nervous or ignorant suspect, and ultimately to discourage any confession at all. The aim in short is toward "voluntariness" in a utopian sense, or to view it from a different angle, voluntariness with a vengeance.

To incorporate this notion into the Constitution requires a strained reading of history and precedent and a disregard of the very pragmatic concerns that alone may on occasion justify such strains. I believe that reasoned examination will show that the Due Process Clauses provide an adequate tool for coping with confessions and that, even if the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination be invoked, its precedents taken as a whole do not sustain the present rules. Viewed as a choice based on pure policy, these new rules prove to be a highly debatable, if not one-sided, appraisal of the competing interests, imposed over widespread objection, at the very time when judicial restraint is most called for by the circumstances.

II. Constitution Premises.

It is most fitting to begin an inquiry into the constitutional precedents by surveying the limits on confessions the Court has evolved under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. This is so because these cases show that there exists a workable and effective means of dealing with confessions in a judicial manner; because the cases are the baseline from which the Court now departs and so serve to measure the actual as opposed to the professed distance it travels; and because examination of them helps reveal how the Court has coasted into its present position. The earliest confession cases in this Court emerged from federal prosecutions and were settled on a nonconstitutional basis, the Court adopting the common-law rule that the absence of inducements, promises, and threats made a confession voluntary and admissible. Hopt
v. People of Territory of Utah, 110 U.S. 574, 4 S.Ct. 202, 28 L.Ed. 262; Pierce v. United States, 160 U.S. 355, 16 S.Ct. 321, 40 L.Ed. 454. While a later case said the Fifth Amendment privilege controlled admissibility, this proposition was not itself developed in subsequent decisions. The Court did, however, heighten the test of admissibility in federal trials to one of voluntariness "in fact," Ziang Sung Wan v. United States, 266 U.S. 1, 14, 45 S.Ct. 1, 3, 69 L.Ed. 131 (quoted, ante, p. 1621), and them by and large left federal judges to apply the same standards the Court began to derive in a string of state court cases.

This new line of decisions, testing admissibility by the Due Process Clause, began in 1936 with Brown v. State of Mississippi, 297 U.S. 278, 56 S.Ct. 461, 80 L.Ed. 682, and must now embrace somewhat more than 30 full opinions of the Court. While the voluntariness rubric was repeated in many instances, e. g., Lyons v. State of Oklahoma, 322 U.S. 596, 64 S.Ct. 1208, 88 L.Ed. 1481, the Court never pinned it down to a single meaning but on the contrary infused it with a number of different values. To travel quickly over the main themes, there was an initial emphasis on reliability, e. g., Ward v. State of Texas, 316 U.S. 547, 62 S.Ct. 1139, 86 L.Ed. 1663, supplemented by concern over the legality and fairness of the police practices, e. g., Ashcraft v. State of Tennessee, 322 U.S. 143, 64 S.Ct. 921, 88 L.Ed. 1192, in an "accusatorial" systems of law enforcement, Watts v. State of Indiana, 338 U.S. 49, 54, 69 S.Ct. 1337, 1350, 93 L.Ed. 1801, and eventually by close attention to the individual's state of mind and capacity for effective choice, e. g., Gallegos v. State of Colorado, 370 U.S. 49, 82 S.Ct. 1209, 8 L.Ed.2d 325. The outcome was a continuing re-evaluation on the facts of each case of how much pressure on the suspect was permissible.

Among the criteria often taken into account were threats or imminent danger, e. g., Payne v. State of Arkansas, 356 U.S. 560, 78 S.Ct. 844, 2 L.Ed.2d 975, physical deprivations such as lack of sleep or food, e. g., Reck v. Pate, 367 U.S. 433, 81 S.Ct. 15 41, 6 L.Ed.2d 948, repeated or extended interrogation, e. g., Chambers v. State of Florida, 309 U.S. 227, 60 S.Ct. 472, 84 L.Ed. 716, limits on access to counsel or friends, Crooker v. State of California, 357 U.S. 433, 78 S.Ct. 1287, 2 L.Ed.2d 1448; Cicenia v. La Gay, 357 U.S. 504, 78 S.Ct. 1297, 2 L.Ed.2d 1523, length and illegality of detention under state law, e. g., Haynes v. State of Washington, 373 U.S. 503, 83 S.Ct. 1336, 10 L.Ed.2d 513, and individual weakness or incapacities, Lynumn v. State of Illinois, 372 U.S. 528, 83 S.Ct. 917, 9 L.Ed.2d 922. Apart from direct physical coercion, however, no single default or fixed combination of defaults guaranteed exclusion, and synopses of the cases would serve little use because the overall gauge has been steadily changing, usually in the direction of restricting admissibility. But to mark just what point had been reached before the Court jumped the rails in Escobedo v. State of Illinois, 378 U.S. 478, 84 S.Ct. 1758, 12 L.Ed.2d 977, it is worth capsulizing the then-recent case of Haynes v. State of Washington, 373 U.S. 503, 83 S.Ct. 1336. There, Haynes had been held some 16 or more hours in violation of state law before signing the disputed confession, had received no warnings of any kind, and despite requests had been refused access to his wife or to counsel, the police indicating that access would be allowed after a confession. Emphasizing especially this last inducement and rejecting some contrary indicia of voluntariness, the Court in a 5-to-4 decision held the confession inadmissible.

There are several relevant lessons to be drawn from this constitutional history. The first is that with over 25 years of precedent the Court has developed an elaborate,
sophisticated, and sensitive approach to admissibility of confessions. It is "judicial" in its
treatment of one case at a time, see Culombe v. Connecticut, 367 U.S. 568, 635, 81
S.Ct. 1860, 1896, 6 L.Ed.2d (concurring opinion of The Chief Justice), flexible in its
ability to respond to the endless mutations of fact presented, and ever more familiar to
the lower courts. Of course, strict certainty is not obtained in this developing process,
but this is often so with constitutional principles, and disagreement is usually confined to
that borderland of close cases where it matters least.
The second point is that in practice and from time to time in principle, the Court has
given ample recognition to society's interest in suspect questioning as an instrument of
law enforcement. Cases countenancing quite significant pressures can be cited without
difficulty, and the lower courts may often have been yet more tolerant. Of course the
limitations imposed today were rejected by necessary implication in case after case, the
right to warnings having been explicitly rebuffed in this Court many years ago. Powers v.
United States, 223 U.S. 303, 32 S.Ct. 281, 56 L.Ed. 448; Wilson v. United States, 162
U.S. 613, 16 S.Ct. 895, 40 L.Ed. 1090. As recently as Haynes v. State of Washington,
373 U.S. 503, 515, 83 S.Ct. 1336, 1344, the Court openly acknowledged that questioning of witnesses and suspects "is undoubtedly an essential tool in effective law
enforcement." Accord, Crooker v. State of California, 357 U.S. 503, 441, 78 S.Ct. 1287,
1292.
Finally, the cases disclose that the language in many of the opinions overstates the
actual course of decision. It has been said, for example, that an admissible confession
must be made by the suspect "in the unfettered exercise of his own will," Malloy v.
Hogan, 378 U.S. 1, 8, 84 S.Ct. 1489, 1493, 12 L.Ed.2d 653, and that "a prisoner is not
"to be made the deluded instrument of his own conviction," Culombe v. Connecticut,
367 U.S. 568, 581, 81 S.Ct. 1860, 1867, 6 L.Ed.2d 1037 (Frankfurter, J., announcing the
Court's judgment and an opinion). Though often repeated, such principles are rarely
observed in full measure. Even the word "voluntary" may be deemed somewhat
misleading, especially when one considers many of the confessions that have been
brought under its umbrella. See, e. g., supra, n. 5. The tendency to overstate may be
laid in part to the flagrant facts often before the Court; but in any event one must
recognize how it has tempered attitudes and lent some color of authority to the
approach now taken by the Court.
I turn now to the Court's asserted reliance on the Fifth Amendment, an approach which I
frankly regard as a trompe l'oeil. The Court's opinion in my view reveals no adequate
basis for extending the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination to the
police station. Far more important, it fails to show that the Court's new rules are well
supported, let alone compelled, by Fifth Amendment precedents. Instead, the new rules
actually derive from quotation and analogy drawn from precedents under the Sixth
Amendment, which should properly have not bearing on police interrogation.
The Court's opening contention, that the Fifth Amendment governs police station
confessions, is perhaps not an impermissible extension of the law but it has little to
commend itself in the present circumstances. Historically, the privilege against self-
incrimination did not bear at all on the use of extra-legal confessions, for which distinct
standards evolved; indeed, "the history of the two principles is wide apart, differing by
one hundred years in origin, and derived through separate lines of precedents. * * *" 8
Wigmore, Evidence Section 2266, at 401 (McNaughton rev. 1961). Practice under the
two doctrines has also differed in a number of important respects. Even those who would readily enlarge the privilege must concede some linguistic difficulties since the Fifth Amendment in terms proscribes only compelling any person "in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Cf. Kamisar, Equal Justice in the Gatehouses and Mansions of American Criminal Procedure, in Criminal Justice in Our Time 1, 25-26 (1965).

Though weighty, I do not say these points and similar ones are conclusive, for, as the Court reiterates, the privilege embodies basic principles always capable of expansion. Certainly the privilege does represent a protective concern for the accused and an emphasis upon accusatorial rather than inquisitorial values in law enforcement, although this is similarly true of other limitations such as the grand jury requirement and the reasonable doubt standard. Accusatorial values, however, have openly been absorbed into the due process standard governing confessions; this indeed is why at present "the kinship of the two rules [governing confession and self-incrimination] is too apparent for denial." McCormick, Evidence 155 (1954). Since extension of the general principle has already occurred, to insist that the privilege applies as such serves only to carry over inapposite historical details and engaging rhetoric and to obscure the policy choices to be made in regulating confessions.

Having decided that the Fifth Amendment privilege does apply in the police station, the Court reveals that the privilege imposes more exacting restrictions than does the Fourteenth Amendment's voluntariness test. It then emerges from a discussion of Escobedo that the Fifth Amendment requires for an admissible confession that it be given by one distinctly aware of his right not to speak and shielded from "the compelling atmosphere" of interrogation. See ante, pp. 1623-1624. From these key premises, the Court finally develops the safeguards of warning, counsel, and so forth. I do not believe these premises are sustained by precedents under the Fifth Amendment.

The more important premise is that pressure on the suspect must be eliminated though it be only the subtle influence of the atmosphere and surroundings. The Fifth Amendment, however, has never been thought to forbid all pressure to incriminate one's self in the situations covered by it. On the contrary, it has been held that failure to incriminate one's self can result in denial of removal of one's case from state to federal court, State of Maryland v. Soper, 270 U.S. 9, 46 S.Ct. 185, 70 L.Ed. 449; in refusal of a military commission, Orloff v. Willoughby, 345 U.S. 83, 73 S.Ct. 534, 97 L.Ed. 842; in denial of a discharge in bankruptcy, Kaufman v. Hurwitz, 4 Cir., 176 F.2d 210; and in numerous other adverse consequences. See 8 Wigmore, Evidence Section 2272, at 441-444, n. 18 (McNaughton rev. 1961); Maguire, Evidence of Guilt Section 2.062 (1959). This is not to say that short of jail or torture any sanction is permissible in any case; policy and history alike may impose sharp limits. See, e. g., Griff in v. State of California, 380 U.S. 609, 85 S.Ct. 1229, 14 L.Ed.2d 106. However, the Court's unspoken assumption that any pressure violates the privilege is not supported by the precedents and it has failed to show why the Fifth Amendment prohibits that relatively mild pressure the Due Process Clause permits. The Court appears similarly wrong in thinking that precise knowledge of one's rights is a settled prerequisite under the Fifth Amendment to the loss of its protections. A number of lower federal court cases have held that grand jury witnesses need not always be warned of their privilege, e. g., United States v. Scully, 2 Cir., 225 F.2d 113, 116, and Wigmore states this to be the
better rule for trial witnesses. See 8 Wigmore, Evidence Section 2269 (McNaughton rev. 1961). Cf. Henry v. State of Mississippi, 379 U.S. 443, 451-452, 85 S.Ct. 564, 569, 13 L.Ed.2d 408 (waiver of constitutional rights by counsel despite defendant's ignorance held allowable). No Fifth Amendment precedent is cited for the Court's contrary view. There might of course be reasons a part from Fifth Amendment precedent for requiring warning or any other safeguard on questioning but that is a different matter entirely. See infra, pp. 1649-1650.

A closing word must be said about the Assistance of Counsel Clause of the Sixth Amendment, which is never expressly relied on by the Court but whose judicial precedents turn out to be linchpins of the confession rules announced today. To support its requirement of a knowing and intelligent waiver, the Court cites Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 58 S.Ct. 1019, 82 L.Ed. 1461, ante, p. 1628; appointment of counsel for the indigent suspect is tied to Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed.2d 799, and Douglas v. People of State of California, 372 U.S. 353, 83 S.Ct. 814, 9 L.Ed.2d 811, ante, p. 1627; the silent-record doctrine is borrowed from Carnley v. Cochran, 369 U.S. 506, 82 S.Ct. 884, 8 L.Ed.2d 70, ante, p. 1628, as is the right to an express offer of counsel, ante, p. 1626. All these cases imparting glosses to the Sixth Amendment concerned counsel at trial or on appeal. While the Court finds no pertinent difference between judicial proceedings and police interrogation, I believe the differences are so vast as to disqualify wholly the Sixth Amendment precedents as suitable analogies in the present cases.

The only attempt in this Court to carry the right to counsel into the station house occurred in Escobedo, the Court repeating several times that that stage was no less "critical" than trial itself. See 378 U.S. 485-488, 84 S.Ct. 1762-1763. This is hardly persuasive when we consider that a grand jury inquiry, the filing of a certiorari petition, and certainly the purchase of narcotics by an undercover agent from a prospective defendant may all be equally "critical" yet provision of counsel and advice on the score have never been thought compelled by the Constitution in such cases. The sound reason why this right is so freely extended for a criminal trial is the severe injustice risked by confronting an untrained defendant with a range of technical points of law, evidence, and tactics familiar to the prosecutor but not to himself. This danger shrinks markedly in the police station where indeed the lawyer in fulfilling his professional responsibilities of necessity may become an obstacle to truthfinding. See infra, n. 12. The Court's summary citation of the Sixth Amendment cases here seems to me best described as "the domino method of constitutional adjudication * * * wherein every explanatory statement in a previous opinion is made the basis for extension to a wholly different situation." Friendly, supra, n. 10, at 950.

III. Policy Considerations.

Examined as an expression of public policy, the Court's new regime proves so dubious that there can be no due compensation for its weakness in constitutional law. The foregoing discussion has shown, I think, how mistaken is the Court in implying that the Constitution has struck the balance in favor of the approach the Court takes. Ante, p. 1630. Rather, precedent reveals that the Fourteenth Amendment in practice has been construed to strike a different balance, that the Fifth Amendment gives the Court little solid support in this context, and that the Sixth Amendment should have no bearing at all. Legal history has been stretched before to satisfy deep needs of society. In this
instance, however, the Court has not and cannot make the powerful showing that its new rules are plainly desirable in the context of our society, something which is surely demanded before those rules are engrafted onto the Constitution and imposed on every State and county in the land.

Without at all subscribing to the generally black picture of police conduct painted by the Court, I think it must be frankly recognized at the outset that police questioning allowable under due process precedents may inherently entail some pressure on the suspect and may seek advantage in his ignorance or weaknesses. The atmosphere and questioning techniques, proper and fair though they be, can in themselves exert a tug on the suspect to confess, and in this light "[t]o speak of any confessions of crime made after arrest as being 'voluntary' or 'uncoerced' is somewhat inaccurate, although traditional. A confession is wholly and incontestably voluntary only if a guilty person gives himself up to the law and becomes his own accuser." Ashcraft v. State of Tennessee, 322 U.S. 143, 161, 64 S.Ct. 921, 929, 88 L.Ed. 1192 (Jackson, J., dissenting). Until today, the role of the Constitution has been only to sift out undue pressure, not to assure spontaneous confessions.

The Court's new rules aim to offset these minor pressures and disadvantages intrinsic to any kind of police interrogation. The rules do not serve due process interests in preventing blatant coercion since, as I noted earlier, they do nothing to contain the policeman who is prepared to lie from the start. The rules work for reliability in confessions almost only in the Pickwickian sense that they can prevent some from being given at all. In short, the benefit of this new regime is simply to lessen or wipe out the inherent compulsion and inequalities to which the Court devotes some nine pages of description. Ante, pp. 1614-1618.

What the Court largely ignores is that its rules impair, if they will not eventually serve wholly to frustrate, an instrument of law enforcement that has long and quite reasonably been thought worth the price paid for it. There can be little doubt that the Court's new code would markedly decrease the number of confessions. To warn the suspect that he may remain silent and remind him that his confession may be used in court are minor obstructions. To require also an express waiver by the suspect and an end to questioning whenever he demurs must heavily handicap questioning. And to suggest or provide counsel for the suspect simply invites the end of the interrogation. See, supra, n. 12.

How much harm this decision will inflict on law enforcement cannot fairly be predicted with accuracy. Evidence on the role of confessions is notoriously incomplete, see Developments, supra, n.2, at 941-944, and little is added by the Court's reference to the FBI experience and the resources believed wasted in interrogation. See infra, n. 19, and text. We do know that some crimes cannot be solved without confessions, that ample expert testimony attests to their importance in crime control, and that the Court is taking a real risk with society's welfare in imposing its new regime on the country. The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but a hazardous experimentation.

While passing over the costs and risks of its experiment, the Court portrays the evils of normal police questioning in terms which I think are exaggerated. Albeit stringently confined by the due process standards interrogation is no doubt often inconvenient and unpleasant for the suspect. However, it is no less so for a man to be arrested and jailed,
to have his house searched, or to stand trial in court, yet all this may properly happen to
the most innocent given probable cause, a warrant, or an indictment. Society has
always paid a stiff price for law and order, and peaceful interrogation is not one of the
dark moments of the law.
This brief statement of the competing considerations seems to me ample proof that the
Court's preference is highly debatable at best and therefore not to be read into the
Constitution. However, it may make the analysis more graphic to consider the actual
facts of one of the four cases reversed by the Court. **Miranda v. Arizona** serves best,
being neither the hardest nor easiest of the four under the Court's standards.
On March 3, 1963, an 18-year-old girl was kidnapped and forcibly raped near Phoenix,
**Arizona**. Ten days later, on the morning of March 13, petitioner **Miranda** was arrested
and taken to the police station. At this time **Miranda** was 23 years old, indigent, an
d educated to the extent of completing half and ninth grade. He had "an emotional illness"
of the schizophrenic type, according to the doctor who eventually examined him; the
doctor's report also stated that **Miranda** was "alert and oriented as to time, place, and
person," intelligent within normal limits, competent to stand trial, and same within the
legal definition. At the police station, the victim picked **Miranda** out of a lineup, and two
officers then took him into a separate room to interrogate him, starting about 11:30 a.m.
Though at first denying his guilt, within a short time **Miranda** gave a detailed oral
confession and then wrote out in his own hand and signed a brief statement admitting
and describing the crime. All this was accomplished in two hours or less without any
force, threats or promises and -- I will assume this though he record is uncertain, ante,
1636-1637 and nn.66-27 -- without any effective warnings at all.
**Miranda's** oral and written confessions are now held inadmissible under the Court's
new rules. One is entitled to feel astonished that the Constitution can be read to
produce this result. These confessions were obtained during brief, daytime questioning
conducted by two officers and unmarked by any of the traditional indicia of coercion.
They assured a conviction for a brutal and unsettling crime, for which the police had and
quite possibly could obtain little evidence other than the victim's identifications, evidence
which is frequently unreliable. There was, in sum, a legitimate purpose, no perceptible
unfairness, and certainly little risk of injustice in the interrogation. Yet the resulting
confessions, and the responsible course of police practice they represent, are to be
sacrificed to the Court's own finespun conception of fairness which I seriously doubt is
shared by many thinking citizens in this country.
The tenor of judicial opinion also falls well short of supporting the Court's new approach.
Although Escobedo has widely been interpreted as an open invitation to lower courts to
rewrite the law of confessions, a significant heavy majority of the state and federal
decisions in point have sought quite narrow interpretations. Of the courts that have
accepted the invitation, it is hard to know how many have felt compelled by their best
guess as to this Court's likely construction; but none of the state decisions saw fit to rely
on the state privilege against self-incrimination, and no decision at all has gone as far as
this Court goes today.
It is also instructive to compare the attitude in this case of those responsible for law
enforcement with the official views that existed when the Court undertook three major
revisions of prosecutorial practice prior to this case, **Johnson v. Zerbst**, 304 U.S. 458,
58 S.Ct. 1019, 82 L.Ed. 1461; **Mapp v. Ohio**, 367 U.S. 643, 81 S.Ct. 1684, 6 L.Ed.2d
1081, and Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed.2d 799. In
Johnson, which established that appointed counsel must be offered the indigent in
federal criminal trials, the Federal Government all but conceded the basic issue, which
had in fact been recently fixed as Department of Justice policy. See Beaney, Right to
Counsel 29-30, 36-42, (1955). In Mapp, which imposed the exclusionary rule on the
States for Fourth Amendment violations, more than half of the States had themselves
already adopted some such rule. See 367 U.S., at 651, 81 S.Ct., at 1689. In Gideon,
which extended Johnson v. Zerbst to the States, an amicus brief was filed by 22 State s
and Commonwealths urging that course; only two States besides that of the respondent
came forward to protest. See 372 U.S., at 345, 83 S.Ct., at 797. By contrast, in this case
new restrictions on police questioning have been opposed by the United States and in
an amicus brief signed by 27 States and Commonwealths, not including the three other
States which are parties. No State in the country has urged this Court to impose the
newly announced rules, nor has any State chosen to go nearly so far on its own.
The Court in closing its general discussion invokes the practice in federal and foreign
jurisdictions as lending weight to its new curbs on confessions for all the States. A brief
resume will suffice to show that none of these jurisdictions has struck so one-sided a
balance as the Court does today. Heaviest reliance is placed on the FBI practice.
Differing circumstances may make this comparison quite untrustworthy, but in any event
the FBI falls sensibly short of the Court's formalistic rules. For example, there is no
indication that FBI agents must obtain an affirmative "waiver" before they pursue their
questioning. Nor is it clear that one involving his right to silence may not be prevailed
upon to change his mind. And the warning as to appointed counsel apparently indicates
only that one will be assigned by the judge when the suspect appears before him; the
thrust of the Court's rules is to induce the suspect to obtain appointed counsel before
continuing the interview. See ante, pp. 1633-1634. Apparently American military
practice, briefly mentioned by the Court, has these same limits and is still less favorable
to the suspect that the FBI warning, making no mention of appointed counsel.
Developments, supra, n. 2, at 1084-1089.
The law of the foreign countries described by the Court also reflects a more moderate
conception of the rights of the accused as against those of society when other data are
considered. Concededly, the English experience is most relevant. In that country, a
cautions as to silence but not counsel has long been mandated by the "Judges Rules,"
which also place other somewhat imprecise limits on police cross-examination of
suspects. However, in the court' discretion confessions can be and apparently quite
frequently are admitted in evidence despite disregard of the Judges' Rules, so long as
they are found voluntary under the common-law test. Moreover, the check that exists on
the use of pretrial statements is counter-balanced by the evident admissibility of fruits of
an illegal confession and by the judge's often-used authority to comment adversely on
the defendant's failure to testify.
India, Ceylon and Scotland are the other examples chosen by the Court. In India and
Ceylon the general ban on police-adduced confessions cited by the Court is subject to a
major exception: if evidence is uncovered by police questioning, it is fully admissible at
trial along with the confession itself, so far as it relates to the evidence and is not
blatantly coerced. See Developments, supra, n. 2, at 1106-1110; Reg. v. Ramasamy
[1965] A.C. 1 (P.C.). Scotland's limits on interrogation do measure up to the Court's;
however, restrained comment at trial on the defendant's failure to take the stand is allowed the judge, and in many other respects Scotch law redresses the prosecutor's disadvantage in ways not permitted in this country. The Court ends its survey by imputing added strength to our privilege against self-incrimination since, by contrast to other countries, it is embodied in a written Constitution. Considering the liberties the Court has today taken with constitutional history and precedent, few will find this emphasis persuasive.

In closing this necessarily truncated discussion of policy considerations attending the new confession rules, some reference must be made to their ironic untimeliness. There is now in progress in this country a massive re-examination of criminal law enforcement procedures on a scale never before witnessed. Participants in this undertaking include a Special Committee of the American Bar Association, under the chairmanship of Chief Judge Lumbard of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; a distinguished study group of the American Law Institute, headed by Professors Vorenberg and Bator of the Harvard Law School; and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, under the leadership of the Attorney General of the United States. Studies are also being conducted by the District of Columbia Crime Commission, the Georgetown Law Center, and by others equipped to do practical research. There are also signs that legislatures in some of the States may be preparing to re-examine the problem before us.

It is no secret that concern has been expressed lest long-range and lasting reforms be frustrated by this Court's too rapid departure from existing constitutional standards. Despite the Court's disclaimer, the practical effect of the decision made today must inevitably be to handicap seriously sound efforts at reform, not least by removing options necessary to a just compromise of competing interests. Of course legislative reform is rarely speedy or unanimous, though this Court has been more patient in the past. But the legislative reforms when they come would have the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study, they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts, and they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs.

IV. Conclusions.

All four of the cases involved here present express claims that confessions were inadmissible, not because of coercion in the traditional due process sense, but solely because of lack of counsel or lack of warnings concerning counsel and silence. For the reasons stated in this opinion, I would adhere to the due process test and reject the new requirements inaugurated by the Court. On this premise my disposition of each of these cases can be stated briefly.

In two of the three cases coming from state courts, *Miranda v. Arizona* (No. 759) and *Vignera v. New York* (No. 760), the confessions were held admissible and no other errors worth comment are alleged by petitioners. I would affirm in these two cases. The other state case is *California v. Stewart* (No. 584), where the state supreme court held the confession inadmissible and reversed the conviction. In that case I would dismiss the writ of certiorarion the ground that no final judgment is before us, 28 U.S.C. Section 1257 (1964 ed.); putting aside the new trial open to the State in any event, the confession itself has not even been finally excluded since the California Supreme Court left the State free to show proof of a waiver. If the merits of the decision in Stewart be
reached, then I believe it should be reversed and the case remanded so the state supreme court may pass on the other claims available to respondent.

In the federal case, Westover v. United States (No. 761), a number of issues are raised by petitioner apart from the one already dealt with in this dissent. None of these other claims appears to me tenable, nor in his context to warrant extended discussion. It is urged that the confession was also inadmissible because not voluntary even measured by due process standards and because federal-state cooperation brought the McNabb-Mallory rule into play under Anderson v. United States, 318 U.S. 350, 63 S.Ct. 599, 87 L.Ed. 829. However, the facts alleged fall well short of coercion in my view, and I believe the involvement of federal agents in petitioner's arrest and detention by the State too slight to invoke Anderson. I agree with the Government that the admission of the evidence now protested by petitioner was at most harmless error, and two final contentions -- one involving weight of the evidence and another improper prosecutor comment -- seem to me without merit. I would therefore affirm Westover's conviction.

In conclusion: Nothing in the letter or the spirit of the Constitution or in the precedents squares with the heavy-handed and one-sided action that is so precipitously taken by the Court in the name of fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities. The foray which the Court makes today brings to mind the wise and farsighted words of Mr. Justice Jackson in Douglas v. City of Jeannette, 319 U.S. 157, 181, 63 S.Ct. 877, 889, 87 L.Ed. 1324 (separate opinion): "This Court is forever adding new stories to the temples of constitutional law, and the temples have a way of collapsing when one story too many is added."