


The Bill of Rights



THE RIGHT AGAINST SELF- INCRIMINATION

Edited by Kimberly Troisi-Paton

The Bill of Rights



The Right Against Self-Incrimination

Kimberly Troisi-Paton, Book Editor

GREENHAVEN PRESS

An imprint of Thomson Gale, a part of The Thomson Corporation

THOMSON
— ★ —
GALE

Detroit • New York • San Francisco • San Diego • New Haven, Conn.
Waterville, Maine • London • Munich



Bonnie Szumski, *Publisher*
Helen Cothran, *Managing Editor*
Scott Barbour, *Series Editor*

© 2006 Thomson Gale, a part of The Thomson Corporation.

Thomson and Star Logo are trademarks and Gale and Greenhaven Press are registered trademarks used herein under license.

For more information, contact:

Greenhaven Press

27500 Drake Rd.

Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535

Or you can visit our Internet site at <http://www.gale.com>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, Web distribution, or information storage retrieval systems—without the written permission of the publisher.

Articles in Greenhaven Press anthologies are often edited for length to meet page requirements. In addition, original titles of these works are changed to clearly present the main thesis and to explicitly indicate the author's opinion. Every effort is made to ensure that Greenhaven Press accurately reflects the original intent of the authors. Every effort has been made to trace the owners of copyrighted material.

Cover photograph reproduced by permission of © Bob Daemmrich/The Image Works.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

The right against self-incrimination / Kimberly Troisi-Paton, book editor
p. cm. -- (Bill of rights)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7377-3343-8 (lib. bdg. : alk. paper)

1. Self-incrimination--United States. I. Troisi-Paton, Kimberly. II. Bill of Rights (San Diego, Calif.)

KF9668.R53 2006

345.73'056--dc22

2005054524

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Foreword	9
Introduction	12

Chapter 1: The Evolution of the Right Against Self-Incrimination

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. The Origin of the Fifth Amendment's Right Against Self-Incrimination | 19 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
- Leonard W. Levy*
- A history professor and Pulitzer Prize winner traces the evolution of the protection against self-incrimination from its roots in English common law to its inclusion in the Fifth Amendment of the Bill of Rights.
- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2. The Sixth Amendment Creates a Right to Remain Silent | 33 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
- Arthur J. Goldberg*
- Escobedo v. Illinois* (1964) was the first case to discuss a right to remain silent, citing the Sixth Amendment right to consult with counsel.
- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 3. The <i>Miranda</i> Ruling and the Right to Remain Silent | 42 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
- Gary L. Stuart*
- A lawyer and author describes how *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) changed the law regarding self-incrimination.
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| 4. The Court Reaffirms <i>Miranda</i> | 55 |
|---------------------------------------|----|
- Timothy C. MacDonnell*
- A criminal law professor in the Judge Advocate General's School discusses *Dickerson v. United States* (2000), which confirmed that *Miranda* rights are constitutional protections that continue to apply in federal and state cases.
- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 5. Only Testimonial Evidence Is Protected by the Fifth Amendment | 64 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
- William J. Brennan Jr.*
- In *Schmerber v. California* (1966), the Supreme Court ruled that the Fifth Amendment bars officials from requiring suspects to communicate, but it does not prevent

police from gathering physical evidence, including blood from a suspect's body.

6. A Person Should Not Be Compelled to Speak in a Lineup 70

Abe Fortas

In *United States v. Wade* (1967), the Supreme Court decided that a person can be put in a lineup, dressed a certain way, and told to utter certain words, and the protection against self-incrimination is not violated. Justice Abe Fortas wrote a dissenting opinion.

7. Immunized Testimony Can Be Compelled from a Witness 75

Lewis F. Powell Jr.

In *Kastigar v. United States* (1972), the Supreme Court decided that persons granted immunity from future prosecutions in return for their testimony cannot invoke the Fifth Amendment and refuse to testify without risking contempt of court.

Chapter 2: Pleading the Fifth: Witnesses Who Have Refused to Speak

1. Joseph McCarthy and the “Fifth Amendment Communists” 83

Donald A. Ritchie

The associate historian of the U.S. Senate Historical Office explains how the Fifth Amendment privilege was invoked repeatedly during the McCarthy hearings.

2. Oliver North's Fifth Amendment Rights Were Not Violated 96

Patricia M. Wald

In *United States v. North* (1993), a federal circuit court vacated Oliver North's convictions on the premise that he had been convicted with the use of his testimony before Congress, which had been immunized. The chief judge of the court disagreed and wrote a dissenting opinion.

3. Pleading the Fifth at the O.J. Simpson Trial 104

Mark Fuhrman

A former Los Angeles detective discusses his choice to plead the Fifth in the criminal suit against O.J. Simpson.

Chapter 3: Current Issues and Perspectives

1. Miranda Rights Are Expanding 111

Gary L. Stuart

A lawyer and author discusses how Miranda rights have expanded and new rights have been created in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

2. The Supreme Court Has Eroded *Miranda* 121

Gerald Plessner

In *Chavez v. Martinez* (2003), the Supreme Court ruled that coercive interrogations bordering on torture are constitutional, dealing a blow to the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination.

3. Forcing Suspects to Identify Themselves 125

Does Not Violate Their Right Against Self-Incrimination

Cleveland Plain Dealer

In *Hibel v. Judicial District Court of Nevada* (2004), the Supreme Court upheld a state law that allows police to compel suspects to identify themselves. The Court ruled that this law does not violate suspects' rights to withhold incriminating information.


Appendix A: The Origins of the American Bill of Rights 129

Appendix B: Supreme Court Cases Involving the Right Against Self-Incrimination 132

For Further Research 140

Index 142

The Bill of Rights



The Right Against Self-Incrimination

Other books in the Bill of Rights series:

Freedom from Cruel and Unusual Punishment

Freedom from Unfair Searches and Seizures

Freedom from Unfair Seizure of Property

Freedom of Assembly and Petition

Freedom of Religion

Freedom of Speech

Freedom of the Press

States' Rights

The Right to a Fair Trial

The Right to a Trial by Jury

The Right to Bear Arms

The Right to Due Process



The Right Against Self-Incrimination

Kimberly Troisi-Paton, Book Editor

GREENHAVEN PRESS

An imprint of Thomson Gale, a part of The Thomson Corporation

THOMSON
— ★ —
GALE

Detroit • New York • San Francisco • San Diego • New Haven, Conn.
Waterville, Maine • London • Munich



Bonnie Szumski, *Publisher*
Helen Cothran, *Managing Editor*
Scott Barbour, *Series Editor*

© 2006 Thomson Gale, a part of The Thomson Corporation.

Thomson and Star Logo are trademarks and Gale and Greenhaven Press are registered trademarks used herein under license.

For more information, contact:

Greenhaven Press
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535
Or you can visit our Internet site at <http://www.gale.com>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, Web distribution, or information storage retrieval systems—without the written permission of the publisher.

Articles in Greenhaven Press anthologies are often edited for length to meet page requirements. In addition, original titles of these works are changed to clearly present the main thesis and to explicitly indicate the author's opinion. Every effort is made to ensure that Greenhaven Press accurately reflects the original intent of the authors. Every effort has been made to trace the owners of copyrighted material.

Cover photograph reproduced by permission of © Bob Daemmrch/The Image Works.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

The right against self-incrimination / Kimberly Troisi-Paton, book editor
p. cm. -- (Bill of rights)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-7377-3343-8 (lib. bdg. : alk. paper)
1. Self-incrimination--United States. I. Troisi-Paton, Kimberly. II. Bill of Rights (San Diego, Calif.)
KF9668.R53 2006
345.73'056--dc22

2005054524

Contents

Foreword	9
Introduction	12

Chapter 1: The Evolution of the Right Against Self-Incrimination

1. The Origin of the Fifth Amendment's Right Against Self-Incrimination	19
<i>Leonard W. Levy</i>	

A history professor and Pulitzer Prize winner traces the evolution of the protection against self-incrimination from its roots in English common law to its inclusion in the Fifth Amendment of the Bill of Rights.

2. The Sixth Amendment Creates a Right to Remain Silent	33
<i>Arthur J. Goldberg</i>	

Escobedo v. Illinois (1964) was the first case to discuss a right to remain silent, citing the Sixth Amendment right to consult with counsel.

3. The <i>Miranda</i> Ruling and the Right to Remain Silent	42
<i>Gary L. Stuart</i>	

A lawyer and author describes how *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) changed the law regarding self-incrimination.

4. The Court Reaffirms <i>Miranda</i>	55
<i>Timothy C. MacDonnell</i>	

A criminal law professor in the Judge Advocate General's School discusses *Dickerson v. United States* (2000), which confirmed that *Miranda* rights are constitutional protections that continue to apply in federal and state cases.

5. Only Testimonial Evidence Is Protected by the Fifth Amendment	64
<i>William J. Brennan Jr.</i>	

In *Schmerber v. California* (1966), the Supreme Court ruled that the Fifth Amendment bars officials from requiring suspects to communicate, but it does not prevent

police from gathering physical evidence, including blood from a suspect's body.

6. A Person Should Not Be Compelled to Speak in a Lineup 70

Abe Fortas

In *United States v. Wade* (1967), the Supreme Court decided that a person can be put in a lineup, dressed a certain way, and told to utter certain words, and the protection against self-incrimination is not violated. Justice Abe Fortas wrote a dissenting opinion.

7. Immunized Testimony Can Be Compelled from a Witness 75

Lewis F. Powell Jr.

In *Kastigar v. United States* (1972), the Supreme Court decided that persons granted immunity from future prosecutions in return for their testimony cannot invoke the Fifth Amendment and refuse to testify without risking contempt of court.

Chapter 2: Pleading the Fifth: Witnesses Who Have Refused to Speak

1. Joseph McCarthy and the "Fifth Amendment Communists" 83

Donald A. Ritchie

The associate historian of the U.S. Senate Historical Office explains how the Fifth Amendment privilege was invoked repeatedly during the McCarthy hearings.

2. Oliver North's Fifth Amendment Rights Were Not Violated 96

Patricia M. Wald

In *United States v. North* (1993), a federal circuit court vacated Oliver North's convictions on the premise that he had been convicted with the use of his testimony before Congress, which had been immunized. The chief judge of the court disagreed and wrote a dissenting opinion.

3. Pleading the Fifth at the O.J. Simpson Trial 104

Mark Fuhrman

A former Los Angeles detective discusses his choice to plead the Fifth in the criminal suit against O.J. Simpson.

Chapter 3: Current Issues and Perspectives

1. Miranda Rights Are Expanding 111

Gary L. Stuart

A lawyer and author discusses how Miranda rights have expanded and new rights have been created in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

2. The Supreme Court Has Eroded *Miranda* 121

Gerald Plessner

In *Chavez v. Martinez* (2003), the Supreme Court ruled that coercive interrogations bordering on torture are constitutional, dealing a blow to the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination.

3. Forcing Suspects to Identify Themselves 125

Does Not Violate Their Right Against Self-Incrimination

Cleveland Plain Dealer

In *Hibel v. Judicial District Court of Nevada* (2004), the Supreme Court upheld a state law that allows police to compel suspects to identify themselves. The Court ruled that this law does not violate suspects' rights to withhold incriminating information.

Appendix A: The Origins of the American Bill of Rights 129

Appendix B: Supreme Court Cases Involving the Right Against Self-Incrimination 132

For Further Research 140

Index 142

"I cannot agree with those who think of the Bill of Rights as an 18th century straightjacket, unsuited for this age. . . . The evils it guards against are not only old, they are with us now, they exist today."

*Hugo Black, associate
justice of the U.S. Supreme
Court, 1937–1971*

Foreword

The Bill of Rights codifies the freedoms most essential to American democracy. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, the right to bear arms, the right to a trial by a jury of one's peers, the right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment—these are just a few of the liberties that the Founding Fathers thought it necessary to spell out in the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

While the document itself is quite short (consisting of fewer than five hundred words), and while the liberties it protects often seem straightforward, the Bill of Rights has been a source of debate ever since its creation. Throughout American history, the rights the document protects have been tested and reinterpreted. Again and again, individuals perceiving violations of their rights have sought redress in the courts. The courts in turn have struggled to decipher the original intent of the founders as well as the need to accommodate changing societal norms and values.

The ultimate responsibility for addressing these claims has fallen to the U.S. Supreme Court. As the highest court in the nation, it is the Supreme Court's role to interpret the Constitution. The Court has considered numerous cases in which people have accused government of impinging on their rights.

In the process, the Court has established a body of case law and precedents that have, in a sense, defined the Bill of Rights. In doing so, the Court has often reversed itself and introduced new ideas and approaches that have altered the legal meaning of the rights contained in the Bill of Rights. As a general rule, the Court has erred on the side of caution, upholding and expanding the rights of individuals rather than restricting them.

An example of this trend is the definition of cruel and unusual punishment. The Eighth Amendment specifically states, "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." However, over the years the Court has had to grapple with defining what constitutes "cruel; and unusual punishment." In colonial America, punishments for crimes included branding, the lopping off of ears, and whipping. Indeed, these punishments were considered lawful at the time the Bill of Rights was written. Obviously, none of these punishments are legal today. In order to justify outlawing certain types of punishment that are deemed repugnant by the majority of citizens, the Court has ruled that it must consider the prevailing opinion of the masses when making such decisions. In overturning the punishment of a man stripped of his citizenship, the Court stated in 1958 that it must rely on society's "evolving standards of decency" when determining what constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. Thus the definition of cruel and unusual is not frozen to include only the types of punishment that were illegal at the time of the framing of the Bill of Rights; specific modes of punishment can be rejected as society deems them unjust.

Another way that the Courts have interpreted the Bill of Rights to expand individual liberties is through the process of "incorporation." Prior to the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Bill of Rights was thought to prevent only the federal government from infringing on the rights listed in the document. However, the Fourteenth Amendment, which

was passed in the wake of the Civil War, includes the words, “... nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” Citing this passage, the Court has ruled that many of the liberties contained in the Bill of Rights apply to state and local governments as well as the federal government. This process of incorporation laid the legal foundation for the civil rights movement—most specifically the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling that put an end to legalized segregation.

As these examples reveal, the Bill of Rights is not static. It truly is a living document that is constantly being reinterpreted and redefined. The Bill of Rights series captures this vital aspect of one of America’s most cherished founding texts. Each volume in the series focuses on one particular right protected in the Bill of Rights. Through the use of primary and secondary sources, the right’s evolution is traced from colonial times to the present. Primary sources include landmark Supreme Court rulings, speeches by prominent experts, and editorials. Secondary sources include historical analyses, law journal articles, book excerpts, and magazine articles. Each book also includes several features to facilitate research, including a bibliography, an annotated table of contents, an annotated list of relevant Supreme Court cases, an introduction, and an index. These elements help to make the Bill of Rights series a fascinating and useful tool for examining the fundamental liberties of American democracy.