

Supreme Court of the United States

Washington 13, D. C.

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE TOM C. CLARK

"It has long since come to be true that law
per se is heedless of the means by which
otherwise relevant and creditable evidence is
obtained... These decisions are not arbitrary adap-
tions to the comprehensive right of States to fashion

Mr. Justice: their own rules of evidence for criminal trials. They
are not parts in our constitutional law but ap-
The petr in Wolf v. Colorado, 338 U.S.

25, did move to suppress the evidence. <sup>ga farrnac fui-
ple</sup> 172-173

However, the record in Irvine v. California,
347 U.S. 128, does not indicate that any
such motion was made.

CLE

present situation based on ad hoc See Kochum
series of recent cases enforced the constitutional principle
that the States may not base convictions upon confessions,
however much verified, obtained by coercion - Wolf
"The Constitution is "intended to preserve freedom and
substantial rights, not to maintain theories" Dore & Mills 194/er,
erj.

If it is requirement of due process for a trial in the federal
courthouse, it is impossible for me to say it is not a re-
quirement of due process for a trial in the state courthouse,

"It would be a satisfaction of the responsibility which the course of
constitutional history has cast upon this Court to hold that in order
to convict a man the police cannot extract by force what is in his
mind but can extract what is in his stomach"

"Coaxed confessions offend the community's sense of fair play
and decency" - all from Kochum

Silworth case 251/385

Palko 302/319

Harris 331/145, 197 also 156 & 172

✓ McDonald 335/451, 456

✓ Rockin 342/165

✓ Gorleb 255/298, 311

✓ Amos 255/313, 315

Weeks 232/383, 391

Wolf - 338/25, 39-40

Irvin 347/128, 134 - 128 + 137

Williams 341/97 Congress can act

Science 325/91 motion for recd , 851 . 8. U 798

Stafanelli 342/117, 120

In Irvin FF + Burton would apply due process

Jackson said p.134 To upset state conviction were before the states there had adequate opportunity to reject or adopt would be unwarranted use of process

Wolf & Irvin should be in line with Deems 347/556

Watt 338/49 Holley 332/596 Milwaukee 324/401 Anchorg + 332/433

Stobbe 343/181, 190

Strong support on each side Before

Deliber rule is capricious

Grant circumventing the 4th Amend 14 SoCal L Rev 359

Role on state officers see Lustig 338/74 78-9 + 80

The Wolf case - 45 Ill L Rev 1, 20

Tiffen 342/48

Blinsted 277/438, 470 & 485

McNabb 318/332, 345

Funk 290/371, 381 an offence

Soulls 287/435, 45-3

Quote on Wigmore p 448

People v. Beale
242 NY 13, 21