



THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT

ROBERT J. FERGUSON, JR., AARC

ALLAN L. MILLER, BBA, E.T.S.U.

CHARLES C. THOMAS • PUBLISHER • SPRINGFIELD • ILLINOIS

THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT

THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT

By

ROBERT J. FERGUSON, JR., AARC

*Member American Polygraph Association
Polygraphist Licensed and Certified
by the State of Texas
Chief Examiner Texas Industrial Security, Inc.
Fort Worth, Texas*

and

ALLAN L. MILLER, BBA, E.T.S.U.

*Founder-President
Texas Industrial Security, Inc.
Fort Worth, Texas
Member Texas Association of Polygraph Examiners
Affiliate Member American Polygraph Association
Licensed and Certified by the State of Texas*



CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER
Springfield • Illinois • U.S.A.

Published and Distributed Throughout the World by
CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER
BANNERSTONE HOUSE
301-327 East Lawrence Avenue, Springfield, Illinois, U.S.A.

This book is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced in any manner without written permission from the publisher.

© 1973, by CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER
ISBN 0-398-02679-3
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-88443

With THOMAS BOOKS careful attention is given to all details of manufacturing and design. It is the Publisher's desire to present books that are satisfactory as to their physical qualities and artistic possibilities and appropriate for their particular use. THOMAS BOOKS will be true to those laws of quality that assure a good name and good will.

Printed in the United States of America
N-1

This work is humbly dedicated to men like John E. Reid, Leonard Harrelson, Lynn Marcy, Alex Gregory, Charles Zimmerman along with other members of the American Polygraph Association, who have expended lifelong efforts toward the enhancement, enrichment, establishment, and recognition of polygraphy as the most objective means for accurate truth verification; and to those great champions of justice, the brilliant trial lawyers, such as the outstanding F. Lee Bailey, Edward Bennett Williams, Melvin Belli, Percy Foreman, John Tobin, James Russ, and so many others, whose knowledge, skill and expertise have been the inspiration for this book.

FOREWORD

DID YOU EVER HAVE an innocent client convicted of a serious crime? Maybe you can not answer that question. After all, lawyers are not at the scene of the crime. They do not have any inside knowledge other than what their clients tell them and what they can determine and infer from the evidence. But lawyers, prosecutors and defense attorneys alike can go one step further. The defense attorney or prosecutor can go that one step further by requiring that his client or key witnesses submit to a polygraph examination.

If you have never asked a client to take a polygraph examination maybe you need to ask yourself why. It is certainly not the expense, because as an investigative tool it is one of the least expensive. Perhaps you do not want to know whether or not your client is guilty or innocent. To know that you represent an innocent man only increases the pressure and the awareness of the responsibility that goes with proper legal representation.

If you care about your clients, and if you are willing to take that one additional step, then you will find this an interesting and important book.

I have had an innocent client convicted of a crime he did not commit. I have had that client submit to a polygraph analysis which showed he was innocent. I have used the same information from the polygraph test to investigate the crime to the point where I felt that I knew who did commit the crime. The heart of my defense was that my client had voluntarily submitted to and been cleared by a competent polygraph examination. I failed in my effort to have the court consider this most important piece of evidence. As I look back on that first attempt to introduce and qualify the polygraph examiner and his test results, I realize how important and useful this book could have been to me.

In writing this foreword I attempt to point out the areas in this book that are of assistance to a defense lawyer or prosecutor.

I think first of all you will find a convincing underlying philosophical perspective presented by the authors that rests upon the assumption that it would be a better world to live in if everyone told the truth. This is an interesting position that many of us might well reject. But the authors start from this assumption and proceed to argue that there is a way to detect the truth, and because a better world would result from the knowledge of the truth, the acceptance of the scientific advances in polygraph analysis will make this a better place in which to live.

The authors equate truth with justice. Criminal defense lawyers do not operate on this same equation. Justice can be done even though a guilty man goes free. This is best exemplified in one of the largest areas of the practice of criminal law, the motion to suppress evidence based on the violation of a defendant's Fourth, Fifth or Sixth Amendment rights. An important piece of evidence may be suppressed because the police used illegal means in obtaining it. The government's case may completely fold as a result of the granting of a motion to suppress evidence. Justice would have been done even though a guilty man would have gone free and the truth would not have been revealed to a jury.

While there is a concept of justice that does not totally equate with truth, I think no one should claim that justice is done when an innocent man is convicted. Yes, all the procedures may have been followed. He may have had an adequate defense. But, if an innocent man is convicted we should not accept this as justice.

Polygraph tests help determine the truth. But before they can fully help us to achieve justice, they must be recognized by the courts. In Chapter 2 the authors reproduce a thorough and thoughtout legal brief for the admissibility of the results of a polygraph test. The authorities are cited in detail, and numerous cases not ordinarily available by the normal methods of research are presented. The argument speaks for itself, and without elaboration I would only add that as a first step toward an attempted presentation of polygraph test results in court, an attorney would do well by adopting this brief.

It is not enough to have a good legal argument for the admissibility of the polygraph results. Resistance by the courts to the admissibility of this evidence is astonishingly high. I do not pretend to know all the psychological reasons behind this resistance to an important new scientific advance. But these barriers of history, prejudice and ignorance will not be overcome simply by good legal arguments. If you plan to produce a polygraph expert in court, be prepared to present more than a legal argument. Be prepared to explain what the polygraph is about.

Chapter 4 is where you will start. To qualify the polygraphist in court, you can follow no better example than given in this book. If you do not have a qualified polygraph analyst who can answer the questions set forth in Chapter 4 do not make the attempt. The criteria of expertise for a polygraphist are much higher than those expected of any other expert. If we compare the standards that have been imposed for admissibility of the polygraphist's expert testimony against the standards required of psychiatrists, we realize how inconsistent our courts have been in the standards they have set for the admissibility of expert testimony. All lawyers relish the idea of cross-examining a psychiatrist. Nothing is easier or more fun. I wonder if our prosecutors and defense lawyers would so relish the idea of cross-examining a competent polygraphist.

This book does more than give you the legal brief to support the admission of your expert's testimony and give you the proper direct examination for the admissibility of that evidence. It gives the layman a thorough working knowledge of polygraph tests. Part II of this book goes beyond what one usually finds available in a discussion of polygraphy. The validity of polygraph tests is argued in terms of basic recognized emotional responses to deception. You will recognize in reading these chapters a direct correlation between your own emotional responses which the polygraph instrument records. These same responses are explained in physiological and psychological terms. But the point is clear; we do respond to the conscious telling of a lie. We do respond emotionally. Where lies are told because of a *desire* not to get caught, it is not surprising that this desire or emotion is reflected physiologi-

cally in a way that can be detected by monitors of physiological responses. The *Polygraph in Court* starts from the simplest most recognized assumption that when we are under stress, we respond in ways that affect our heartbeat, respiration and perspiration. And these are measureable physiological responses to the psychological fact that one knows when he is not telling the truth.

How then does the polygraph analyst read what is basically a registry of physiological responses to psychological stimuli? The authors provide excellent examples of exactly what the analyst is doing. You will not learn how to be a polygraph analyst. You will learn how the polygraph chart is read and you will be able to answer many of those perplexing questions that are raised about polygraph analysis. What if someone makes himself "emotionally respond" to a question? How can you tell a highly nervous person from a liar? What if someone is very frightened when they go into a polygraph test? Will this ruin the test? Can the calculating liar beat the test? You will be able to see how the polygraph analyst answers these questions by looking at the very charts he would look at. You will see the fluctuations, by seconds, to the physiological responses correlated to certain questions. You will, I think, be impressed with the presentation.

The only thing that this book does not offer by way of a complete exposition of a polygraph analysis is a movie or a viewing of a polygraph test in operation. I have seen the authors conduct such tests on video taped closed circuit television. The firsthand observation of the tests being given and of the responses and the analysis of the charts probably is the most impressive evidence I can imagine of the reliability of polygraphy. Robert Ferguson, Jr., with an hour at his instrument has saved me many hundreds of hours in fruitless investigation and pursuit of my client's dreams, fantasies or just plain lies.

If the courts are never convinced as to the admissibility of these tests, then lawyers should be. Nothing can save you more time in investigative work. Nothing can be more valuable to you than talking honestly with your client. Even if you never sought to introduce the results of one of these tests, you should take it upon yourself in fulfilling your duty to your client in adequate

representation of his cause to use these tests. You also owe it to yourself to understand this important scientific advance. This book will help you fulfill those duties.

R. DAVID BROILES
with the law firm of
Hooper, Kerry, Chappell and Broiles
Fort Worth, Texas

FOREWORD

THIS BOOK, *THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT*, will hasten the day when the instrument and its associated techniques will be recognized by the judicial system on the same basis as other expert testimony and scientific evidence. That day is long overdue.

Judicial precedents supporting the admissibility of the polygraph are overwhelming. Expert testimony and scientific evidence now routinely accepted by the courts include, among others, latent fingerprint evidence, firearms identification, tool mark evidence, traces of hair, fiber and other materials from weapons and instruments of attack, document examination and identification, traces of blood, fingernail scrapings, traces of dusts, soils, metals, glass, ash, poisons and drugs, and other materials.

One needs only to examine the requirements for admission to membership in the American Polygraph Association to recognize the professional stature of the polygraph examiner today. It is interesting to note that the polygraph is used extensively in Medical Schools throughout the country in their Departments of Psychiatry to implement their study of the emotions.

As early as 1959, a survey revealed that police departments in more than 200 American cities and the state police in 48 states were making use of the polygraph.* The survey further indicated the extent to which the polygraph is being employed in the Armed Forces, including the U. S. Air Force, the U. S. Marines and the Military Police. Parenthetically, the polygraph training program at the Provost Marshal General's School at Camp Gordon, Georgia, is conceded to be among the best and most comprehensive programs of its kind in the entire United States.

In another area where the polygraph is used extensively and on an expanding scale, it is significant that the conservative *Wall*

*Goodnick, Louis: *A Survey of Police Use of the Polygraph*, a Master's Thesis, New York University, New York, 1959.

Street Journal featured on the front page of its October 1961 issue an article on the increasing use of the polygraph by business and industry in the screening of personnel. On the roster of known users of the polygraph were major companies in steel production, copper refining, automobile manufacturing, meat packing, food processing, electronics manufacturing, mail order retailing and wholesale drug concerns.

The authors have presented the case for admissibility in a convincing and thoroughly professional manner. *THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT* is a welcome addition to the literature of criminal justice administration. Because of its inherent interest to the polygraph profession, the law enforcement field, practicing attorneys, including the prosecution and defense, and the judiciary, it should experience a wide distribution.

V. A. LEONARD, BS, MA, PH.D.
Honorary Life Member
American Polygraph Association
Denton, Texas

PREFACE

RESearch in any endeavor partakes of infinities and, in turn, widens our capacities. The higher we mount the steps of knowledge, the more magnificent are the prospects it stretches out before us, and rewards of effort commence to substitute facts for appearances.

The Polygraph in Court is the first legal, psychological, and physiological correlation, under one cover, of modern polygraphy based on actual live court cases and testing situations.

Supported by the records, writings and illustrations of recognized authorities in their respective fields, this work also presents functional psychological and physiological ingredients responsible for the unchallenged accuracy and acute reliability of the polygraph technique.

It is our sincere hope that intelligent men of every profession will materially benefit from the contents contained herein.

ROBERT J. FERGUSON JR.
ALLAN L. MILLER

INTRODUCTION

THIS TEXT aims to present a rather comprehensive view of the facts and principles embodied in modern polygraphy, correlating these with analytic, descriptive, structural, legal and psychophysiological counterparts.

For truth verification to prevail during all phases of pretrial, posttrial, presentencing, and postconviction situations, it becomes almost paramount that attorneys, judges and jurors realize when they are indulging in subjective speculation, frequently based on uncorroborated hearsay, and then objectively do something about it.

In this most modern twentieth century, there are far too many persons, subsequently proven innocent, regularly being accused, indicted, convicted, sentenced and incarcerated.

By the same token, there are far too many criminals who described their crimes in minute detail, led police to bodies of their victims, and who have frankly admitted enslaving young people to hard narcotics, walking free on adjudged legal technicalities having little relationship to the fact that they did commit the crime.

In this twentieth century there is far more deliberate, unbridled perjury in our trials than ever before. And yet, appellate courts, for the most part, have consistently ignored the most accurate and reliable method of ascertaining the truth thus far developed.

That the infamous Frye decision in 1923, even though the prosecutor, jury and judge were later shown to have convicted an innocent man, could to this day be one of the main barriers against polygraph's admissibility into trial evidence seems incredibly inconceivable.

When Dr. William Marston tested Frye in 1923 he did so using a crude systolic blood pressure apparatus.

That was not polygraphy. That apparatus had not even the faintest resemblance to the polygraph technique, nor did that apparatus record with hardly more than a small portion of the sensitivity of modern polygraph instruments. Yet because of the court's ruling in this one "wrongful incident," a lot of truth verification and a great deal of justice has since been thwarted.

While relevant precedent may be a necessary controlling attribute, irrelevant precedent should never be compounded to the detriment of the times.

Is there too much injustice because we have come to regard justice as that which is established, and thus all our established laws will be regarded as just, without being examined, just because they are established?

The polygraph examiner is primarily concerned about ascertaining the "whole" or something less than the "whole" in truth or deception, not getting involved in speculative theories or unfounded hypothesis. In this particular we are referring to what takes place inside, and comes from, the human body, not the dog, cat, mouse or rubber tree plant.

In *The Polygraph in Court* we have endeavored to illustrate, on the basis of medical and physiological documentation, exactly how a verbal stimulus during polygraphy goes through the ear, brain, autonomic nervous system, to organ destination, and thence into development of individual cardiovascular, respiratory and galvanic skin response tracings on a moving chart.

Coordinatingly, we are specifying consciousness and awareness of right or wrong, truth or deception, as the material ingredients of the polygraph technique. In order to properly correlate these factors we have dramatically inserted the mental generalities of knowing, feeling, and willing as purposive factors dependent upon conscious nervous processes in the brain. We might paraphrase to say that a conscious agency is, therefore, presumed to account for the character and quality of our conscious states.

Physiological psychology, as contained in polygraph examination, objectively considers consciousness as either the direct result or the correlate of brain and nervous system activity. Needless to say, polygraph chart tracings do not come from unconscious

origins but, of course, deviations from “physiological norm” may come from sensitivity or other mental associations.

We know that before the brain can digest a stimulus it must be seen, heard, or felt. In some isolated instances it may even be sensed or anticipated. The stimulus in polygraphy is the question asked by the polygraphist. Herein, then, we are initially referring to sound. The question goes through predetermined pathways to one or more brain centers in the cerebral cortex. There it is digested and enters the realm of consciousness and meaning. It appears that the brain is the medium or agent for consciousness and not its cause, for consciousness may be nonmaterial or even spiritual in its nature and yet dependent upon the brain to manifest itself.

Accordingly, we see the activity of the nervous tissue, with the brain as its starting point, acquaint itself with the facts of histology, anatomy and physiology of the nervous system in response to certain auditory stimuli inserted by the polygraphist.

Also interwoven throughout this text are three other material ingredients which permit a broader understanding of the merger of psychophysiological knowns into heretofore polygraph unknowns. These are (1) observation, (2) introspection, and (3) mental awareness. Different degrees of each of these three may be figuratively ascertained only when the merger is reduced to a common unit. This, in polygraph examination, is accomplished through a process of elimination. The final analysis is termed “results.” It is the content side of consciousness which furnishes the facts for scientific physiological recordings produced on the polygraph chart.

For some time there has been much misconception circulating amidst the uninformed with respect to “beating the lie detector test.” Even some psychological experimenters using galvanometers under poorly controlled laboratory conditions arrived at the unsubstantiated conclusion that such a test was inconclusive because the “instruments used” could not detect the difference between subject “work” and “emotion.” We feel the chapter entitled “The Physiology of Subject Movement” shoots holes clear through such ridiculous assertions.

During the past fifteen years we have been extremely pleased to note an increasing interest by judges, lawyers, psychologists and psychiatrists in the results obtained through competent application of polygraphy. While polygraphy certainly is not infallible, nor is it a panacea for all the courts' ills, common sense dictates its invaluable contribution to truth verification in so many areas.

For whatever it is worth, *The Polygraph in Court* is designed to help eliminate costly and unnecessary trials. Its purpose is to show that through polygraphy there is a much higher degree of accuracy not only in assisting to bring the guilty to the bar of justice but also for protection of the innocent.

Is it not true that prosecuting attorneys, with all the power at their disposal, are supposed to do everything within that power to protect the innocent?

To every judge, juror, prosecuting and defense attorney, who are only men and women, also vehemently swayed by personal and political desires and prejudices, we can only say that justice is the great interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for general security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our country.

R.J.F.
A.L.M.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

OUR SINCERE appreciation to those persons listed below for their true professional expertise, interest, material contributions, review and editing labors which helped us during the long months of manuscript preparation and research to compile, write and put this volume together. We feel this book belongs to them just as much as it does to us.

F. Lee Bailey, attorney at law, Boston, Massachusetts. We encourage everyone to read his book, *The Defense Never Rests*, Stein and Day Publishers, New York, 1971.

John E. Reid, Chicago, Illinois. There is probably no other living person who knows as much about polygraphy.

Lynn P. Marcy, polygraphist emeritus, Dearborn, Michigan.

Leonard Harrelson, president, Keeler Polygraph Institute, Chicago, Illinois.

Fred L. Hunter, polygraphist, John E. Reid & Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Charles Zimmerman, polygraphist emeritus, Auburndale, Massachusetts.

Melvin J. Williams, Chief Warrant Officer, Army C.I.D. (retired), Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Earl Tighe, Public Defender, Redwood Falls, Minnesota.

Ira E. Scott, Coordinator, School of Polygraphy, Law Enforcement Training Division, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.

Joe S. Gonzalez, specialist in criminal-narcotic polygraphy, El Paso, Texas Police Department.

Robert C. Cummins, a polygraphist dedicated to professionalism, John E. Reid & Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Ronald Decker, Director and Chief Instructor, Army School of Polygraphy, Fort Gordon, Georgia.

- Natale Laurendi, polygraphist emeritus, District Attorney's office, New York City.
- Sgt. Gene Danish, polygraphist, San Antonio, Texas, Police Department.
- W. W. Baker, polygraphist, Texas Department of Public Safety.
- Noble Brymer, Lieut., polygraphist, Nashville, Tennessee, Police Department.
- Warren Holmes, polygraphist-criminologist, Holmes Polygraph Service, Miami, Florida.
- Chris Gugas, Sr., polygraphist emeritus, former president American Polygraph Assoc., Hollywood, California.
- Richard O. Arther, polygraphist emeritus, Director, National Training Center of Lie Detection, New York City.
- Edward M. Wier, M.D., Children's Clinic, Fort Worth, Texas.
- J. V. Basmajian, M.D., Director, Department of Anatomy, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
- William B. Emmal, attorney at law, Fairbanks, Alaska.
- Joseph P. Parker, attorney at law, Fort Worth, Texas.
- G. H. Lawrence, M.D., Assistant Professor, Neuropsychiatric Department, St. Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Russell L. Vinson, D.O., Physician and Surgeon, Haltom City, Texas.
- Wallace, Craig, attorney at law, Fort Worth, Texas.
- The Hon. Olin E. Teague, Congressman, Texas.
- Cleve Backster, the Backster School of Polygraphy, New York City.
- Bob Phillips, Eastland, Texas, for his brilliant creative efforts put forth on the dust jacket of this book.
- J. J. Heger, president, C. H. Stoelting Co., Chicago, Illinois.
- Richard W. Inman, president, Associated Research, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.
- J. D. Williams, A.A.R.C., National Security Director, The Zale Corporation, Dallas, Texas.
- Dee E. Wheeler, polygraphist emeritus, Fort Worth, Texas, Crime Laboratory.
- F. T. Lindsey, branch manager, Truth Verification, Inc., Fort Worth, Texas. His initial assistance was tremendous.

- Richard Earl Williams, Executive Vice President, Texas Industrial Security, Inc., Ft. Worth, Texas.
- Roy R. Steele, licensed polygraphist, Texas Industrial Security, Inc.; member Texas Association of Polygraph Examiners.
- Benjamin Malinowski, former senior instructor (retired) at the U.S. Army Military Police Polygraph School, Fort Gordon, Georgia, now in Atlanta, Georgia.
- Robert Brisentine, polygraphist, C.I.D. Agency Liaison and polygraph control officer.
- Walter A. Van de Werken, polygraphist, lecturer, C. H. Stoelting Co., Chicago, Illinois.
- Michael O'Rourke, attorney at law, Hennepin County, Minnesota, Legal Advice Agency.
- Alfred and Martin Rosen, attorneys at law, New York City.
- Milton A. Berman, polygraphist, Louisville, Kentucky.
- The Hon. John H. Dimond, Assoc. Justice (retired) Alaska Supreme Court, Juneau, Alaska.

No amount of thanks could ever suffice for the help, encouragement and the writing of the Forewords by attorney R. David Broiles, with the law firm of Hooper, Kerry, Chappell & Broiles, 200 Ft. Worth Club Bldg., Ft. Worth, Texas, and the brilliant psychologist-author, Dr. V. A. Leonard of Denton, Texas.

Special recognition must go to Payne Thomas, Charles C Thomas, Publisher, Springfield, Illinois, who first saw the nucleus of this manuscript back in 1968 and never lost faith.

If per chance we have not properly credited assisting sources here or elsewhere, such is purely by accident or oversight, certainly not intentional.

Should this volume serve to spread some knowledge and a better understanding of the polygraph profession, the long months of manuscript preparation shall not have been totally in vain.

R.J.F.
A.L.M.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Foreword</i> —R. David Broiles	vii
<i>Foreword</i> —V.A. Leonard	xiii
<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Introduction</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxi

PART I

Chapter

1. WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT	5
2. AN ARGUMENT FOR POLYGRAPH'S ADMISSIBILITY	24
3. TRUTH VERIFICATION VS. OUTDATED PRECEDENT	52
4. QUALIFYING THE POLYGRAPHER IN COURT	85
5. THAT JUSTICE MIGHT PREVAIL	115

PART II

6. FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS BEHIND EMOTION	143
7. PHYSIOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF AUTONOMIC ACTION	170
8. POLYGRAPH'S GRAPHIC CORRELATIONS	202
9. THE PHYSIOLOGY OF SUBJECT MOVEMENT	233
10. AUTONOMIC CARDIOVASCULAR TRACINGS	262
11. AUTONOMIC PNEUMOGRAPH TRACINGS	293
12. GALVANIC SKIN RESPONSE TRACINGS	303
<i>Portions of a Polygraph Testing Data Sheet</i>	319
<i>References</i>	322
<i>Index</i>	323

THE POLYGRAPH IN COURT

PART I

Chapter 1

WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

AFTER RESEARCHING several thousand criminal cases quietly buried in police, district attorney and prison records, we gradually become more aware of how poor investigation, unconcern and legal complacency permits false “positive” identification, arrest, indictment and conviction of the innocent, all under the guise of “probable cause.”

So, let’s start with what happens in some police investigations.

A prominent citizen is robbed on one of the streets of a metropolitan city. He reports to the police and demands immediate action.

The police want to show him they are on the ball. He is questioned for a description of the assailant.

Our prominent citizen is emotionally upset and, no doubt, somewhat frightened. When robbed, the light was far from good. His inner tensions run high.

“How big was he? How tall was he? What was his color?”

The citizen searches his mind.

“About the same as that fellow over there?” the officer asks, pointing to one of the detectives.

“No, a little smaller.”

“About like that other fellow?”

“Something like him.”

“All right. Five feet eight inches,” the officer says. “Now, how about weight? About like this fellow?”

“No, more like that other chap.”

“Weight one hundred and sixty-five.”

Then they take the citizen into a rogue’s gallery where they bring out several volumes of photographs, and where they consult charts labeled “modus operandi,” and so forth.

Suddenly one of the officers exclaims, “Say, I’ve got an idea. Pete Backus got out of the pen last month and this is exactly the

kind of a job he'd pull off. He used to haunt this area and this is like his MO."

"By George, that's right," another officer chimes in. To the citizen he knowingly smiles. "Look here, I think we've got this thing solved. I think we know your man."

He flips through a mug book and points to the picture of Pete Backus.

The man starts to shake his head.

"Now wait a minute," the officer says. "Let's not be hasty about this. You may have to change your opinion. I think if you could see this man you'd recognize him as the robber. Remember that this picture was taken four or five years ago and that pictures sometimes don't look too much like a man. Now, just don't go off on a tangent on this thing. Study that picture carefully. Look at it in a better light."

The citizen keeps studying the picture. He doesn't think it's the man. The officer asks him why not, asks him to point out any particular where the picture doesn't fit.

Eventually the citizen makes what is called a "partial identification."

Then he goes home. Two weeks pass, then a grinning detective calls at his front door. "I think we've got your man. Come on down with me and identify him."

At headquarters the citizen witnesses a lineup with five men in it. The man in the middle is Pete Backus. The citizen immediately feels a flash of recognition. He's seen that man before. His face is familiar. It was in connection with the holdup. He nods emphatically. "That's the man."

How much of that identification is predicated upon a recollection of a face of the man who held him up, and how much of it upon the fact that he studied the photograph of Pete Backus so carefully that he became familiar with a photographic likeness?

We don't know. Police officers don't know. No one knows. The witness himself doesn't know.

Police officers do know that some people make positive identifi-

cations of individuals who couldn't by any stretch of the imagination have participated in the crime.*

When professors of science, or any art based on scientific principle, swear they can distinguish between the whole truth and something less than the whole truth and back their assertions academically and physiologically, would it not be too much for persons like judges to say the witness cannot thus distinguish and on that ground refuse to hear his opinions at all?

By such a course of action, a judge would undertake of his own sufficiency to determine how far a particular science, not possessed by him, can carry human knowledge, and to determine it in opposition to the practitioners of that science.

Prior to his untimely death on March 11, 1970, Erle Stanley Gardner, famous attorney, author, American, philosophically remarked: "Why does a man become a slave to the very thing he hoped would set him free?"

Leaving behind him literary legacies and legal legends that will live forever, he turned his *Court of Last Resort* (a court of public opinion) over to the American Polygraph Association's Case Review Committee with these last words:

In my experience of using the polygraph to ascertain the truth of a matter, whether it be ferreting out of the guilty, or for protection of the innocent, I have come to realize that scientific interrogation is too important a part of our present civilization to be either plowed under, on the one hand, or permitted to die on the vine, on the other hand.

The problem of facing realities cannot be mitigated unless there is a realization of the mental and emotional stress induced by environmental changes. Justice is not and cannot be a concept devoid of the human element. Where there is respect for the dignity of human beings, and regard for the truth, the machinery of the administration of justice will function efficiently.

Ignorance, failure to understand, ill will, or the desire for arbitrary power which originates in the experiences of individuals

*Gardner, Erle Stanley: *The Court of Last Resort*. William Sloane Associates, New York, 1952, pp. 250-253.

may cause its breakdown. Separate man from the administration of justice, and there is nothing.

Similarly, for attorneys and judges to endorse the prosecution and conviction of defendants, in the face of scientific evidence to the contrary, becomes no less grievous an act than touching once again a torch to human flesh, all the name of justice.

Modern court procedures must embrace the recognized status of modern conditions of mechanics, psychology, physiology, sociology, medicine, philosophy, history, and all the other available sciences. The failure to do so only further serves to question the ability of the courts to efficiently administer justice.

No government is better than its concept of justice. If our kind of democracy hopes to survive, the machinery of justice must afford equal protection to all and be swift in its operation. Whenever there is a separation between truth and justice, neither is safe.

One of the healthiest aspects of a democracy is the continuous inquiry of its citizens into the operation of government. The machinery of justice reflects the moral climate of the citizenry. The ethics and morals of the representatives of the people—be they judges, legislators, “politicians,” attorneys, police, clergymen, union leaders, or teachers—will be no higher than the ethics and morals of the people they represent.

We must not blind ourselves to truth.*

Justice is truth in action, inclusive of all virtues, older than sects and schools and, like charity, more ancient than mankind. Every man seeks for truth, but only God knows who has found it. The triumphs of truth are the most glorious, chiefly because they are the most bloodless of all victories, deriving their lustre from the total number of the saved, not slain.

But, in recent years, what has been happening in America, as well as to our once highly cherished and once reverently regarded system of justice?

Why do we indulge and permit excesses and outrages? Why do so many, even now, continue to perpetrate and sanction them? Rome fell when its citizens became so obsessed with greed and

*Dienstein, William: *Are You Guilty*. Thomas, Springfield, 1954, pp. 18, 149.

personal ambition that they lost sight of the long range goal—the good of the nation as a whole (without which there can be no fulfillment of individual interests) .

In many ways we are experiencing symptoms of a similar moral breakdown. We are slowly losing perspective of the proper role of government in relation to the individual and are abandoning genuine rights for the sake of instant satisfaction of needs and desires. Too many of us confuse the desire *for* something with the right *to* something. There are certain rights in a free democracy which are the function of government to guarantee and protect. Among these is the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But there are other so-called rights, about which we hear a great deal lately, which are not really rights at all. They have taken on an aura of credence as “rights” because of the myths surrounding them.

In the process of perpetrating these myths, genuine rights—such as the right of the majority to freedom from fear, to protection by the law, and to the freedom to choose—have been so twisted and degraded that not only has its true meaning been obscured, but the acts committed in its name have made a mockery of its original intention. It is becoming increasingly fashionable today to justify almost anything by calling it a “right.”

It is time to take another look at the mythical rights on the alter of which we are slowly sacrificing our legitimate rights. Liberty does not mean license from the law. The right to dissent means protest within the bounds of law, not mob rule. The right to the pursuit of happiness means equal opportunity, not guaranteed income and equal shares.

The philosophy of equal shares is contrary to a man's fundamental right to place a value on his work. A man's work is an expression of himself. When you deprive him of the means by which to judge the quality of his efforts, namely, proportionate reward, you take away not only the dignity and incentive of work but also pride in achievement. The philosophy that goes with the demand for guaranteed income is not only impractical, it is a direct denial of principles which have made this the richest nation

in the world—the right to competition, free enterprise and reward based on merit.

Present crime rates are a grave threat and of great concern. But a greater danger lies in a complacent attitude and false sense of security in the face of the root cause of widespread lawlessness—a breakdown of the moral fiber. The internal chaos generated in the individual will become manifest in society as a whole. We are seeing visible signs of this everywhere.

It is manifest in the student unrest in the universities . . . in their demands for “student power,” in the use of subversive tactics to achieve such goals as seizing the role of administrators and wanting to teach rather than learn, and in their choice of heroes who, if given the opportunity, would destroy this country. Their parents pay tuition and board while they court communism and play at guerrilla warfare, without conception or concern for the consequences.

It is a sad spectacle that many persons have become so immune to genuine values that they can take their own hypocritical attempt to play at being little men so seriously that they become a threat to themselves and to their country; when they can succeed in deluding themselves to the extent that annihilation of all authority seems a worthwhile goal and the swaggering demagogic posture of contempt for work, family, the home and society, a fulfilling life.

It is an irony and a tragedy that the affluent permissive environment, out of which many of these so-called revolutionaries came, has backfired; that instead of contributing to the development of character and a sense of responsibility, it has led them to seek a life of continuous ease and escapism; a life in which the gap—the human need for socially worthy meanings—is pathetically filled by latching on to utopian, bizarre ideals which, because they are so unrealistic, allow them to remain perpetual children. The danger to the country is that in their naivete such persons become easy victims for the corrupters and the real revolutionaries.

To require the status quo as an object for destruction in order to achieve a sense of identity is a pitiful dependency on just that status quo. Those who rely solely on deviation to make their