***Miranda vs. Arizona***

Ernesto Miranda was accused of kidnapping and raping an 18-year-old girl near Phoenix, Arizona. The girl claimed she was on her way home from work when a man grabbed her, threw her into the back seat of a car, and raped her. Ten days later, Miranda was arrested, placed in a lineup, and identified by the girl as her attacker. The police then took Miranda into an interrogation room and questioned him for two hours. At the end of the two hours, the officers emerged with a written and signed confession. This confession was used as evidence at trial, and Miranda was found guilty.

Miranda later appealed his case to the U.S. Supreme Court, arguing that he had not be told of his right to remain silent or of his right to remain silent or of his right to counsel. Miranda did not suggest that his confession was false or brought about by coercion but rather that he would not have confessed if he had been advised of these rights.

**Questions**

1. Summarize the facts in the Miranda case. On what grounds did Miranda appeal his conviction?
2. Do you think Miranda’s confession should have been used as evidence against him at trial? Why or why not?
3. Do you think police should be required to tell suspects their rights before questioning them?
4. Do you think suspects would confess after being warned of their rights?
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