

10 April 2000

Dear Sam -

It's true that one cannot disprove the existence of something. For example, are there aliens among us? The presentation of an alien proves alien existence; the non-presentation of an alien does not disprove alien presence. McCarthy used this truth in saying that the government was full of communists. No one could disprove it. Similarly with the absence of one piece of evidence. But this doesn't mean that other things demonstrating innocence can't be proven. For example: your fingerprints are on the murder weapon. However, the murder occurred at <sup>a</sup> certain time, in a certain place, + you can prove that you were elsewhere at that time. You have proven that your fingers were not on the weapon at the time of the crime. Science says the non-existence of things cannot be proven. "Innocence" is an abstraction, not in the realm of the physical things that science deals with at all. You don't prove the non-existence of your physically scientific "guilt" - something which doesn't exist - you prove your physical fingers were not on the physical weapon at the physical time of the physical act defined by society as "crime." This can be done scientifically.

What is wrong with the current "justice" system is that it is a rigged part of the police state establishment. The defense lawyers, like the DA's, are part of the system. According to Anglo-Saxon tradition, you are supposed to be judged by a jury of your "peers" - people chosen at random from the tribe or nation. Instead, the jury is selected from the conservative establishment element - "upstanding" citizens supposedly without prejudice, but who of course

have more of a vested interest bias than anyone else. If this is not possible, because the neighborhood is so overwhelmingly working class, like the Bronx, the trial is moved to a conservative establishment bastion like Albany, with the rationalization that it is the non-bourgeois rabble without vested interests who are the more biased. In the Bronx, one's police come in from the relatively affluent suburbs, + one must go to the relatively affluent upstate to find one's "peers." Democratic "law + order" in action.

Guilt is often established upon circumstantial evidence, so overwhelming as to be convincing "beyond a reasonable doubt." This goes back to Anglo-Saxon tradition. Cooperating with the police may offer an alternative explanation of circumstances where a jury would otherwise feel they were being absurdly gullible if they didn't convict. But again, if the suspects are conservative establishment bourgeois robber-baron billionnaires like the Ramseys, their "peers" are never given the chance to make that judgment.

Sincerely,  
Elliot