

In W. of the plans was the remains were found, not
exclusively in line -

within law is, nor was I am of the
statement. Explanation is shown it is to
including also appearances when Police went to search the

Remainder is also an analysis of the case, leading,
indefensible & all important fact depends upon only one
of the great number of lost witnesses.

The best of all known importance to come must
be taken not to be decided by number of witnesses - by the
idea that there is much proof, when this single fact, if it
fails to be found beyond reasonable doubt is decided against
the Gov.

There is a note which points of the testimony of
Littellfield as an instance - and apply to it
the best test - of 1. if it is reliable, credible - suff.
found to prove a fact stated, & 2nd whether the
facts proved "do to a moral certainty, exclude every
hypothesis but that stated as by Gov."

1. Supposing the statements of S to be substantially correct
do all the facts stated by him exclude to a moral
certainty the hypothesis that the remains were deposited
when they were found, & all the appearances respecting
them, including the fragments found in the vicinity of the
farm, were produced by some person equally a
stranger to Dr W. & to L.