

#210

## The Making of a Murderer - Inside the Steven Avery & Brendan Dassey Fram created 16 Jan. 2016

Dr. Phil concluded that Brendan Dassey was easily manipulated, showed a clip from the detectives' "interview" with Brendan that supported that conclusion. But the average person can't believe that someone could be so suicidally impressionable because the average person is not so suicidally impressionable.

After being imprisoned based on his "confession," Brendan was moved out of one prison into a more isolative prison because at the first prison Brendan was being taken advantage of by other prisoners, sexually & otherwise. The scummy prisoners were talking Brendan into doing what they wanted.

Courts carefully scrutinize the testimony of children who are witnesses to/of abuse to ensure that the children were not led to say something happened, which a child is inclined to do because s/he wants to please adults. For example, asking a child,

"Did the man touch your butt?"

suggests to a child that the adult wants to hear what the question informed the child of: a man touched his butt. Even worse would be to ask a child,

"How many times did Sherman\* touch your butt?"

and still worse,

"Sherman touched your butt, right?"

In the clip Dr. Phil showed, detectives did ask Dassey super-leading questions,

"Tell us about her being shot in the head,"

while standing over Brendan, who's body language was that of

---

\* I'm not talking about a guard named Sherman who works here, even though he looks like he'd touch a kid's butt. 😊

total submission.

Brendan's parents ought to be slapped & his lawyer sued for legal malpractice & disbarred for not being in the room with Brendan while he was "interrogated". At least in theory they could have ensured that Brendan was telling the truth, even if that truth wasn't what the several detectives looming over Brendan didn't want to hear.

Dr. Phil showed Brendan's writing, which had no punctuation & misspellings that I would have scoffed at in the Fourth grade. By the way, when I was in the Fourth grade I totally believed outrageous lies my mom told all of her kids to discourage us from wanting to communicate with her family: she said they were child-sacrificing Satan worshippers who wanted to kill us. I'm hardly gullible, but, like everyone, as a child I was <sup>I believed mom.</sup> Brendan clearly remains as gullible or more gullible, thus the story that detectives instructed Brendan to tell can not be believed.

Without Brendan's story, the only evidence that suggests Avery committed the crime is the physical evidence. But that physical evidence was... obtained by the same detectives who obtained Brendan's non-credible story.

"But there's the jail-house snitch's testimony!" an idiot might say, because only an idiot would consider that as evidence.

In my own murder case multiple jail-house snitches came forward, claiming I confessed. One said that I told him that the murder was done by me + my brother because we had some sorta homosexual love triangle going on (neither my brother nor myself were/are gay). Another said that I had a helicopter coming to bust me out of the state mental hospital, after my mom had sex with him (she was issued a trespassing citation for that, as he was in a community corrections apartment) - I couldn't even pay for an attorney let alone pay for a helicopter (or persuade someone to

fly it for me. Yet the prosecutor chose to use the testimony of a jail-house snitch who'd been given money from my mother (she was insane, testified against me herself) and testified that I told him me & my brother tied up & tortured the victim before killing him (the evidence said otherwise) - the trial judge (after the trial) said that guy wasn't credible, was an obvious liar.

The jail-house snitch in Avery's case said Avery told him that he planned to rape, torture & kill women, but there's no way to verify any part of that story. He was a smarter snitch than the one in my case because Avery couldn't show him to be lying with physical evidence. But Avery's snitch is still not credible: he's under duress, in prison, in a position where the system he testified for can & will reward him for giving them something they clearly wanted.

The law says that evidence can be excluded for being too prejudicial (inciting a negative emotional response that blinds a rational decision) and not very probative (proving a fact). The jail-house snitch's testimony was clearly such evidence. It didn't help prove that Avery killed Theresa, but would incite a negative emotional response. The testimony should never have been allowed and is yet more evidence that the prosecutor was scrounging for even dirty, inadmissible evidence.

"If the evidence was inadmissible, how <sup>did</sup> the prosecutor get away with using it?" you might ask.

Simple, most Wisconsin judges, at all levels, favor the prosecution, will misrepresent the facts and/or ignore the applicable law in order to justify their favoritism. Many judges were prosecutors: the guy who prosecuted my case (Scott Horne) is now a judge (he replaced the judge who presided over my case), as is Todd Bjerke, another former prosecutor in La Crosse County. Wisconsin judges are poli-

tricians, elected, just like the head prosecutors. They know each other, work + play golf with each other, cooperate with each other and ain't about to step on the toes of another politician that might politick against them for being "soft on crime."

There is no "independent" judiciary in Wisconsin. So, when Avery's prosecutor said Brendan Dassey wasn't taken advantage of and the jail-house snitch's testimony wasn't prejudicial, the prosecutor got what he wanted, and the appellate judges let it stand.

Steven Avery's case is not the only high-profile case that was unfairly resolved. There's Theodore Oswald's case and my case. Take a look at the Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision in State v. Lindell, 629 N.W.2d 223, 245 Wis.2d 689 (2001), where they denied me a new trial despite an unfair jury selection process that they'd previously ruled (7 times in 3 years!) entitled a defendant a new trial. Many more low-profile cases are unfairly resolved.

What's curious to me is that all the media hype is about Steven Avery's case, with little mention of Brendan Dassey's unjust conviction. Brendan should have had a guardian ad litem, as he clearly was too low-functioning to make important decisions like whether or not to make a statement or to plead guilty.

I hate rapists, because I love women. But I also hate bullies, hypocrites, those who abuse their authority. No sane person can say that Steven Avery or Brandon Dassey were fairly convicted; there's plenty of reason to doubt either are guilty.

Just another bump on the road in the home of the slave and the land of the greed.

Sincerely, Nate A. Lindell #303724  
WSPF P.O. Box 9900  
Boscobel, WI 53805

P.S. Readers, please share this with

Dr.Phil.com, his Avery link. Also lacrossetribune.com <sup>editors</sup> + Madison.com

Thanks