

Chapter 3: BEYOND DOUBT

“HUMAN BEINGS ARE PERHAPS NEVER MORE FRIGHTENING THAN WHEN THEY ARE CONVINCED BEYOND DOUBT THAT THEY ARE RIGHT.” —Sir Laurens van der Post, South African author (1906-1996)

If you are convinced beyond doubt that O.J. Simpson is guilty of murder you have no choice but to believe wholeheartedly in the mental, emotional or spiritual shortcomings of those who disagree. If the truth is that cut-and-dried, there have to be some fundamental flaws in the logic circuits of those who don't see it, right? Maybe they're insane or stupid. Maybe they're ill-informed or ill-served by their passions. If you're an OJI, you've heard it all. And what can you say in your defense?

PETLADY

Tiger,

What you don't seem to understand is that we, and I think I am speaking for most of the OJI's, do not idolize O.J. It has nothing actually to do with O.J. the man. I do not have Court TV yet, I will get it in April, and I will watch, and anytime I see what I feel is the police and the district attorney's office pushing a case the way it was done in this case, I will object. O.J. could have been Joe Schmoe, and I would feel the same way.

My God, if I'm going to idolize somebody it would be someone different than O.J. I think he lied about the abuse prior to 1989, I know he's a womanizer (but I think we can name a few others, including some Presidents, who were also womanizers). We also know that Mark Fuhrman, under oath, lied. We know that Vannatter, under oath, lied. We know that strange things happened during the criminal trial, like the

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

blood on the gate that wasn't there, and then it was, bindles that were thought to be initialed, but were not, missing blood from the blood vial, that later was explained. Well, it really wasn't 8 cc's, it was only 6 ½, since there was 1 1/2 cc's missing.

It doesn't have anything to do with idolizing O.J. It has to do with what's missing, why all of the pieces of the puzzle don't fit together. What was the difference in the amount of blood that was on one glove that was dry and one glove that was wet? Did it take 1 minute or 10 minutes to kill these people? This is what it has to do with. You have your standby, the DNA. Okay. But we have our questions, and until these questions are answered we will stand firm. And if that's strange to you, think of where we would be if old Chris Columbus had believed he was going to sail off the edge of the earth if he went too far in one direction. I mean that's what all the people believed back then, but he had questions and he got his answer, he didn't sail off the edge.

Peggy

Rhino, Bear, Lion and Tiger,

I cannot believe what I have read this morning from you, Rhino. "Darden and Clark despised Fuhrman." ...Fuhrman was their "golden boy." He was the whole case. He found the so-called blood spot on the car door, he jumped the fence (in case someone was dead or dying inside), he questioned Kato, examined his shoes and clothes he wore the night before (without a search warrant by the way), he found the glove.

The only time Darden and Clark turned against Mark Fuhrman was when the world found out what kind of man he was. And Marcia Clark did her damndest to keep the world from finding out. Marcia Clark said O.J. was the murderer within hours of the discovery of the bodies (read Joe Bosco's book). Now, how did she become so wise and all-knowing within hours of the crime?

Chapter 3: BEYOND DOUBT

You know, you all talk about me answering questions; how about an answer to some of my questions?

1. Why was Marcia Clark so convinced, before any DNA testing, before any evidence was collected, before anyone was a suspect, that O.J. was the killer?
2. Why did Fung go to Rockingham before he went to Bundy?
3. Why did Marcia Clark go to Rockingham?
4. Why was Dr. Lee not allowed to properly conduct his investigation of the crime scene? In fact, why was Dr. Lee treated the way he was treated by the LAPD?
5. Why did Peratis change his testimony given at the Grand Jury and the Preliminary Hearing about the amount of blood he had drawn from O.J.?
6. Why did four detectives (two in charge of the crime scene, and two who were the first detectives at the crime scene) go to Rockingham to “inform O.J.”?
7. Why were witnesses for the defense intimidated to the point where they could not testify?
8. Why didn't the police further investigate the phone call received asking about “sitting on two bodies in Brentwood”?
9. Why was blood on the gate three weeks after the crime scene had been released?
10. Why was the crime scene released within 24 hours, when the crime scene in the JonBenet Ramsey case is still not released (I may be wrong about JonBenet)?
11. Why were Nicole's people allowed to be at her place the next day, washing down the walk, taking all her stuff away?
12. Why were the socks not there and then there?
13. Why was there no evidence of blood on the socks, and then, oops, yes there is?

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

You people believe what you want to believe, and disparage or throw out everything else. You talk about us being of one mind. How about you? There is no room for any doubt in your minds, there is no questioning, there is only one path, just like the LAPD, straight to O.J. And Tiger, I don't know how many times you have mentioned womanizing. Is this a case of "thou protest too much." There have been many womanizers in the past, but none to incur your wrath like O.J. A great deal of them have been in politics. Tell me, did you vote for Kennedy, or Eisenhower?

And Lion, Goldman is still not satisfied. He stated time and time again, it wasn't about money. So O.J. was found responsible. If it wasn't about money, Goldman could have said "Okay, that's all I wanted, and any award I may receive can go to such-and-such charity." Man, I would have admired him for that. But that's not the case. Goldman wants his pound, two pounds, five pounds of flesh. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord" ...No, vengeance is Fred Goldman's.

As far as I know there is still an investigator for Simpson working on this. Why doesn't he give up? Over half the world has said O.J. is guilty. What's wrong with this man? He must enjoy butting his head against a brick wall. And for your information, Lion, I have never used the term, "I have a right to my opinion."

How could I possibly know what evidence was destroyed by the LAPD. If Mark Fuhrman was right, obviously a bloody fingerprint was overlooked. What about the blood-drops on Nicole's back that were never tested? I have taken some tremendous heat from you guys, and I don't think I have ever tried to cop out on anything.

Tiger, the reason there is not an iota of evidence pointing anywhere else is totally unknown to us. How can you say there is not an iota of evidence pointing anywhere else, when all we have been fed is what the LAPD has deigned to give

Chapter 3: BEYOND DOUBT

us. And you're damned right I'm saying Clark and Darden manipulated the evidence. Not only the evidence, but the witnesses. When Marcia Clark couldn't get exactly what she wanted from Kato, she had to treat him as a hostile witness. Darden browbeat Rosa Lopez to the point she fled the country. Heidstra had words put in his mouth by Darden, about the vehicle he saw.

As I said before, what if O.J. had been found guilty and was at this moment sitting in jail, would that have appeased Goldman's desire for revenge. I think not. I think he would go on and on until there was nothing left. This man has a vendetta to carry out, and come hell or high water, he's going to carry it out.

Peggy

Tiger, Lion and Bear,

What I am saying with regard to Mr. Goldman goes all the way back to the criminal trial. Goldman was convinced by Marcia Clark, Darden and the rest of the DA's office (probably with a little Fuhrman thrown in) that O.J. was the killer. He, like the police, looked no further. And before you guys start with the hat, glove, fiber, etc., Goldman was on TV every chance he got with his fiery rhetoric about O.J. Also, Mr. Goldman made the statement numerous times that it wasn't about the money, he just wanted O.J. responsible. Well, his jury found O.J. responsible. Enough said. Now, he's still not satisfied, he wants to dig in the spurs and make him bleed.

I'm sure Fred Goldman loved his son, we all love our children. If someone killed one of my children, I would want to see him/her dead. But I would not blindly accept what a District Attorney told me as the gospel, which from all indications, Mr. Goldman did. You know, it's hindsight, but I wonder if O.J. had been found guilty, if that would have satisfied

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Mr. Goldman. Didn't he file his case first, way back at the beginning of the criminal trial? I'm not clear on this, so if I'm wrong, I'm positive one of you will let me know.

No, Tiger, Bear and Lion, Mr. Goldman wants his revenge all the way. O.J. has been found liable. But Goldman goes on and on. Perhaps he will donate everything he gets to charity. That will make him a lot more believable to me. And by going after O.J. and all his so-called wealth, he now is also going after O.J.'s children. I'm sorry I just have no respect for the man. I think he wants the money, and I think he wants someone to pay for the rest of their lives. In this case the someone is O.J., and O.J.'s children.

Peggy

Tiger,

I have been sitting here trying to sift through the 132 e-mails I had when I got home and I came to yours about Fuhrman's clean record and it floored me. You and Lion seem to have gone on some kind of a crusade for Mark Fuhrman. My God, have you both lost your senses?

In an interview for workers compensation in 1981, Fuhrman related to the psychiatrist that during the last six months he was in the Marines he "got tired of having a bunch of Mexicans and niggers that should be in prison, telling him they weren't going to do something." From December 1981 to mid-1983, Fuhrman was granted compensation and was on paid leave, not working the "mean streets," as Lion would put it. In 1983 Fuhrman filed a Superior Court appeal because he was turned down for permanent disability. This is public record, and if I ever figure out how to get into the Superior Court files I plan to get a transcript of this appeal.

He bragged to the psychiatrist about breaking hands, faces, arms and legs, if necessary. He talked to a clinical professor of psychology at the UCLA School of Medicine about choking,

Chapter 3: BEYOND DOUBT

kicking and punching a man after he was unconscious. He also told this professor about the four guys at the housing project that he and his partner pounded their faces to mush and pushed down the stairs. This incident was investigated. Fuhrman said Internal Affairs knew he did it. He also thought he was smarter than the people who were investigating him.

Several psychiatrists recommended that he be removed from the streets. One even recommended that he should not be allowed to carry a gun. He went back on the streets in 1984. So, obviously from 1981 to 1984, he was not out on the streets, leaving his wife and kiddies to go and get shot. He has been named as a defendant in at least four brutality lawsuits. He settled a case, during the Simpson trial, on planting evidence.

He shoots to kill. In his own words: “And I don’t want them to think I’m a coward. So sometimes that’ll stimulate me to do what I have to do, and plus I like it when people are trying to hurt me, because there is something that is on the line, something that’s important in my life, and I like working under pressure. And it’s good. It feels good because I accomplish something. And you can look around and say, most of these punks couldn’t do it. It’s control, power, whatever you want to call it. But it’s something that’s inherent in only some people. I listen to liberals talk, and I can’t believe that someone who is educated, or even just opens their eyes for one day can think what they think. Do you people—don’t you shoot to wound ’em? No, we shoot to kill ’em. Now, the department says we shoot to stop, not to kill which is horseshit. The only way you can stop somebody is to kill the son of a bitch. And what’s the big deal? If you’ve got a reason to shoot somebody, you’ve got a reason to kill him.”

He believed in revenge if someone kills a cop: “If I ever see the son of a bitch and we’re alone, I would kill him. If there’s

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

nobody except him and me, dead men tell no tales. I have an obligation if I ever have the opportunity, I should kill him. And that's all there is to it.”

And this is the guy you and Lion are defending? Now, we know that none of the direct quotes above are lies, because Fuhrman doesn't lie, right? This is just too damn much for me to comprehend. I gave you and Lion both a lot of credit for your knowledge about certain things, but when it comes to looking at Mark Fuhrman objectively you two seem to be his biggest fan club. —Peggy