

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

“WHAT KIND OF SHOES WERE YOU WEARING?”—
Phillip Vannatter, lead detective in the Bundy murder case,
interviewing O.J. Simpson on the 13th of June, 1994

Before I left the threads, Jamal and I posted to each other about the significance of the defense expert's testimony that the Harry Scull photos were faked. To me, it didn't matter, since the September, '93 photo was reported to have appeared in a '93 Buffalo Bills newsletter. Frankly, the defense argument never made sense to me. I respected Jamal and the fact that it made sense to him, but discussing it on the boards was like trying to have a personal telephone conversation on a party line. Anyone could break in with personal attacks that could rob you of your ability to exchange ideas with others who didn't know you. The only thing I thought was important, was the idea that they were O.J.'s. Once that idea was firmly planted, which it was the instant O.J. handed Lange his size 12 Reeboks, the plaintiffs could always argue that seeing was believing, and the defense expert had to be wrong. If the prosecution could do that to Dr. Henry Lee, the plaintiffs could do it to anybody.

If, on the other hand, the photos could be proven to be doctored, that would open up other trails of inquiry I'd want to explore. Since I was no longer in direct touch with Jamal, I was dependent on those who were for the benefit of his insights. He had a better grip on some aspects of the case than I did, and the whole issue of the shoes may have been one of them. The boards closed down before I could get samples of his work. But the following analysis of Lange and Vannatter's infamous interrogation of O.J. Simpson is, I believe, typical of how both of us would have seen the same evidence...

Vannatter and Lange's questioning of O.J. about the night of June 12th is normally reported as either a bungled opportunity to learn the truth or a clever ploy to get it. According to the “bungled opportunity” school of thought, championed by Mark Fuhrman and Vincent Bugliosi, the detectives' easy questioning tipped their hand to O.J. on the blood evidence

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

and allowed him to compose more workable lies on the spot. According to Vannatter and Lange's "cleaver ploy" school, rough handling would have caused O.J. to clam up, and the "incriminating" inconsistencies they coaxed out of him may never have tipped his hand to them.

In Vannatter and Lange's ironically titled book, *Evidence Dismissed*, the former detectives tip their hand to their readers by dismissing all evidence of O.J.'s innocence. They had to have been saying what they thought was true because they reproduced the interview in whole to "prove" their contentions, with notes describing their take on what impressed them and why. The problem is, their annotated transcript proves only that they didn't register anything significant that O.J. said unless it seemed to incriminate him in the murder. That didn't take much. That interview, as it is presented in their book, is a classic study in prejudice. They assumed he was guilty and interpreted everything he did and didn't do accordingly.

For example: When Vannatter asks O.J., "What kind of shoes were you wearing?" O.J. answers, "Tennis shoes." The note following O.J.'s answer describes a photo of him wearing dressy/casual shoes at Sydney's recital. The clear implication is that O.J. lied.

What they missed in their 90-second conversation about the clothes was how logically his answer fit in with the preceding exchange. If he knew as little about the crime as he said he did, he would not have understood the significance of the questions. We know for sure that he didn't know how much time would be spent on what issue, what all of the issues were going to be, who was going to say what next, and where any of it would eventually lead.

With that in mind, consider the fact that Vannatter's first question about the clothes was, "What were you wearing last night, O.J.?" The transcript does not indicate Vannatter or Lange nodding when O.J. asked about what he wore on the golf course, but immediately after his question he talked about the pants. Then he said, "I mean, I changed different for whatever it was." In other words he dressed for the occasion. When Vannatter asked if he'd worn the golf pants to the recital, O.J. told him he hadn't and searched his memory for what he had worn. In an apparent attempt to find whatever it was the detectives wanted to know, O.J. expanded on his wardrobe by

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

saying he'd worn a white T-shirt, but didn't back away from the pants they seemed to be so interested in. Lange asked two more questions about the pants. He wanted to know what O.J. did with them when he got home.

So far the questions about the clothes had progressed in chronological order, from what he'd worn when he played golf, to what he'd worn at the recital, to what he did with his clothes when he got home. He answered, "I always hang up my clothes," and went on to explain his normal routine with his housekeeper, making sure not to avoid any questions about the pants. That's when Vannatter asked him about the shoes.

What shoes could he possibly be talking about? O.J. had already said that he dressed for whatever it was he did. He obviously hadn't worn his golf shoes to the recital or his recital shoes on the golf course, and he had just said that he put his recital clothes away. Vannatter didn't ask, "What shoes did you wear to the recital?" He asked, "What kind of shoes were you wearing?"

Questions like these are what the OJI's and OJU's were trying get to the bottom of, only we didn't have enough primary documents to work with. The trials, the transcripts and the news either left out the things we wanted to know or we missed them. All I wanted to know about the Bruno Magli shoes was the identity of the man who wore them on 6-12-94 to a double murder in Brentwood. All I knew were facts on top of facts from the public record and my personal experience that added up to an educated guess.

Subj: Re: Jamal

Date: 97-02-08 12:32:34 EST

From: Trille

To: Crowe

CC: Trooper, Hhhana, Connie, Petlady, Chameleon

Trooper1 wrote:

"Pat— I don't think that a word you said was strange. Lion never said what her source was for Fuhrman's alibi, but I heard it from somebody at work—who didn't have a source for it, either. The only thing I know was what I said about Fuhrman being "in the desert." It seems to me that Fuhrman

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

managed to get that in when he was on the witness stand without being asked or challenged. I didn't write it down and I didn't record it because I was sure there would be a lot more questions about it. The questions never came.

"As far as garbage-picking O.J. clothes, that was only one suggestion of how it could have been done. He may have had a thing going with Nicole for the sole purpose of gathering that stuff a little at a time from her home. The gloves Nicole bought could have been a gift to him. As Christine points out, they didn't fit OJ; they may fit MF. The shoes may also have been a gift from Nicole (a requested gift). He could have paid or blackmailed a professional thief to steal them. Who knows what happened?

"The only point I was trying to make was that there were several ways Fuhrman could have gotten the evidence to plant that the jury found so convincing. The only way to narrow the possibilities is to do an investigation. I still want to find the source of the size 12 information. I wonder what the OJG's would say about it? —Jasper"

Pat Whetham wrote:

"Jasper—You know what? I really don't care what the OJG's think. I think a lot of them are pretty ignorant. They appear to be know-it-alls and really don't know any more than the rest of us. Did you see the site Jamal posted on the threads. The picture is very interesting. www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/1472/

"If this picture was taken Sept. 26, the date of the Scull and Flammer photos, something stinks to high heavens. The pants look more like something OJ would wear and the shoes are not "ugly assed." Take a look if you get a chance. Well it's really late so I'll sign off for now.

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

“Keep the faith—Pat (Crowe)”

The photo, with no clear indication of when or where it was taken, showed O.J. standing on the field of a stadium wearing almost identical clothes as the ones in the Scull-Flammer photos. The only difference was the shoes.

Jasper and Petlady— That photo is so indicative of “Something Wrong!”

And the shoes and pants look like something OJ would wear. See, in order for the Scull-Flammer photos to work, they must have used the real shoes and pants of somebody, but that somebody wasn't OJ. OJ is a neatnick, and those worn out unfashionable shoes and those baggy wrinkled pants NEVER DID SEEM TO BELONG TO OJ.

Obviously there are real Bruno Maglis in this world. I wonder if it's possible that OJ never knew the names of his shoes. I sure don't know the names of my clothes. Like Patsy from Absolutely Fabulous said, “the only label my clothes have, is ‘drip dry’!” But I do believe OJ didn't bring most of his clothes from NY to LA, it would make no sense. If he had a condo in NY and spent a good deal of time in NY, then he would have all his stuff there, and other stuff in LA, and only carry the most important stuff from one to the other. The reason he had luggage from LA to Chicago is that he didn't have a permanent home in Chicago. But it hasn't been conclusively proven to me that the footprints at Bundy ARE BRUNO MAGLIS AND THAT THERE IS ONLY ONE SET.

Remember who testified to that; an FBI man. Can we really trust him? I don't understand why the defense accepted that testimony. Chameleon has a posting on a thread where she said that she found some news photo taken while it was still a crime scene and THERE ARE NO FOOTPRINTS. CHAMELEON AT THAT TIME WAS STILL OPEN TO DISCUSSION AND WAS OJU. —Trille

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Jamal

Date: 97-02-08 13:30:35 EST

From: Trille

To: Chameleon

CC: PWhetham, Trooper, Hhhana, Connie, Petlady

Chameleon wrote:

Hello everyone— Chameleon at this time is still OJU and open to discussion. If you want me to send the photos I will...no problem. Chameleon's posts to Jamal on the threads is for him to make himself known to you OJI's...He is being unfair to you. He should tell you about himself, instead of keeping you in the dark...that is cowardice...wouldn't you feel the same way if it were anyone else?

If Jamal is in e-mail contact with all of you...let me know. You don't have to give me his e-mail address, all you have to say is that you guys have the e-mail address and can communicate with him anytime you want. It is unfair to keep you guys on the line and think he is better than all of you...He is not better than any of you...You are all nice wonderful people...He should acknowledge you and respect you enough to give you an e-mail addresses... don't you think...? —Chameleon

Subj: Re: [Fwd: RE shhhh]

Date: 97-02-08

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper173@aol.com

CC: Trille

Hi Jasper—Glad you're home today...I have a lot on my mind and my heart. Need to vent a little, then share some information I've gleaned regarding MF.

First, though, I am amazed at the feeding frenzy of the OJG's on the Court TV threads. I believe they would have OJ bound in chains, stripped naked, and pulled through the streets so those "holy ones" could scream their righteous

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

indignation while throwing stones at the “demon.” I am amazed at the depth of the cruelty and hate being demonstrated by these pompous a_____ (forgive please).

Now for business, you may or may not have heard the interview Jack Ford had with the Vanity Fair reporter on MSNBC the other night. This guy went to Idaho and spent 5 days with the Fuhrman family. I have not seen the article and I promised myself I certainly would not buy the book he’s getting ready to publish....but I’m not so sure now.

This guy has an ego to beat all egos. He just may trip himself up. According to the reporter, MF claims the police, (other than him) did a poor job. He claims there was dark clothing in OJ’s bathroom at Rockingham that never was collected by the police. Now, taking this statement and assuming that he and at least one other officer were involved in staging (Vannatter?), suppose he took the outfit the murderer wore (him?) and planted it there.

Now suppose the other cop (Vannatter) thought this was too obvious, and might actually implicate the true killer and removed it [*Editor’s note: After reading Fuhrman’s book, it was clear to me that Vannatter was not privy to Fuhrman’s plans, but at this point we knew nothing about Roberts*]. If we suppose MF had gone back to Bundy, he may not have known about the change of plan.

Now, we have to suppose that later after the evidence had been collected, someone (not Vannatter, he wasn’t there) maybe MF grabbed the socks and planted them just to put another nail in OJ’s coffin. The only thing the police had were the socks...Why would MF say there was dark clothing in OJ’s bathroom? (because he planted it there?) Next, didn’t MF testify he did not go upstairs? How does he know about the clothes?

The reporter also stated MF said he saw a “bloody fingerprint” at Bundy. If this is correct and he said Bundy, not Rockingham, how did it get there? Maybe smudged on by

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

MF himself? Maybe removed by an accomplice as overkill? If he saw it at Bundy, why was it not included in those precise notes he wrote at Bundy? Do you see what I mean? Does it make sense to you that a super ego like this slime's may give us a lot of answers? *[Editor's note: Hhhana was right about Fuhrman's book. His ego did give us a lot of answers including his part in "finding" the socks. In showing how clever he was, he all but tells what he did, why he did it and how—and defies the world to prove it.]*

Waiting to hear... —Paula

P.S. Who is Jamal? So intelligent and right on the money....

Subj: Re: [Fwd: RE shhhh]

Date: 97-02-08 14:32:03 EST

From: Trille

To: Hhhana

CC: Trooper173

Hi Paula— In regards to the “dark clothes in washer,” that WAS SETTLED DURING THE REAL TRIAL. I have sent an e-mail to Mr. Walraven for the exact place in the transcripts, but it went something like this: Judge Ito: “Mr. Simpson, you don't wear black lace underwear, do you” [laughter, sniggering]. Mr. Simpson, “No, of course not.” It occurred during a sidebar, I believe. The dark clothes in the washer were Arnelle's underwear, and believe me, had there been blood ANYWHERE ON ANY CLOTHES, IN THE WASHING MACHINE OR IN THE DRAINS, WE WOULD HAVE KNOWN ABOUT IT.

We can really assume that whatever Fuhrman says in his crap book, is only designed to SELL THE BOOK. Even Darden admitted that he knew nothing about dark clothes in the machine. That is because it was cleared up a long time ago. Darden is an idiot and probably doesn't remember or he prefers not to admit it, but any clothes in the washing machine

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

at Rockingham, were Arnelle's. As far as bloody finger prints in the maid's room, that would have come out in the trial if it had been true.

Does anyone remember Dumb and Dumber stating on some tabloid show that OJ had drugs in his system, and they could prove it? How come we NEVER HEARD THAT OFFICIALLY?! Because it wasn't true, it is very easy to lie on those crap shows; they are not under oath, and they know the public will swallow anything bad or derogatory on OJ, no matter how ludicrous or non-factual. Don't be conned into buying this Nazi's book. If you must read it, get it from the library, or read it in bookstores. Just go and read as much as you can before they throw you out, or buy something else to satisfy them, but don't give money to these people! They have done enough harm as it is.

Paula, I don't want the Baker law firm to think we are a bunch of kooks, and I accidentally sent them too many copies of stuff the other day. I figured I would lie low for a few days, before I start faxing them again, but the more I hear and read, the more upset I get at what's happening to OJ. There was a little tidbit in the Washington Post today about a black man who died from a drug overdose, and the police and jailers just mocked and tormented him as he sat dying bound and gagged on a chair. This was in Florida, and unfortunately for the police, the whole thing was videotaped. —Trille

Subj: Where does it start

Date: 97-02-09 12:55:04 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper

CC: Trille

Jasper— I keep asking myself, "where does it start"? Or better yet, when does it start? The Court TV threads are amazing. They tell so many stories about people and the way they

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

think, the inequities in our society many of us don't take personally because we assume they don't apply to us.

I did a bad thing yesterday. I was so angry at being unfairly attacked by Lion and Bear, I lost it. I acted out in the worst kind of way and I am sorry for it. Do you know the difference between an OJG and an OJI? OJI's are thinking people. OJG's are not. I believe any one of us who have believed in OJ would still continue to think and dig even if what we discovered pointed directly to OJ's guilt [*Editor's note: That is exactly what we did, pursuing trails that could have led anywhere*]. An OJG would never do that. Their minds are set in cement.

This is what I didn't understand that you did. We are judged to be unworthy by the OJG's before we even say anything. It's because they consider the only supporters of OJ are inferior black people!! I've got it now. Oh, Jasper, I am seeing the black experience up close and personal. They can't see any of us; they just assume. I couldn't be black. I'd more than likely be dead by now, because people are people and deserve to be respected for what they do and what they say; these auto-assumptions hurt too bad. I would be a radical of radicals, screaming injustice from the rooftop until someone decided to shut me up, probably with a bullet. Where in the world are we going? What will it take to set things right in our country?

I let the OJG's run me off because I was offended by their racism. I can understand that. But what I missed was that I was enraged without understanding that their racism was also being directed at me; get it?

Getting back to what needs to be done. Jamal, Hargrove, and Trille are wonderful on the threads. I can send a zing in every once in awhile, but don't have the temperament to deal with the hate on a regular basis. Jamal and Hargrove are so gifted and have extraordinary intelligence. I'm not in their league [*Editor's note: HA!*], but I have contributions to make. Maybe

Chapter 7: PEOPLE LIKE JAMAL

on the threads, certainly in understanding the people I suspect were involved in the framing of OJ.

I need to get you to forward me a new copy of the MFG scenario. Can you do it? I can save it to disc. I've looked everywhere in my files for them. I also will buy his book. I am convinced a lot of the gaps will be filled in; his ego will demand it [*Editor's note: She was absolutely correct. See Chapter 29: Fuhrman at the Movies*].

By the way, were you aware of the statements he made about the dark clothes and the bloody fingerprint?

Sorry if I let anybody down.... —Hhhana

Subj: Where does it start

Date: 97-02-09 12:55:04 EST

From: Trille

To: Hhhana

CC: Trooper173@aol.com

Hi Paula, I am right with you. I, too, am living the black experience and it is awful. I couldn't stand it for any length of time. I, too, would be killed for being outspoken. But don't Lion and Tiger and all the rest realize we are white, and we are asking questions and having doubts about the legal system BECAUSE WE CARE, BECAUSE WE AREN'T BLIND, BECAUSE WE READ, BECAUSE WE INVESTIGATE.

I can't believe the OJG's actually read the transcripts because it was so clear to me that I figured anyone who read them, would KNOW THE TRUTH. So now I am left with, didn't they really read the whole thing, or are their brains fundamentally different? If that's so, it really is scary, because those "kinds" are all over, they are on juries, they are cops, they are judges, they are politicians, they are the mob, and THEY RULE.

Something must be done. We have got to speak out on every occasion where we see injustice and not keep silent because

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

we don't want to make a fuss or look different or weird or antagonize anyone. We have no choice! —Trille