

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

“THE FIRST STEP IN SOLVING A PROBLEM IS IDENTIFYING IT.” —U.S. Army study guide for leadership, 1965

Throughout the Vietnam War, the American Armed Forces never lost one significant battle. Yet, the frequently defeated North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and Viet Cong (VC) are often said by Geraldo Rivera and other opinion leaders of the time—who now proclaim OJ’s guilt—to have “defeated the American Army.” Some say we were beaten at home with relentless, award-winning repetition of the idea that we could not win. The object of all wars is to convince the enemy that “resistance is futile.” Whichever side is first to believe it, loses. The side left in charge wins. To the extent that North America saw the men who fought in U.S. uniforms (that includes 5,000 Canadians) demonized by our mass media as racist mass murderers, resistance was, indeed, futile.

My first book was dedicated to Dennis Hammond, a friend who was killed in captivity by the VC after they forced him to beg for the privilege of “coming home.” That’s why a bumper sticker on my car says, “POW/ MIA, YOU ARE NOT FORGOTTEN,” and, “BOYCOTT JANE FONDA, AMERICAN TRAITOR BITCH.” You remember how Geraldo’s war buddy, Jane, posed with NVA guns and said of U.S. bomber pilots, “I wish I had one of those murderers in my sights!” Dennis was listed, at the time, as MIA because the Viet Cong would not list him as a prisoner. I followed every televised second of Jane’s visits with POW’s in 1992, hoping for a glimpse of him alive and well. Not even his body came home. The only people who gave a shit were his family, his friends and the helpless villagers he extended his tour of duty with the Marines to protect from the VC, the real mass murderers. Nobody who mattered gave a shit about them, either.

To say that I care about the image of Vietnam War vets is a colossal understatement. David Riley, another childhood friend who joined the Marines, died in action. I also lost good and honorable friends whom I

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

soldiered with in the Army. If anyone thinks I want a racist ex-Marine to be the murderer of Ron Goldman and Nicole Brown Simpson, they don't know me. The last person I want found guilty of those crimes is a fellow Vietnam vet—unless he did it.

This is where Dable's letter about the cheerful POW and his "Attitude" tape kicked off the chain of events leading to Judge's call for Trille to apologize to Tiger. No one asked to see Trille's offending words in context that she offered to show all of us. For those of us who'd witnessed Tiger's knack for rearranging such words to serve her ends, there was no need. For those of us who saw no justification for the use of such words under any circumstances, there was no excuse. To learn the truth, one had to grant the possibility that Trille might be as smart as we were—a proposition that no Judge, no Tiger, no Lion, no Bear and no Bull I'd ever met would seriously consider. Thus, it was preordained that nothing would change. Was there a lesson in this? I thought so.

Subj: Bad words/Context/Hidden handicap

Date: 02:55 AM 2/14/97

From: Trooper

To: Trille

CC: Hhhana, Crow

Right on again, Christine—But I'm afraid few people will hear you. Haven't you noticed how selective people are in what they "hear" us saying. Sometimes it takes no more than a word to send them off and running in a whole new direction. What about context, you say? What about it? I have yet to have that stop people from showing me all kinds of "outrageous" things other people have written when the context makes it clear that they are saying something altogether different.

Context is something most people fill in for themselves when they scan a page and see something that jerks their chain. They make a judgment right there—a judgment about your character and your motives. They slap a label on you, an old familiar one they know all about. They are no longer talking

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

about what you said. They are talking about what they think you meant by what you said and why they think you said it. No matter how many times they go over it or how hard they look to see your point of view, they will continue to see the same thing—only now with more conviction because of the sincere effort they put into trying to be fair. That is the power of prejudice and all of us are subject to it.

I don't know how to get through that barrier. I've been trying since I figured out what was happening to my "best stuff" for the last 20 years. A lot of people never see it—especially those with very high IQ's who haven't stopped to think that yours might be higher. Christine, you don't know how smart you are and how tough it is for people who aren't on your level to see what you're talking about. Paula, Crowe and a few others we know are every bit as smart as you are so it's not a problem for them. I think I can look you in the eye most of the time. But when I look up, I see better. I hate to be the one to break the bad news, but you may have a serious hidden handicap. Christine, I think you're a genius.

Glad you're on my side. —Jasper

Subj: Re: Bad words/Context/Hidden handicap
Date: 97-02-14 12:09:50 EST
From: Kitty (Kim MacAuley)
To: Trooper173

Jasper— Count me in, too. I don't know exactly what you were writing about (if I'm prying I'm sorry). Selective hearing is, in my opinion, one of the biggest problems in the world and society as a whole. I mean, just look at the Simpson case! I try to be open-minded and hear the whole conversation. Not just what I think I want to hear.

Thanks for your knowledge. Hope to talk to you again. —Kim

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Kim had two sign-off lines that always stayed with me after I'd finished her letters. "Those who choose security over freedom, deserve neither freedom nor security," was the one she used for her "Selective Listening" letter. I don't know why she chose it, but it describes to me the hidden forces at work in the O.J. Simpson case, with the tide of popular opinion in favor of a lawless justice system swamping the sand castles of freedom. I had a long way to go before I could be as certain of O.J.'s innocence as were Trille and Hargrove, who had worked out the timeline that cleared him. That was a separate issue from his Constitutional rights to be free and secure in his own home before there was reasonable cause for police to enter his property and do what was done to produce evidence of guilt. From then on, "selective listening" was all the real killer needed to make a badly flawed frame-up stick, if he was as good at planting false ideas as he was in planting other false evidence. All the killer had to know to insure that he would get that selective ear, were a few basics about history, psychology, personality types and the nature of prejudice.

Subj: Lies

Date: 97-02-14 15:24:22 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Judge, Pat, Trooper173, Trille

CC: Connie, Dable, Bear, Bull, Rabne, Tiger, Matlock

Hi Judge— ...I always enjoy reading your messages, but was wondering where you fall in the Simpson saga. Do you think he did it?

I got hung up and defensive with the media's immediate reaction. Everybody was just so quick to condemn him. Then the violation of his property added insult to injury when I listened to the police testimony, and, of course, all of the media experts again either saying it was justified or that it was wrong, but the judge not suppressing the evidence. If it's wrong, it's wrong. Suppress the evidence.

I think the thing that amazes me most about the law is that it can be used in so many ways that it seems it wasn't intended to be used. The law says you can't go over mine or OJ's wall without a search warrant, but they did. Allowing it

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

can't make it right. The law says for testimony to come before a jury, the person who said it or saw it has to be the one to bring it in, or you can't get it in. Now, I can go to Los Angeles and tell a prosecutor I saw Nicole in a store and she was crying—told me OJ was going to kill her. I can say it; doesn't make it true. Can't come in.... UH-OH, comes in because it shows her state of mind? How can it show her state of mind if I'm lying?

Seems like all I can say to the police or prosecutors is that I saw Nicole crying in the store. I'd still be lying, but it wouldn't put the big lie in front of the jurors.

I'll stop here for now, my modem has been shutting down today because of the weather. This can be part one. —Paula

Before we move on, I must remind you of Matlock, the mild-mannered lawyer who found my use of the r-word so repugnant that he excoriated me and demanded that I remove his name from my mailing list. The number of people in the country who felt the way he did made a real murder investigation of Mark Fuhrman impossible. The instant race was mentioned as a possible factor in the murders, the police investigation or the news reports, the person who attempted to make it an issue became the subject of the same hostility I received from Matlock. Matlock, who didn't know the whole story and didn't want to, never got the letter from Judge admitting that he thought my charges of racism against Lion might be true. There were enough "Judges" around—especially on legal talk shows like "Geraldo" to maintain the status quo. Selective hearing had taken hold and the statistical advantage was with those who chose not to hear a meaningful word about Euro-American racism in the case of "The People v. O.J. Simpson."

It was fine for O.J.'s defenders to accuse a white cop of planting evidence. But to say that he may have planted the rare, size 12 shoeprints after killing two beautiful white people in military style, was a non-starter for most folks. Indeed, Fuhrman's military records, which might have shown his aptitude and experience in taking human lives the way Ron and Nicole's

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

lives were taken, was sealed by Judge Ito. We know about Fuhrman's attitude on that score only because the ruling of the North Carolina judge who heard the defense request for the McKinny's tapes was overturned on appeal. Most tellingly, no one out to make a buck would have been crazy enough to publish a book entitled, *Iago in Brentwood: How Mark Fuhrman Got Away With Murder*. Even those who believed the r-word applied to him, were angered by the suggestion that it could mean something. To raise the level of relevance to that of a motive for murder was to raise their level of angry rejection.

For Judge, the last-minute photo evidence in the civil case of O.J. wearing the shoes that left the bloody shoeprints, and the identification of the blood-drops next to them, was enough to tell him that the civil jury made a wise decision. Fuhrman didn't have to lie about making those shoeprints because nobody asked. No one even bothered to check his shoe size. O.J.'s criminal defense team, pursuing a multi-pronged strategy to create reasonable doubt, made no attempt to crack Fuhrman's alibi. Unlike O.J., Fuhrman was not required to testify in the civil trial. Instead, Fuhrman's theories, and everything else useful to the plaintiffs that he said about his discoveries at Bundy and Rockingham, went straight into evidence in the civil trial without attribution—as if God Almighty had done the detective's work.

With all of that coming after Fuhrman was permitted to take the Fifth because of his perjured testimony in O.J.'s first trial, why wouldn't hearsay or other tainted evidence be allowed in the second? The "search for truth" was over. It started with rare shoeprints and Fuhrman's theory that the killer was bleeding from his left hand. It ended with the tainted "discovery" of a bloody glove and a cut on O.J.'s finger. As Hhhana observes in her letter to Matlock, who apparently didn't get her message to Judge, you have to start with the basics....

Subj: Re your response

Date: 97-02-14 19:38:22 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Matlock

CC: Chameleon, Connie, Dable, Judge, Bear, Petlady, Bull,

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

Pat, Rabne, Tiger, Trille, Trooper

Hi Matlock— Thanks for the reply. Actually, I was referring to the criminal case. Kind of trying to take it back to basics as far as the law is concerned. Therefore, the suppression hearing would have to be vital to the case. As far as hearsay is concerned, my questions are more philosophical, I think. If someone can go into court and say I told them Joe said he was going to kill me and I'm dead, I may not have really said it. State of mind doesn't matter if the person who is saying it is not truthful. Or I could say to someone, "Joe's going to kill me when he sees the credit card bill." Not only might it be untrue, it also may not have shown a true state of mind.

I know the law allows it; I can see the dying declaration exception. But to be truthful, the rest can be powerful testimony that means absolutely nothing (I've decided to be much more careful when talking about Joe and the credit card bills.) How much of the law gets changed in order to allow something in a particular case? And then, doesn't it set a precedent that will apply to all similar cases? The protections built in the law for us seem to be stripped away one case at a time. How much more can we afford to give up? — Paula

Subj: Re: your stand on OJ

Date: 97-02-15 19:21:55 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Judge, Matlock

CC: Pat, Rabne, Tiger, Trille, Trooper

Hi Greg— ...I just got in from work and have been enjoying yours and Matlock's mail. I can respect your opinion regarding guilt or innocence. Until I went on the net, I couldn't find anybody other than my husband who would agree with me that he is innocent (he probably doesn't have much choice). I know the things we see and the experiences we have, help to determine the way we look at things, and I

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

actually look to my husband Joe for one and my first husband for the other.

Joe grew up with a burning desire to be a police officer. It was his only goal. Well, he did it. Was a police officer for several years. Didn't take long to discourage him and then to completely destroy everything he thought it stood for. He saw a lot of people hurt; lots of evidence enhanced or just plain manufactured. He never lied in court but a lot of the others did. He didn't last 4 years. Sad. He's a good man and was a good officer.

...I think there may be even more problems with the jury. Two jurors were on the "Today Weekend" show this morning. One of them was asked if she realized when she was selected for the jury that she would face so much media curiosity after the trial. I swear, she grinned and said, "I knew it. In fact I knew the first day we were sworn in that I would have to face the public and explain why I found him responsible." Think she was open-minded?

They knew what they were there to do. It was all about righting the wrong of the verdict in the criminal trial. The brouhaha is just starting. After watching the criminal trial, I wouldn't even visit California. You might go out there and never come back.

I have a pretty good understanding of the evidence in the first trial. The shoes in the civil trial bother me, but I think they were presented so late the defense didn't have enough time to even look at them, so I've decided I'll put them on the back burner for now. I'm interested in the original question regarding the evidence from Rockingham that was collected after the officers went over the wall. If they had no right to go onto the property, the evidence should have been suppressed. How is it that all this stuff is allowed?

I know the reasons they gave; also know nobody believed them. They went there to get OJ Simpson. Judge Ito said one

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

of the most confusing and interesting things I've ever heard when the testimony was given regarding Vannatter's statements to other people that they didn't go there to save lives; OJ was a suspect, the husband's always a suspect. Again Uelmen made a motion to suppress the evidence. Judge Ito said it didn't matter what they thought or why they went over. As long as a reasonable person could have had an idea there was an emergency situation, whether the officers believed it or not didn't matter. And Ito said he believed a reasonable person could think there was an emergency.

What in the world kind of ruling is that?

What about the DA going to Thano Peratis' home with the video camera to have him change his story? How do they get away with that? Was it strictly OJ stuff or can prosecutors really act like that?

Enough for now. Have a great evening. Interested in any thoughts. —Paula

Subj: Re: your stand on OJ
Date: 97-02-15 19:36:54 EST
From: Pat
To: Judge, Matlock, Hhhana
CC: Rabne, Trille, Trooper

Paula— Hope you had a good day. I find it hard to believe that Ito let in all the evidence at Rockingham. I can't see how anyone could think they had a good reason to go over the wall when all they supposedly saw was a blood spot, the size of a match head, found by none other than our good friend MF, who also found all the other damning evidence at Rockingham. As far as the DA going to Peratis' house, if I had been in the DA's office I would have been ashamed of using such evidence in a court of law. I imagine the disbelief of the jury over this evidence was probably one of the reasons for the acquittal.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Have you seen some of the civil jury interviews? My goodness, the people who said the first jury was dumb hadn't seen this bunch. I'm not for jury bashing, but this bunch had their minds made up before they ever saw the inside of a courtroom. —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re Good for me?

Date: 97-02-19 09:34:41 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper

Jasper— Good for me? I went back and read my message to you and I guess I'm confused. But I take it you are agreeing with the entire message? This will probably be long, so I hope you have time to read. I need some emotional strength. Set [dinner date] up for an early hour to get me home in time to see MF. Don't know why, but I could not sleep. Went to bed after midnight, got up at 4:45. I think I'm getting confused with all of the stuff pouring in over my computer. I've almost made up my mind to trash all of my mail unless it's from you, Trille or Pat.

The OJG's and the OJU's have caused me to lose my focus. With all of the wrangling back and forth, I've gotten diverted, thinking about things that are distressing to me. If it wouldn't make Joe crazy, I'd go back and watch videotapes of the trial today, but he says I know them by heart; no need to watch....

...I've decided this morning that I need to get back to basics. Two people slashed to death. OJ accused. Could he have done it? No! Get all this other junk out of my mind. It's insignificant banter, probably designed to do just what it's doing, divert and confuse. Am I wrong?

It's time for OJ to say something. Since the civil trial, we've heard from everybody who has an ax to grind. The families, all of their attorneys, all of the authors, it's time for OJ or

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

someone who represents him to speak up. Enough for now, I guess. —Paula

Subj: Mark Fuhrman
Date: 97-02-19 10:33:42 EST
From: Pat
To: Hhhana
CC: Trooper, Dable, Petlady

Hi Gang—Hope all is well. Don't forget tonight is the “Prime Time Live” show on MF (I laugh every time I type that) Also Friday night Geraldo's cable show on CNBC is with MF live. I guess the time for the appeal is just about up. I wonder what will happen? Too bad they didn't have a judge with a bit more guts. I think Fuji will do nothing and let them take it to an appellate court. I think he's the gutless wonder. All the crap about Baker deserting a sinking ship really gets to me. From what I have heard and read, it was decided a long time ago that, if there was an appeal, Baker would not handle it. What do you think? —Pat

Subj: MFG Scenarios
Date: 97-02-19 10:48:18 EST
From: Hhhana
To: Pat
CC: Trooper

Pat—Just left the CTV boards. Good to have them back up, but they are long and slow to get to. Posted a few messages, left quick. Has Talker dropped off? I hope not. When she/he posted “who was that cop” and faced the “claws of righteousness” I was hoping that it wouldn't chase him/her away.

Have you noticed the number of OJI's not there anymore? Chased away? It's a real shame. I've decided not to read any mail that would get me sidetracked in my thinking. This is

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

for you and Jasper, private, please. I think I remember a few days back that you asked about the Marcus Allen connection. I think it is one of the most interesting parts of the case, but has to be kept from OJG's because it could swing both ways. Allen could be considered either a suspect or a trigger for the killer.

I won't address him as a suspect yet, but as the trigger. If we are looking at the MFG theory, we know MF had a connection to Nicole. Again, remember in the criminal trial the defense was trying to get a couple of police officers to testify, one about comments regarding MF being "Nicole's personal cop," and the other for racial attitude. It was also submitted MF made comments about breast surgery Nicole had.

There would possibly be 2 types of connection. Drugs or sex. More likely sex. If we assume it until it can be proven, what is the trigger for rage in MF because it was a rage killing? A white woman with a black man. Marcus Allen is also the 3rd white Bronco, you know. OJ, AC, and Marcus all drive them. According to sources other than testimony, (Cora) I believe, Nicole was still seeing Marcus Allen, and I think it was said he dropped by her place before leaving on vacation on June 12, the day of the murder. If MF saw him, knew she was also seeing him, would that set him off? Oh yeah...

If he spoke with her, he would probably have known O.J. was in town for the recital and leaving for Chicago late that night. Everybody asks how would they know? That's how. This would also allow for there to have been only one glove at the Bundy scene. MF could have been the one rushing from Bundy to Rockingham. We know he can go over walls; he could have gone over the fence and hit the wall...thump..thump..thump..and dropped the glove under Kato's window. He didn't have to shower, hide the clothes, get rid of the knife....

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

When OJ came out for the limo, MF could have been on the Rockingham property. Jasper, this scenario takes away the need for MF to manipulate his way into the case, although I still believe he knew he would be called when the bodies were discovered. After hitting the air conditioner, he may have had to change his plans. He may have intended to hide all of the murder evidence at O.J.'s. He could have slim-jimmed the Bronco after OJ left for the airport, swiped blood around from the clothing he was wearing, relocked it, then left to dispose of the evidence, change, and wait for the call from Phillips. Rough, but have been thinking about it for a while. —Hhhana

Subj: MFG Scenarios

Date: 97-02-19 21:54:09 EST

From: Pat

To: Hhhana

CC: Trille, Trooper

Paula just wanted you to know I got this. Will think about it and post a reply. —Pat

Subj: Keep on writing, boys!

Date: 97-02-19 21:54:09 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Pat, Trille, Trooper

CC: Connie, Judge, Petlady, Rabne

Pat— Thanks for the article on the feud... I loved it. Let them keep writing. It's amazing, now they're calling each other liars. Doesn't it make you sick that all of the country bashed the jury? Look at who they listened to, lying cops, experts that have been demoted. Lying in the beginning, lying in the end. Sound familiar? I'm waiting for the glove man to write a book. I'm getting ready to tape MF on "Prime Time Live." Talk to all of you tomorrow. —Paula

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Unimpressed

Date: Thursday, February 20, 1997 2:28 AM

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper, Trille, Patricia Whetham

Hey guys— Pretty unimpressive, huh? I know they think they are scoring more points against OJ and I know the OJG's will be worshipping MF the same way they worship Lange, Vannatter, Clark, Darden, the Goldmans, and the Browns. Didn't really learn anything new except the stuff about Roberts being there. He had formerly been Fuhrman's partner. The stuff about the washing machine is old. Arnelle's clothes. The police did look at them, I believe, but am not sure. I know there was a bra and panties in there also. (Part of the disguise, I guess). If there had been blood in the housekeeper's room, the cops, even as bad as they were, would have found it. Also, the back gate wasn't brass, it was painted metal. It might have held a bloody fingerprint, but it wouldn't have been easy to spot like the shiny brass MF describes. Also the brass wouldn't have held the fingerprint.

He can try to rehab himself all he wants, but he can't do it. The tapes only validated the personal testimony of K Bell, N Singer, and R Hodge. That had nothing to do with a screenplay. It was real life, up close and personal. —Hhhana

Subj: Re: Unimpressed

Date: 97-02-19 23:46:06 EST

From: Pat

To: Hhhana, Trooper, Trille,

Hhhana— I haven't watched "Prime Time" yet. I taped it so will watch it later. —Pat

Subj: Re: Unimpressed

Date: 97-02-20

From: Trooper

Chapter 13: OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

To: Hhhana

CC: Petlady, Connie, Pat, Dable, Trille, Chameleon

Paula— I learned something new.

I learned about Brad Roberts. I'd like to learn more. Who is he? Why wasn't he called to testify? What is his relationship to Fuhrman outside of his police duties? How long have they known each other? What does he have to say about MF's interview of Rosa Lopez (remember the man she said waited for him in the car)? How is it that he never heard MF talk the way he did on the tapes when Kathleen Bell, Natalie Singer and Roderic Hodge did?

How about it? —Jasper

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD