

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

“YOU CAN FOOL ALL OF THE PEOPLE SOME OF THE TIME AND SOME OF THE PEOPLE ALL OF THE TIME, BUT YOU CAN’T FOOL ALL OF THE PEOPLE ALL OF THE TIME.” —Abraham Lincoln, famous dead President

When I look back at some of the things I thought were true only because they were repeated so often by so many people, I cringe. The murder weapon? Cobwebs beyond the air conditioner? Time for the killer to get back to Rockingham and make the 3 thumps? Blood trail going into the Rockingham gate? O.J. the wife-beater? O.J. the stalker? O.J. the liar? O.J.’s blood on Bundy? Fuhrman’s alibi? Where did these ideas come from? Where did they really come from?

Subj: Re: Unimpressed

Date: 97-02-19 23:52:44 EST

From: Christine (Trille)

To: Hhhana, Trooper, Pat

CC: Judge, Pat, Peggy, Connie

Hhhana— Hi guys. Everybody used to say how good-looking Fuhrman is, but has anyone noticed he looks like a rat, his nose is pointed rat-like, and his face juts out with a rat-like snout! Anyway, JUST WHAT IS THE POINT OF THE SERRATED KNIFE, AND IF IT TRUE THAT A SWISS ARMY KNIFE WAS USED, DOESN’T THAT MEAN IT WOULD TAKE EVEN LONGER TO MAKE ALL THOSE WOUNDS, JUST IMAGINE. I AM SURE WE HAVE ALL USED THOSE KIND OF KNIVES, AND YOU KNOW HOW HARD IT IS TO GET THE DIFFERENT PARTS OUT; YOU BREAK YOUR NAILS TRYING TO GET THE CAN OPENER PART OUT. JUST THINK, TRYING TO GET THE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE KNIFE OUT BECAUSE YOU CAN’T USE THEM TOGETHER.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

JUST IMAGINE IT, YOU HAVE TO USE ONE AT A TIME. YOU HAVE FIRST, THE ONE KNIFE THAT IS NOT SERRATED, AND THEN YOU HAVE TO GET THE OTHER ONE OUT. THEY CAN'T BOTH BE OUT, BECAUSE THEY WOULD OBSTRUCT EACH OTHER. AND ALL THIS IS DONE IN 15 SECONDS!

Trooper is right about one thing, though, the hunting knife business and being able to use both ends. I rather thought this statement of Fuhrman WASN'T TOO GREAT FOR HIMSELF. I think if I were Fuhrman, I would not bring up kinds of hunting knives and the different kinds of blades, but you know, criminals will always confess something about the crime. Unwittingly, they will let something out.

Also, that whole thing about the knife boxes. That is either a direct lie, which can be proven by showing the Ford video, or irrelevant. Uelmen disposed of the whole knife box and knife incident. It was in his medicine cabinet and never used. It was in the yellow envelope, and another judge, not Ito, was involved in getting it into custody—another red herring. People like Fuhrman and Dumb and Dumber think we don't know anything about the case. Of course, most people don't, and they know they will never have to confront someone like us, so they are willing to lie outright.

Paula, doesn't it seem peculiar that there would only be 1 (one) fingerprint at this very bloody scene. We already know about the washing machine and Arnelle's clothes, and the video shown on TV of a washing machine. There is no proof that it is THE WASHING MACHINE AT ROCKINGHAM, LIKE THE FOOD LION CASE, THESE PEOPLE ARE WILLING TO LIE AND USE DECEPTION.

As far as not testifying after the tapes, is Fuhrman living on this planet? THE WHOLE WORLD SAW HIM TAKE THE FIFTH. Fuhrman acts like he had no contact with the prosecution. Lies. Darden had been told by Fuhrman about

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

an affair between him and the McKinny woman, I don't know if it's true they had an affair, but they are willing to lie to make her look bad. The whole thing reminds me of magic tricks. All the emphasis on the serrated knife, magic trick of rabbit being pulled out of hat, BUT IT IS A DIFFERENT RABBIT THAT JUST LOOKS THE SAME. HOOKEY POOKEY, HUMBUG! —Trille

Subj: Re: Unimpressed

Date: 97-02-20

From: Christine (Trille)

To: Hhhana, Trooper, Pat

CC: Judge, Pat, Peggy, Connie

Hi guys, in one of the better books on the OJ case, someone, I believe it must be the Freed book, that Fuhrman's partner, heretofore unknown, WAS ALL IMPORTANT. I FORGET WHY, BUT I WILL LOOK IT UP. Certainly he would know about MF's racism. Don't forget, Roberts, the partner, WAS NOT UNDER OATH ON THE SHOW, THEY CAN SAY AND DO ANYTHING.

If you can get to it, the hearing on James Earl Ray is on Court TV, AND THE MAJOR FIREARMS EXPERT, HATHAWAY, IS ANOTHER ONE OF DR. LEE'S CO-WORKERS. This idea that Dr. Lee and Scheck are discredited is not universally shared, and certainly not by fellow experts. I do believe Dr. Lee left working for the FBI lab for an unexplained reason. Now it makes sense, knowing the state of FBI labs and shoddy work. Dr. Lee would not say anything against the FBI, but would stop working with them. It all makes sense.

EVERYBODY, TRY TO IMAGINE USING THIS SWISS ARMY KNIFE WITH AT LEAST TWO BLADES, ONE SERRATED, AND PRETEND YOU ARE STABBING TWO PEOPLE. YOU CAN ONLY USE ONE BLADE OF THE KNIFE AT A TIME. YOU HAVE TO PUT AWAY

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

OR PUSH TO ONE SIDE THE KNIFE YOU ARE NOT USING, OTHERWISE YOU WOULD HAVE TWO BLADES AT ONCE AND THE WOUNDS WOULD INDICATE THERE WERE DOUBLE WOUNDS, BY TWO DIFFERENT BLADES. BUT AGAIN, PRETEND THAT YOU ARE STABBING TWO DIFFERENT PEOPLE WITH TWO DIFFERENT BLADES AND YOU HAVE 1 MINUTE TO MAKE 60 TO 70 CUTS ALTOGETHER. DOES ANYONE REALLY BELIEVE THIS? COME ON GUYS!! —Trille

Subj: Re: Brainwashing—media blitz

Date: 97-02-20 12:56:41 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Christine (Trille)

CC: Trooper, Pat

Hey gang— Is the media once again practicing “mind control” on the unsuspecting American public? Ask yourselves this question....has there been one day since the civil trial without you hearing the name OJ Simpson over and over in a negative context? No, there hasn't. We've heard about OJ the killer from the families, the attorneys, the detectives, the pundits, the women's groups and now the racist Mark Fuhrman.

Has there been any positive media concerning OJ? The only thing I've seen is the one interview with F. Lee Bailey on “Larry King.” Do you think it's an intentional act on the part of the media? Where are OJ's attorneys, family, friends? Do you think none of them are willing to talk? Where is OJ? Do you think he doesn't have something to say? Unless it's to make a confession, we'll probably not see anything.

The media is going after our minds and our ability to reason, but we have to be mindful of this. In order for all of this to be true: OJ had to make a conscious decision to go to Nicole's to kill her. He had to put on gloves that were too small, a knit hat, and arm himself with a knife. He had to

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

slash Nicole's throat to the point of nicking her spinal column. He had to stab Ron Goldman over 30 times without a sound being made. He also had to leave them there, outside the house where his children were sleeping. He had to rush back to Rockingham without being seen or heard, get to the back side of the house to hit the wall, drop the glove, get inside to shower, change, and be in the limo in, what? 11 minutes?

Now we are also asked to believe he took the time to strip off his bloody clothes and throw them in the washing machine and wash them. I guess he also wore the panties and bra that were in the washer with the small dark clothes. Makes sense; if he wore little gloves, he would certainly have worn his daughter's clothes.

We have to keep taking ourselves back to these facts and ask, could he have done all of this? HELL NO! —Paula

Subj: Private first

Date: 97-02-20 13:22:49 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper

Hi Jasper— ...Will include Trille and Dianne in my messages unless I have to put in an insult about the OJG's.... When Tiger wrote that poison letter, dripping venom, after you wrote to Judge with a mild warning about them, I was furious. Her attack against you triggered an emotion in me as bad as the one they always display (hatred).

I know and recognize (Trille may not) that they are smart and the rage they attempt to instill in us has nothing to do with the discussion group. It is aimed at keeping us from debating with each other scenarios that might shed some light on the murders. I believe they recognize the danger we pose against the conspiracy they must deny. Tiger would have had others believe her letter was to goad you into returning to the

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

CTV boards, but you and I know different. She wanted to insure that you would not.

Trille is intelligent and brings with her the ability to reason and put forth thoughts and ideas that carry great merit. They have almost neutralized her by goading and insult. I won't let it happen to me because I want to continue to post with other OJI's. —Paula

Subj: Re: Unimpressed

Date: 97-02-20 15:13:08 EST

From: Trooper

To: Christine (Trille)

CC: Chameleon, Kim, GC, Hhhana, Pat, Peggy, Dable

Christine— Fuhrman had to come up with something on the knife to cover not only what he and his partner may have set up to be discovered, but to draw attention away from what he said about being a hunter the last time he was interviewed on television. For all we know, Fuhrman reads the treads. He could be hiding behind the name of a woman or pretending to be an OJI. He may know that someone is on to him.

If you taped the interview, take another look at the knife on the table. Take a look at both ends of it and think about the bruise on Nicole's head. If we could get anybody to dig into that, we'd be half-way home. The Swiss Army knife is a smart move. If an "expert" OJG like Warner Spitz can buy it, just think what Lion, Tiger and Bear will do with it? If they buy it, their minions will surely follow. To paraphrase a rat-faced ex-cop with the most fitting initials I know, the knife is everything... —Jasper (Trooper1)

Subj: Nancy Grace

Date: 97-02-20

From: Christine (Trille)

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

To: Trooper

CC: Chameleon, Kim, GC, Hhhana, Pat, Peggy, Dable

Jasper— HI GUYS, COURT TV'S NANCY GRACE WAS ON THE PAROLE BOARD THAT DENIED JAMES EARL RAY PAROLE. WHY? WHAT DOES SHE KNOW? SHE KEPT INSISTING THAT RAY WILLINGLY CONFESSED, WHEN, IN FACT, ACCORDING TO JOSEPH LOWERY, HE WAS TORTURED INTO CONFESSING. WE KNOW RAY WAS NOT CAPABLE FOR ESCAPING TO EUROPE, OF GETTING A FALSE PASSPORT, GETTING THAT KIND OF MONEY. IT STINKS TO HIGH HEAVEN, BUT WHY IS NANCY GRACE INVOLVED?
—Trille

Subj: The Knife

Date: 97-02-21 16:30:01 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper, Pat (Crowe) Trille

CC: Peggy, Dable, Connie

Jasper— ...I did see the knife. I don't know why it was laying there. They never touched it during the interview. You are right, you know. For a shorter blade to have been jammed into soft tissue there would have been immediate bruising. Dr. Werner Spitz was also incorrect about the chest wound, I think. I'm not a doc of anything but it bears checking out. In order for a 3 inch knife to make a 5+ inch wound in the chest, the depth of the wound would have to be measured with the chest extended (lungs full of air) The measurement would have been done during the autopsy. After death the lungs are deflated. The wound that measures 5+ in the chest area had to be made by a blade at least 5+ inches.

Here's a thought Joe and I had this morning. (it expands the conspiracy theory I'm afraid) With all the talk about the fingerprint on the gate, the one MF put in his notes. Vannatter and Lange said this morning on "Today" that they had 4

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

print specialists at Bundy and they worked both of the gates. If we can believe that, they would have certainly checked the open/close mechanism. What if they collected it and it didn't belong to OJ so the boys got rid of it? I just have to say when these OJG's start talking about this big conspiracy, I think it's big. Who lied? Fuhrman, Vannatter, Lange, Phillips, the FBI, the nurse Peratis. It wasn't about a bunch of people out to get OJ. It turned into saying and doing whatever it took to win the case. These people work for the government. They wanted to win bad; they lied. Why not check out the print? It doesn't match; trash it. —Hhhana

Subj: Re: The Knife/Oops

Date: 97-02-21 14:15:44 EST

From: Kim

To: Trooper

Wouldn't it also take a little bit longer to hack two people to death with a pocket knife? Wouldn't OJ have a bit more blood on him given there was a shorter blade (according to Fuhrman)? And, ya really gotta wonder, if there even was a fingerprint, whose was it?

Subj: Re: The Knife/Oops

Date: 97-02-21 11:21:05EST

From: Trooper

To: Trille

Christine— I sent the other note off accidentally. It wasn't finished. Please don't copy it. If you wish to copy this one, fine. What have you found out about Roberts? I'm dying to hear from you. Also, I'm having trouble sending to Crowe for some reason. Got any ideas about that? Nobody has commented about the hunting knife on the table in Dianne Sawyer's interview with Mark Fuhrman. What's going on? Didn't anybody else see it? Didn't anybody else tape it so they can go back and look? Isn't anybody wondering what Nicole

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

was hit in the head with if he used a wimpy 3 ½” Swiss Army knife to do the slashing—never mind the two different blades? Isn’t anybody wondering how so many of the cuts went through clothes and skin all the way to the full length of the blade without leaving bruises where the handle or the hand had to have made violent contact with the bodies?

[Editor’s note: I got the shock of my life when I read the autopsy report for myself and saw that there were bruises that backed up the Swiss Army knife theory. Then I saw that one wound had to have been made with a blade longer than 6” and realized that two knives must have been used.]

What did Spitz have to say about that? What did he have to say about all the DIAGONAL CUTS (you can’t make a 3” cut with a 3” knife unless the blade is perpendicular to the surface). To produce as many 3” to 3 ½” in cuts as there were on both bodies, you have to have at least a 6” blade—never mind the 5 ½” thrusting wound or its width which is consistent with a hunting knife *[Editor’s note: Wrong. The knife produced by the prosecution, though advertised as a hunting knife, had a blade very close in width to that of a Swiss Army knife]*. To produce the kind of bruise that Nicole had on her head you need a knife with a hammer-like heel—like the one on the table they didn’t talk about. You don’t have to be a forensic scientist to understand how Lakshmanan, Baden and Lee came up with the same kind of knife; they used the same kind of geometry for the blade and the same reasoning and experience for the heel. But if the killer did take the trouble to mark RG’s body with the blade of a Swiss Army knife, that tells me even more about killer, his familiarity with forensic science and the reason for the killings.

We can’t let the man who may have committed the murders get away with dictating what evidence should be paid attention to and what evidence should be ignored. We can’t let a rat-faced MF come off looking like a hero. We can’t let there be any confusion about the knife. That’s all MF needs, confusion. A debate will only help him get what he wants.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

What we need is proof. If we find that a hunting knife or something like it was indeed the weapon and there are indeed marks of a Swiss Army knife on one of the bodies, I'd say we have a strong circumstantial case for murder against Mark Fuhrman. And what of Brad Roberts? He vouched for Fuhrman. Who has vouched for him? —Jasper (Trooper1)

Subj: Re: my e-mail again
Date: 97-02-21
From: Hhhana
To: Pat
CC: Trooper, Dable, Peggy

Now I know it's Friday night, but everybody can't be out on the town. Wanted to send the Friday night MF schedule for tonight. 8pm MSNBC Internight with Jack Ford 9pm CNBC Rivera Live. Watch and tape. We need to see if he makes any errors. —Paula

Subj: Re: my e-mail again
Date: 97-02-21 18:41:02 EST
From: Christine (Trille)
To: Hhhana
CC: Trooper, Pat (Crowe) Dable, Peggy

Hi guys— Trooper said that no one had mentioned the knife on the Dianne Sawyer show, but I made the remarks about the “difficulty” of using a knife with several blades, one regular and one serrated.

Well, anyway, I had told Trooper about an article in the Enquirer about MF's book wherein he describes the murder scene like HE WAS ACTUALLY THERE, AND IF HE IS THE GUILTY ONE, THAT EXPLAINS THE STRANGE WAY HE DESCRIBES HOW THE MURDERS OCCURRED. However, in his scenario how does Ron get inside the gate? It has a lock that broke during the earthquake and

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

someone had to go out and open it manually. So Ron couldn't have come in and be surprised that Nicole was knocked down or injured yet, because she is the one who let him in. Unless the killer let him in, and would Ron go inside if it wasn't Nicole opening the gate?

Of course I noticed the knife on the table, Trooper, I just haven't rerun the show that I did record, and you all know that these people that have these crap shows use props to make a point, like the FOOD LION INCIDENT. The knife on the table was only for effect.

As far as a short-bladed knife cutting a swath deeper than the blade, I think it is possible, but not in this kind of struggle with strong victims, Ron would not have "soft tissue" where the knife could easily go in, Ron was in good shape and probably prided himself on having "hard abs." I can hardly stand to watch these shows, and I actually hate Larry King, Dianne Sawyer, Oprah, Jack Ford, etc. I hate these people more than I hate MF. People's expressions don't necessarily show when they lie, but like someone here pointed out, when Vannatter lies, his face gets a cow-like expression, and Fuhrman looks intense, but each person is different, and I guess it depends on the lie and the circumstances. That whole knife box on the bathtub makes no sense, OJ is neat and orderly, and WHY WOULD HE HAVE BOXES ON THE BATHTUB. As far as OJ supposedly WASHING BLOODY CLOTHES AFTER THE KILLING AND BEFORE LEAVING FOR CHICAGO, doesn't pass the smell test. O.J. didn't even have time for the murders let alone to do laundry.

We know what clothes there were in the machine, and the picture showed on TV DOESN'T HAVE TO BE THE ROCKINGHAM WASHING MACHINE. Why would the cops take photos of the washing machine with laundry in it and not investigate the laundry, these people took the plumbing apart. Also O.J. didn't have any time from the

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

time he left LA for Chicago until he came back from the police station, and then, he had to spend some time in his office while the police were doing their stuff at his house. OJ was never alone again in his house, and wasn't allowed in until that night, so any boxes, knives, laundry didn't come from OJ.

It is good that they are arguing among themselves. Did I understand that Dumb and Dumber are going to sue MF? That is great! —Trille

Subj: Re: The Knife

Date: 97-02-22 01:54:41 EST

From: Trooper

To: Kim

Kim— I had the same reaction you did. The saw-blade on the knife they showed appeared to be thick, like an actual saw blade, as opposed to keen-edged like some serrated butcher knives or hunting knives. If so, it would not have sliced through clothing; it would have ripped the cloth, which would have told everybody what kind of knife it was. There is no way the prosecution could have overlooked that. —Jasper

Subj: Re: The Knife

Date: 97-02-22

From: Kim

To: Trooper

I felt that in the civil trial the plaintiffs had almost an unfair advantage. Did you notice that everything changed? Even down to the time the murders were committed. In the criminal trial they actually had someone video tape the time it took to get from one place to the next, in the criminal trial it is "Oh no, no; it took only a few minutes." Kato changed, the murder weapon changed, the amount of struggle

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

changed. So are we to believe that the prosecution was wrong? Now is that all untrue? Was it a lie? Or is it the civil trial that was the lie? Hmmm... makes ya wonder if none of them really have their story straight. I believe in the latter of the choices.

The defense, on the other hand, was really shut down.

I do not believe that knife crap. The cut on his finger in the criminal trial was consistent with glass (the defense says). In the criminal trial the cut was consistent with a knife (the prosecution says). However, in the civil trial the cuts are consistent with a FINGER NAIL GOUGE? Come on guys make up your f*ckin' minds! If this were true, where are the samples from the deceased finger nails? Oh I forgot...they got misplaced along with the stomach contents.

Mark Fuhrman is an idiot. Even Tom Lange and his "faithful" sidekick thinks so. Hope to talk to you more—Kim

Subj: Re: The Knife / Oops
Date: 97-02-22 01:46:07 EST
From: Trooper
To: Kim

Yes, Kim— Yes, yes and yes. Why don't you share your thoughts with Hhhana (Paula), Whetham (Crowe) and Trille (Christine)? I'm sure they'd love to hear from you... —Jasper

Subj: Re: The Knife
Date: 97-02-22 01:54:41 EST
From: Kim
To: Trooper

Jasper— I used to write on the boardsbut the idiocy got to me. So I think I will stick to these new e-mail boards. I will enjoy speaking with you more about this. —Kim

Subj: The knife and the book
Date: 97-02-22 06:14:35 EST

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

From: Hhhana

To: Trooper

Jasper— It's 5:30. Read your message, have my coffee and I'm ready to write a bit. Where I got way off track before I met you guys was that I believed OJ was framed twice. (By the way, did friends call your dad OJ?) I knew the glove and the sock didn't work. I had gotten far enough on my own to know the killer or killers planted the glove at Rockingham before OJ left for the airport. I believe a lot more would have been planted had it not been for the thump, thump, thump giving them away.

I believed OJ was framed twice, once by the murderer and once by the police. The important connection I never made was that the murderer might have been a part of the police. You were the first one to point that out. The more I look at it, the more likely it seems.

I do think the most ridiculous thing I've seen is the claim of the murder knife being a small Swiss Army knife. The OJG's will jump right on it as being the truth, I'm sure. They can stretch anything to show his guilt, but will deny everything that might point toward innocence.

I want to know more about this chauffeur who they claim made the statements about OJ with the bag of knives. If they had him, they would have put him on the stand. Fuhrman claims the man passed a polygraph. If this were true, even though they did a terrible job, Marcia Clark and Chris Darden would have had him on the stand.

Did you get the message from Trille that was part of a book? I found it fascinating reading and would like to know who the author is. I don't know how much evidence the author was able to get to that we can't, but there might be some answers in it... —Paula

Subj: Re: Back to the knife

Date: 97-02-22 14:45:44 EST

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

From: Trooper

To: Christine (Trille)

CC: Hhhana, Pat (Crowe) Peggy, Dable, Chameleon

Christine— Believe me, I paid close attention to everything you said about the Swiss Army knife and I was, as always, impressed by your analysis of the situation. What you said about Fuhrman's description of the killing gave me the chills.

You are right, of course, about mentioning the fact that the killer would not have been likely to use two different blades. That's what would have had to happen to explain the cuts on both victims' clothes and the marks on Ron's cheek. But I don't think that's what Fuhrman and Sawyer were arguing. They were saying that the wounds could have been made by EITHER blade and the saw-tooth blade matched the marks on Ron Goldman's cheek.

What I was getting at about the knife on the table was the heft of the handle and the hammer-like construction of the heel. It was commentary on THAT knife that I was looking for.

The Swiss Army knife they showed appeared to be just like the one I had as a kid. It was one of the first knives I ever owned and I used the saw blade for sawing wood. The actual murder weapon had a sharp edge, which could have been serrated like some butcher knives or hunting knives. Mine was thick like an actual saw blade. If the one they showed on television is the same—and it sure looked like it—it would not have sliced through clothing; it would have ripped the cloth, which would have told everybody what kind of knife it was. There is no way the prosecution could have overlooked that. We should hear more about it from them.

It would normally do my heart good to hear the bad guys arguing among themselves. But any doubt about the knife helps Fuhrman, because so many people want to believe he's right, and once the idea is planted that the murder weapon was owned by OJ, some people will never let go of it.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Fuhrman's objective isn't to win his argument outright; it's to make an argument out of a settled issue. The argument itself is all he needs. From now on, any statement concerning THE knife, can be turned into a question of WHICH knife. Can't you just see that rat-faced smile of his? I can.

It's starting to get next to me how Fuhrman keeps coming up with answers to questions I thought were important (the fingerprint that had to be somewhere if OJ lost both gloves, the knife case that the knife had to come out of or gone into and the knife that had to have been in OJ's possession). All he has done here is to acknowledge the logical gaps in all the OJG theories we've heard and to fill them. The flaws were there all along. Only now, the person who has to get the credit for "proving" OJ's guilt, is the man who may have committed the murders himself. How do you suppose a thing like that could have happened? —Jasper

Subj: Re: The Knife

Date: 97-02-22

From: Trille

To: Trooper

Trooper—I went over most of the autopsy reports done by Golden, who really wasn't as bad as he was made out to be. But anyway, all the different kinds of wounds **COULD NOT HAVE BEEN MADE BY ONLY A SERRATED BLADE**, there are different kinds of wounds, 'wound around neck area, "Direction of pathway (cut) is upward and slightly from front to back for a distance of approx. 4 inches where it exits, post-auricular, in a 2 inch in length gaping stab/incised wound which has undulating or wavy borders, but not serrated" (from Freed book).

Now I cannot believe that these kinds of wounds could have been made by the knife displayed on the various shows, not the one lying on the table, which was never demonstrated but just lay there, for shock value, but the smaller knife that

Chapter 14: UNIMPRESSED

was demonstrated at various time, the serrated blade and the non-serrated blade were both shown. Even though it is possible for a blade to go in deeper into tissue than the actual length of blade, it would require tremendous force, and even then, the serrated blade would still not allow that kind of sharp force injury.

The reason I know this, is because throughout my life I have had to prepare various kinds of meat and poultry and I know how to use the different kinds of tools. The serrated kind is used to go through tough parts, but is not good for deep slicing. For instance, you would not use a serrated knife for slicing onions, you would use a very sharp non-serrated blade or else you would have a jagged mess, and the onions would not be cut into slices or chopped.

Conversely, if you are cutting through thick chunks or parts of meat, like a roast, where it doesn't matter if the slicing is smooth but you have to partition it, you could use a serrated knife. But to slice fat off of raw meat (I am referring mostly to beef meat rather than poultry) when you have to cut through muscle and fat, you would need the sharpest tool you have because it is impractical to use as much pressure or strength with a serrated blade as you would with a smooth sharp blade.

A serrated blade is mostly used in cutting things like bread where it doesn't matter if you have ragged edges, but in almost any other cutting job, you really need the smooth non-serrated edge. I have often wondered why they even make serrated knives, they often advertise them on TV, and they are practically useless, unless used for cooked meat like steaks, and you have smaller steak knives for that purpose, but serrated knives are hardly used for most purposes.

You are absolutely right about a serrated blade cutting through fabric, also Ron's boot was cut through, I wonder why they never examined the cuts on the boots because it would have been apparent what kind of blade was used, but I

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

guess we can assume if there is anything we don't know or haven't been told, it is favorable to O.J. Otherwise they sure as hell would have announced it from the rooftops. —Trille