

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

“THIS IS NOT THE FORUM...” —Cheri Lewis, deputy district attorney for the County of Los Angeles, arguing why the McKinny tapes should not be heard by the jury in the homicide trial of O.J. Simpson

A successful frame-up requires persuasive evidence that someone other than the perpetrator of a crime is guilty of committing it. Simple. Yet, in the case of O.J. Simpson, who said he was framed, the DA's office never took that basic requirement of a frame-up into account. What's truly insane about that is the fact that the man through whom the most persuasive evidence flowed boasted on tape of his ability to murder, plant evidence and lie in court. The prosecution angrily announced that such evidence against Fuhrman had no place in the prosecution of Simpson. Why? Because there was so much persuasive evidence against Simpson. Where does one begin to argue against logic like that?

Perhaps you have noticed how “ONE believable challenge,” “ONE scrap of evidence” or “ONE reasonable explanation” was all we needed to get respect for our attempts to think out loud about other motives and suspects in the Bundy murders. Perhaps you have also noticed how thoughtlessly EVERY ONE of our challenges and EVERY scrap of our evidence was dismissed. Perhaps you have noticed that NOT ONE explanation we gave for considering other motives or suspects was considered reasonable because O.J. Simpson was the only suspect the OJG's considered reasonable. Does the name “Catch 22” ring a bell?

If this reminds you of the judges, prosecutors, commentators and most of the journalists in the O.J. Simpson case, it's because the attitudes are the same. Ito could just as easily be Judge, Fujisaki could just as easily be Matlock, Marcia Clark could be Tiger, Geraldo could be Lion, Vincent Bugliosi could be Bull and Grodin could be Bear. You need only recall what happened to Deputy DA Lucienne Coleman when she tried to tell William Hodgman and Marcia Clark about Mark Fuhrman: “This is just bullshit put out by the defense,” said Marcia. Judge Ito's ruling on the matter agreed, in effect, with her assessment. The jury did not get to hear it.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

That's why the voices of our OJG's are so important here. An OJG is an OJG and the ones in charge are pretty much alike wherever you find them—arrogant, vindictive and very bad losers. If you do succeed in demonstrating one of your “outrageous” charges, you can expect to be attacked where you will feel it the most.

As an unrepentant Vietnam combat veteran, I've been called a murderer so often that I've come to expect it in certain circumstances. Rarely has my anticipation in those circumstances gone unfulfilled. Therefore, I felt less pain than Tiger intended for me to feel, but that had nothing to do with her intent. She wanted to hurt me with the cruelest weapons at her disposal, words.

Panther, on the other hand, was sincerely at a loss to understand how anyone could think that Fuhrman might have been responsible for the killing and the evidence that made Simpson look guilty. Notice how easy it is to answer most of the questions which she poses as though the only possible answer to them proved Fuhrman's innocence. Notice how the questions themselves often suggest the solutions, and how blind she was to any of them because of her unwillingness to think them through.

Subj: Re: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-05 19:58:33 EST

From: PANTHER

To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

CC: Tiger, Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Pat, Chameleon, Bull,

Puma, Lion, Bear, Hhhana, Lynx, Trooper, Jaguar,

Openminded, Judge, Leopard, Dable, Connie, Ted, Wildcat,

Mike

Peggy— I've been following the e-mail conversation about Fuhrman in the last few days. I believe very strongly that the evidence against Simpson is overwhelming and when I hear speculation that Fuhrman might be the killer, it does appear to me that the OJG'S are reaching a bit. What motive would Fuhrman have to kill Nicole, or was he after Ron? If he killed Nicole to frame Simpson, wouldn't he have made sure Simpson was staying in town first? Did he research Simpson's

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

life to know his shoe size, type of shoe he wore, kind of gloves he wore, that he and Nicole were having problems, that she was afraid of him, etc, etc, etc? How did he drip Simpson's blood next to the bloody footprints, or was that blood left before the crime by Simpson and the drops just happened to correspond with the footprints? There is so much evidence that Fuhrman could not have been involved in the crime and evidence that Simpson was involved that it's difficult to understand how anyone could look to Fuhrman as the killer. —Panther

Tiger wasn't the only OJG prone to paraphrasing the sense out of our words, then commenting on her senseless interpretation. It wasn't what we said about O.J. or other possible suspects that mattered, it was what they were prepared to hear. They were not prepared to hear anything reasonable that was favorable to O.J. or "materially" critical of Fuhrman.

The following letter from Wolf goes back to my MFG hypothesis that some of the OJI's were exploring with me and to what Peggy said about the vehicle Fuhrman was driving on the 12th of June. It illustrates why the OJG's have not seen a "shred of evidence" that anyone other than O.J. was responsible for the Bundy murders. The lines that really got me, though, were the ones that warn against the danger of doing what Fuhrman, Vannatter, Geraldo, etc., did to O.J. Simpson before there was any evidence against him. Only Wolf's concern was not about the seriousness of making false accusations against O.J.

Subj: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-05

From: Wolf

To: Peggy

CC: Hhhana, Trooper, Trille, Dable, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted

Peggy— Am I reading this correctly, that Fuhrman did this crime because he owns/owned a green and white sports vehicle?

Please guys, take a break. Is it so difficult to grasp that Simpson murdered two people in cold blood. It's a pretty

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

serious allegation regarding Mark Fuhrman and one that shouldn't be tossed around like this.

In the posts I have read from the “non-believers” you think that the DA's office framed Simpson and created this whole thing and how wrong they were, etc. If YOU believe that then aren't you guilty of the same thing by accusing Fuhrman of not only planting the glove but now murder. Actually you are much, much worse because in this scenario there is absolutely no proof and the “accused” has an alibi. Denial is a dangerous pedestal and feeding denial by false accusations even more serious. —Wolf

For our OJG's the mere assertion that Fuhrman had an alibi was proof enough that he did. For the record: There is no sworn testimony or evidence of any kind that Mark Fuhrman was where he said he was on the evening of June 12, 1994. All we have is his word to Marcia Clark that he was at the desert resort of La Quinta California, 2 hours (by dog sled) from the murder scene until shortly before 8 p.m.

Q: ON THE EVENING OF JUNE THE 12TH, 1994 AT APPROXIMATELY 8:00 P.M., WHERE WERE YOU?

A: AT APPROXIMATELY 8:00 P.M., I WAS IN — EAST OF PALM DESERT IN LA QUINTA RESORT AT A PROTECTIVE LEAGUE SEMINAR.

Q: WAS THAT A POLICE OFFICERS' FUNCTION, SIR?

A: YES. I'M A DELEGATE IN THE PROTECTIVE LEAGUE OR WAS AT THAT TIME.

Q: OKAY. AND WHAT TIME DID YOU LEAVE?

A: I BELIEVE I LEFT SOMEWHERE AROUND 8:00 O'CLOCK JUST AS THE BARBECUE WAS STARTING.

Q: AND YOU LEFT — WHEN YOU LEFT, YOU DROVE WHERE?

A: I DROVE TO MY HOME.

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

Q: REMEMBER WHAT TIME YOU GOT HOME, SIR?

A: ABOUT — ABOUT 10:30.

Q: AND WAS THERE ANYONE HOME WHEN YOU GOT THERE?

A: MY WIFE.

Q: WHAT TIME DID YOU GO TO BED?

A: I BELIEVE ABOUT 11:00, MAYBE A LITTLE LATER.

Now it appears that the seminar may have ended at noon. Even if it didn't, he had no alibi. He never used the affair as an alibi anyway; his defenders did. He used a credit card.

Subj: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-03 12:41:18 EST

From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

To: Puma

CC: All

Hi guys— Good to hear from some new folks. I suppose from here on to the end of time there are going to be two sides to this issue: He did it/He didn't do it.

I feel because of Fuhrman, the police did nothing to try to establish that someone other than OJ could have been responsible for this crime. Fuhrman has been in the forefront of this thing from the beginning. Fuhrman was the first detective at the crime scene. He informed the other detectives about knowing where OJ lived, about being there before on a 911 call, he interviewed Kato, alone, he found the glove behind Kato's room, he spotted the "blood-drop" on the Bronco. He insinuated himself into this case in every way he possibly could. He lied on the stand, under oath.

Now, going from that, and, if you believe as I do that OJ did not commit these crimes, then someone else must have, which makes everybody suspect.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Heidstra saw a light colored utility type vehicle leaving the scene. Darden did everything but put the words in his mouth to make him say it was a white Bronco. Fuhrman owned a pea-green and white sports utility vehicle. Fuhrman is an ex-marine, trained to kill with a knife, silently and quickly. Fuhrman found all the material evidence. Fuhrman was alone at Rockingham a good thirty minutes. Fuhrman's own records set forth his hatred of blacks, Mexicans, etc. in the Marines and on the police force.

There have been reports that Fuhrman's "alibi" may not be true. Also, there have been reports that Fuhrman knew Nicole, and not just from the 911 call. The alibi and knowing Nicole, I haven't been able to verify in any way, but the rest is public knowledge.

No one has looked at anyone but OJ; why were certain things like the phone call about "sitting on two bodies in Brentwood" never followed up? Why was blood planted on the gate and socks? Why did Vannatter lie about OJ not being the main suspect at the time they went to Rockingham?

In Joseph Bosco's book, he states that Marcia Clark, within hours of the murders, said all the evidence was "a trail right to OJ," that he was "guilty as hell, he's a wife beater, he's evil." Now, this is just hours after the murders. How did she know all that so soon? Who was the only person who had had contact with OJ and Nicole when OJ had smashed her windshield? Mark Fuhrman.

I know there will always be those of you out there who say well, there's all this other evidence... but this is like a house of cards, if you take one card out from the bottom, the whole house is going to come down. I have not directly said that Mark Fuhrman did this crime, but I am saying, why not look at all the possibilities. I think one of the reasons people are upset with this whole thing is that within 24 hours, the

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

crime scene was opened, the whole thing washed down, the media already had OJ convicted, and no apparent effort was made to look for anyone or anything else. And yet, the LAPD had to go back, three weeks later, to do some more testing, finding blood on the back gate, etc. There was no investigation of this crime, there was just a straight path to OJ Simpson. And as things went on, I just didn't buy it, and I still don't.

I welcome all thoughts, and hope to hear from you again.

— Peggy

Subj: Re: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-03 12:47:32 EST

From: Tiger

To: Pat, Trooper, Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

CC: All

Fuhrman was stupid. He spent all those years earning a clean record as an officer in one of the most difficult areas to police in the country. He bothered to help make the area safe for thousands of good people. What a fool. He should have been a defense attorney who helps guilty people go free. It pays a hell of a lot more. You know. I've got a plan. I'll kill someone, and when I'm on trial, I'll have my lawyer question the detective who finds the evidence to see if he ever used the word "bitch" in the last ten years. If he did, I'll have him declared a misogynist and I'll be acquitted. What a deal! —Tiger

Subj: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-03 13:39:01 EST

From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

To: Tiger

CC: All

Tiger— Fuhrman's "clean record," seems to be in the eye of the beholder. He was named as a defendant in at least four

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

brutality lawsuits, and at the time of the Simpson trial had a case pending against him for planting evidence, if I recall correctly. —Peggy

Subj: Re: Fuhrman
Date: 97-03-03 14:39:36 EST
From: Pat
To: Tiger, Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
CC: All

Peggy— The facts won't make some people change their mind. They're now into whitewashing MF and those of us who won't tow the line get zapped. Gosh wouldn't it be a boring discussion if we all thought the same things. I've never been much of a rebel but this gets to me. Poor Fuhrman. People are maligning him. Tough. —Crowe

Subj: Re: Fuhrman
Date: 97-03-03 18:38:51 EST
From: Bear
To: Puma
CC: All

Puma— It is incredible isn't it! All the evidence points to one person, and one person only, and these people are insistent on framing someone else for the murders! It must be a scary world that these people live in....police don't use evidence to catch suspects....they randomly choose a "suspect" then make the evidence fit. They must sit by their windows watching and waiting.....will it be their turn next? —Bear

Yes, it was incredible. The most incredible thing about Bear was her inability to see how her arguments strengthened ours. She did it so regularly that it was embarrassing to look at. We weren't accusing Fuhrman of murder. We were looking at the possibility that he might have done it, that his alibi should be checked, that holes in the record needed to be filled in and the answers to a few basic questions about Fuhrman would tell us whether we were right or wrong.

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

If we were wrong, the answers to those basic questions would tell us that the evidence incriminating to O.J. and Fuhrman might also incriminate someone else.

If O.J. was innocent he had to have been framed. If he was framed, who could have committed the murders and who could have framed O.J.? Clearly an ideal frame would consist of evidence that pointed to one person and one person only. Clearly the OJI's were in no position to frame anyone. Clearly a world that not only ignored the possibility that police officers could do such things, but abetted them when the deed is done by attacking those who do consider the possibility, is a scary place—a place were prudent people have to wonder if it will be their turn next.

Subj: Re: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-03 15:01:24 EST

From: Pat

To: Puma, Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

CC: All

Hi Peggy— You know I agree with you 100%. I know we'll never change the minds of some people, but I don't see the harm of trying to come up with new facts. No one has said that Mark Fuhrman did the crime. All we've said is let's look at it again. I thought this whole forum thing was to discuss the case. Now that the civil trial is over some people think that's the end of it. I beg to differ. I think this case is far from over and I think more things will come out as people keep digging.

I don't understand how someone can say Fuhrman was a wonderful cop for years with a clean record. That's just not true. All the OJG's are now trying to whitewash Fuhrman because it fits in with their spin on the case. That's a crock. Well enough for now, you know my thoughts anyway. Prepare to be blasted. Sometimes telling the truth hurts. —Pat (Crowe)

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Re: Simpson case

Date: Monday, March 03, 1997 12:12 PM

From: Tiger

To: Openminded, Dable, Paula P Duke, Panther, Bull M, Margaret Richardson, Bull R, Matlock, Chameleon, Connie, Patricia Whetham, Lion, Bear, Trooper, Ted

Check again. The chain of command is in the record. Also, dried blood on a black sock is not easily “observed,” —that’s why the socks were kept for microscopic examination (see testimony). Regardless, the fantasy is in the desperation to claim a) planting, and if that doesn’t fly, b) contamination. I suppose the Bundy blood, the hair, the carpet fibers, and the shoeprints all were planted—and someone had all those pieces of evidence prior to the murders. What a conspiracy! It is amazing to hear the illogic (which worked with that jury, and you) that the police planted evidence which was the “garbage in” that had unreliable results. If it was planted, it was all OJ’s stuff. If it was contaminated, it only appeared to be OJ’s stuff, but you can’t trust the results. Is the earth flat, a sphere, a cone? Do we take our pick and see which is best? We’ve been over this a thousand times. It doesn’t get less ridiculous. The conspirators also knew that OJ would not have an alibi, right? Think on it. —Tiger

No, it doesn't get less ridiculous. As you have seen, we did think on it. Tiger didn't. Lord knows what she was thinking when she raked Ted over the coals for pointing out how easy it was for a detective in the Simpson case to get hold of blood samples, and how unlikely it was that O.J.'s socks had blood on them when they were collected.

Subj: Re: Simpson case

Date: Sunday, March 02, 1997 12:30 PM

From: Ted

To: Tiger

CC: All

Chapter 18: ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

How long have you been living in Fantasy-land? Obviously you cannot distinguish fact from fancy and your reading ability seems to be questionable too. I said Vannatter carried the blood samples around for hours, if not days. NO ONE knows for certain how long he had them. The blood spot on the socks was CUT OUT of the sock when it was dispatched to the lab so the testing would have no effect on the soaking of the blood to the other inside of the sock. Also it was first examined by 4 (FOUR) expert technicians (3 of them LAPD) and no blood was observed! THESE ARE FACTS proven by the trial transcripts and not BS as you so crudely put it! —Ted

Subj: Re: Simpson case
Date: 97-03-03 15:10:48 EST
From: Pat
To: All

Ted— Haven't you learned yet that if you don't agree with the big three, Tiger, Lion and Bear, you'll be called a fool and all your thoughts will be BS. Stick around. Either agree or expect to get blasted—Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Simpson case
Date: Monday, March 03, 1997 11:52 PM
From: Bear
To: Patricia Whetham
CC: Openminded, Dianne, Paula P Duke, Panther, Bull Marcus, Mauis,

H. Winston Reason, Margaret Richardson, Bull Roberts, Matlock, Chameleon, C Tonsgar, Lion, Trooper, Ted, Tiger

Crowe— Would you like some cheese with that whine??? — Bear

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Bear— Since when is it whining to tell the truth. No wonder the threads got so nasty with the three of you making remarks about anyone who doesn't agree with you. You deserve each other. —Pat

Pat— If that is your opinion of me that's fine...you've stated it! The point I was trying to make was we would rather you state your opinions about the facts of the case...any case...pick one! Now, can you do that...or shall I bring out my cheese tray for you? —Bear