

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

“MAKING A MODEL CAR IS EASY. YOU START WITH A LUMP OF CLAY AND SCRAPE OFF EVERYTHING THAT DOESN’T LOOK LIKE A CAR.” —Walt George, Ford Motor Company, Design Master Modeler

*In the old days of automotive design, few things were more impressive than Ford Motor Company’s master modelers at work. These guys could make a convincing facsimile of anything that was possible to put in 3-dimensional form. It took a good modeler about seven years to learn the basics and another seven or eight to understand the dominating influence in enough political and technical situations to do it all. In each instance, the keys were vision and preparation. Preparation meant knowing the tricks and being ready to use them. It was a principle I’d been taught as a high school student in 1962 but didn’t fully appreciate until 1992, when I became a Ford master modeler.*

Subj: Hitting the target

Date: Friday, March 14, 1997 10:59 PM

From: Trooper

To: Chameleon

CC: Hhhana, Pat, Peggy, Trille, Dable, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Wildcat

Chameleon— I got into that surenet URL you wanted me to see. Boy was it depressing. You could tell that these people were bright. You could tell they had done a ton of homework. And you could tell that they were willing to bend the laws of reason in any direction that would enable them to support the conclusion they started with. That is the essence of prejudice. It was that kind of thinking that gave us Jim Crow.

Think about this for a minute. You’re OJ. Because you were abandoned as a child and because you are impulsive by

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

nature, you are predisposed to murder the mother of your children. Sure, there are other factors involved, but these are the booby-traps waiting to explode when the conditions are right.

You're packing for a trip to Chicago in June. While you're obsessing about abandonment and the children and all that, you happen across an all-purpose bag which contains these handy items: The knit cap that everyone saw you wear in *Naked Gun*, a pair of gloves you wore to cold weather sporting events, and a hunting knife that you found somewhere and never told anyone about—a knife that you routinely get past airport security without a problem. Seeing all that stuff sets you off. You keep on your blue/black sweats, take off your Reeboks and find a pair of Bruno Maglis to put on. Maybe they were in the bag, too. Of course you can't wear your sweatsocks with your dress shoes, so you have to get a pair of dress socks out of the laundry hamper and put them on before you put on the shoes. Now, you're all set to confront your ex.

You drive over to her place wearing the cap and gloves, for some reason, with the intent of doing something to hurt the woman who made you so angry earlier that evening. You're thinking that maybe you'll slash her tires or something. But then you see her. You confront her. She laughs at you and turns away. Your anger gets out of control and you strike her with the butt of the knife. Somehow, you manage to do it in a way that makes it appear that the blow was struck from the front. Anyhow, you screwed up. You see that now, but it's too late.... You have to kill! Kill! Kill!

Good Lord, Chameleon! What were you thinking when you asked me to look at this page? Did you want me to see the worst example of an OJG scenario you ever ran across? Really, I don't get it. I don't need it for the book. I have plenty of ill-considered OJG scenarios I can get from Lion, Tiger and Bear.

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

All of those scenarios have one thing in common: They all begin with the conclusion and work backward to the facts and speculation needed to support it. You can do that with almost any proposition. I'll give you a beauty in my next letter. I'll "prove" to you that Tiger was right about Trooper being the killer after all. I'll give you irrefutable DNA evidence and something OJ never gave anybody—a confession.

For now, I want to leave you with a thought that a journalism teacher passed on to me back in the 10th grade. He was telling us the secret of writing a perfect murder mystery every time, one in which a hundred scattered pieces of evidence can be made to fit perfectly. This, of course was not the same as what a journalist does. That was the point. He told this story:

A man was walking through a forest when he saw a tree with a bull's-eye painted on it. On closer inspection he saw an arrow smack dab in the center. He walked a little further and saw another bull's-eye on a tree with an arrow going straight through the center. The more he walked, the more signs of the extraordinary archer he saw. No matter how high or low the bull's eye was painted, or at what odd angle to the left or right, the arrow was dead center every time. Finally, the hiker saw a man with a bow and arrow drawing back on the bowstring and rushed to make his acquaintance.

"I saw all those bulls you hit," said the hiker. "Incredible! How did you do it?" The man smiled and let go the arrow, which seem to fly forever until a dull sound told the two men that it had hit a tree. The hiker ran in the direction of the arrow until he saw it in a tree. To his surprise, he saw that the archer had not hit the target. In fact, the tree didn't have a target painted on it. Then he looked back at the approaching archer and noticed a paint bucket and brush in his hand. Now when he looked at the tree with the arrow in it, he saw that it didn't have a target painted on it...yet. —Jasper

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Re: Hitting the target  
Date: 97-03-14 23:23:45 EST  
From: Chameleon  
To: Trooper

Trooper...I am sorry that I made you sad by sending the URL to read...I, myself, like to look at all “angles” that are presented about an occurrence.... something I had to do when I worked as a train monitor....I had people’s lives in my assessment of various readings, and those had to be made on a “split second” basis, with “very” sound judgment....I learned that I must have the answers to at least 15 questions on my lips at all times, talk on 3 telephones, and be ready for “the chief” to ask me some asinine question while I was doing all of the aforementioned, and the answer to him had better be correct, or my ass was mud, job gone bye-bye.

I have never been fired from a job in my work career, and I always quit “after” a very long discussion with my superior...I never took a job unless I gave my superior a length of time that I would be available for that position. I am a Gemini, and recognize my fault of wanting to move on to newer and “better” knowledge-gaining endeavors... I thought you might garner some “iota” of an angle from the URL, that’s all...  
Sorry —Chameleon.

Subj: Re: Hitting the target  
Date: Saturday, March 15, 1997 2:46 AM  
From: Trooper  
To: Chameleon  
CC: Hhhana, Pat, Peggy, Trille, Dable, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Wildcat

Chameleon— This is not the letter I was going to send “proving” that Trooper1 was the real Bundy murderer. By your reaction to “Hitting the target,” I can see that you will really hate that one. I don’t want to offend you, but I get the

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

feeling that you would explode in rage if I suggested that you take another look at my last letter. A long, hard look.

You seem to think that I was being a smart-ass, that I was ridiculing a legitimate point of view in opposition to mine without giving it the serious consideration it deserved. I was afraid you might think that, which is why I went easy on the theory that was supposed to be the best. Please tell me what's out of line with my critique. Tell me how the cap, the socks, the shoes and the knife make sense in any OJG scenario. Did I misrepresent the argument? If so, in what way? Did I leave out any relevant facts or add any irrelevant details to confuse the issue? Is my definition of prejudice unfairly skewed against a fair representation of a different point of view? What did I do that was indicative of an unwillingness to learn?

Please bear in mind that I started out as an OJG. Based on Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden's opening remarks, I couldn't imagine how anyone in his right mind could think that OJ was not the killer. I followed everything closely, and despite some surprises from the defense that made some of the evidence questionable (especially the Rockingham glove and the socks) it still seemed that the prosecution had a strong case.

When you suggest that I am not willing to look at an opposing point of view, you are forgetting the fact that I shared that point of view until the evidence I had relied on to sustain it, could no longer be trusted. The logic problems with the "utility bag" scenario represent a case in point. When you give them a hard, honest look, they don't stand up very well.

I can appreciate your special qualifications for being fair-minded and capable of bringing the chaos of rational thought to bear on a chaotic deluge of information. We have more in common than you realize (Hhhana, too).

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

I joined the Army Reserves when I was 17 and tested well enough to become an officer. I didn't want to be an officer. I wanted to do my six years and end my military obligation at the age of 23. At the age of 19 I was the training NCO of an entire Army Reserve training division (4,000 officers and men). More recently, I was a master modeler at Ford Motor Company with the task of transforming two-dimensional styling concepts into functional, buildable, and esthetically pleasing 3-D forms.

Both jobs required a juggling act of multiple inputs and competing interests no less demanding than yours. It takes longer to become a master modeler than it does to become a brain surgeon—and there aren't nearly as many of us. I have to look at many things from many points of view. That's what I do for a living—and that's one of the reasons I'm so slow. I don't know how not to see things from many points of view, and I am very slow to judge what I see.

The problem with being an OJI is the widely held belief that we are inherently incapable of seeing anything that points to OJ's guilt. We are the ones whose questions and opinions are ridiculed without honest reflection. Before you harden your opinion about me, I urge you to take another look at what I wrote and ask yourself, what exactly did he say that was so wrong? —Trooper

Subj: Re: Hitting the target  
Date: 97-03-15 03:17:07 EST  
From: Chameleon  
To: Trooper

Trooper— I have read the text below very carefully...I have missed nothing.

I did read your other message very carefully....missing nothing. In my message to you I was saying one thing...I was explaining why I had sent you the URL that made you sad...that was ALL, nothing more...nothing hidden.

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

I do NOT have a hidden agenda....I have yet to be totally convinced that O. J. Simpson is totally guilty for the murder of Nicole Simpson and Ron Goldman. For me to be TOTALLY convinced that O. J. Simpson did commit the murders, I would have to look into his pupils for about 2 minutes. Then I could tell you. He would not have to say one word, just sit still and let me look into his pupils. I have many photos of him, that I have tried to get a good look into his eyes, but none are clear enough. There are many facets of this case that do not make sense. So, please do NOT place me in either the OJI or OJG camp just yet.

My “answers” to your questions are below—Chameleon.

\*\*\*answer: Very few things make me “hit the roof.”...I have never done so in my life. If I were ever to do that people would definitely die by my hands.

\*\*\*answer: I did NOT think you were being a smart-ass. Every point of view is legitimate, as I have stated on the Court TV threads. —Nothing was out of line with your critique. —The cap, the socks, the shoes and the knife make sense to the OJG because the cap, the socks, the shoes and the knife are irrational, as killing another human being is irrational, therefore irrational is irrational...valid argument. —You did NOT misrepresent the argument. You did not leave out any relevant facts, nor add any irrelevant details to confuse the issue.

Now, you must answer a question for me. In your previous message you mention “Jim Crow.” Who “exactly” is the man Jim Crow? Where did he live? What did “he” personally do that led to the mistreatment of people of a dark skin color? I know the concept that the name represents, but I need to know something of the man, so please give me this information. Then I can answer your question about prejudice.

I saw nothing of an unwillingness to learn.

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

\*\*\*answer: I well know your knowledge background; you need not remind me.

\*\*\*answer: I see nothing that you said that was “so wrong.” I, personally, do NOT have any scenario where O.J. is the murderer...too many facts are not available, and my speculating on such has never entered my mind. I have only speculated on how much time it would take to go from Rockingham to Bundy, commit the murders and return to Rockingham. That is posted on the CTV threads..

Subj: Jim Crow Attitudes

Date: 97-03-16 15:58:24 EST

From: Chameleon

To: Trooper

Jasper—I have put your text here, and my answer is below the text...OK.

\*\*\*\*\*

What did you make of these words in reference to OJG scenarios I criticized that depend on Jim Crow attitudes and imagery...?

“Institutional racism which gets absorbed by the popular culture without notice, is a touchy subject. I don’t want there to be any miscommunication about where I stand on the issue as it relates to certain OJG language, assumptions and lines of reasoning, and why.”

\*\*\*\*\*

Jasper— If the certain OJG’s you are speaking of are specifically Tiger, Bear, and Lion, I can only answer about one of these people. That person is Tiger.

About the way Tiger thinks...you are wrong. This woman is not a “Jim Crow” attitude person. Not in any sense of the word...she firmly believes in the equality of all people...and

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

she has not sat on her butt. She has done a lot of work in her life toward assuring that equality comes about. Her belief that O.J. Simpson is guilty comes from the “evidence” presented at the criminal trial. As you know, she is firmly based on knowledge of DNA analysis. She believes that if his blood was on various pieces of evidence, then he is the one that transferred that blood to those items. That’s all, no more, no less. Tiger couldn’t care less what O.J. Simpson’s skin tendencies are... (if you would like an actual summary of Tiger’s life and times, we could get into that later).

As for Bear... she follows Tiger’s lead...no more, no less...

About Lion...Lion...Here we have a different type of person altogether. Although I know nothing of her attitude toward “institutional racism,” I can tell you that there is much to her that is not known to the “group.” I do know that she is a very kind person...she takes care of her mother, her uncle, her aunt... and there are a few other family circumstances that are quite a job to handle...Don’t count her as “a racist.” She is a very good friend of Openmind (OJI)...she thinks very highly of him...and he has dark tendencies to his skin...(or a black person, if you want to get into that frame of mind).

It is my belief that none of these 3 people are racist...that is not an opinion... that is a belief. I don’t think that they even thought of the skin tendencies of O.J. Simpson when they came to the conclusion that he was guilty.

I am a “word” person...whatever the definition of a word is in the dictionary...that is my use of the word...no if, and, or but added. So, when I read some text...I read it with those guidelines. I don’t read between the lines, or imply anything else to those words...I read some text over again and again to make sure that I know what the person intended by those words, by the way the words are put together....

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

I hope I have answered your questions. If I haven't, please feel free to ask them again. I don't mind. I always ask a question over and over until my mind is satisfied with the answer.... —Chameleon

Maybe you noticed what was missing from that letter—an understanding of what I meant by institutional racism. I was referring to the ideas and feelings we have about race that we are not conscious of but we all know. Is it really conceivable to you that anyone but a black man accused of killing a white woman would be presumed to be guilty on the testimony of a white racist and evidence accessible to him that was vulnerable to tampering? Who would angrily discount the possibility that a Jew might be innocent if his chief accuser was a Nazi, or that an Arab might have been set up if his chief accuser was a member of the JDL?

If Tom Cruise were accused of murdering a black former lover and her current black boyfriend, would anyone assume that he was guilty of a rage killing with no evidence of rage in his demeanor before or after the crime? Who would have accepted, without question, the evidence “found” by a racist black cop and the theories he advanced against Tom if his height and build, the size of his shoes and the kind of vehicle he drove were all consistent with Tom's and the killer's? If that black racist cop was ultra-ambitious—if he yearned to be in the spotlight—if he'd met Tom on an undocumented domestic violence call and was reported to have been sexually involved with the murdered woman—and there were tapes available in which he boasted of his ability to plant evidence against “whities” and murder people with impunity—who wouldn't consider him a murder suspect?

How long would it take for the racist black cop to go on trial for the double homicide and his clumsy attempt to make it look as though Tom Cruise did it? Once his alibi was proven to be a lie, how long would it take for any jury to convict him?

That's what I mean by institutional racism.

Another way to look at it is “the no's we know” about race without thinking and without having to be told. We know that no white celebrity in the United States or Canada would have gone to trial once, let alone twice, for

## Chapter 21: HITTING THE TARGET

murder under the circumstances that O.J. did. No one would have accused attorneys for that celebrity of “playing the race card” by exposing a key black accuser’s racism and therewith a motive to lie. In recent years, a black person can’t even say the r-word without getting accused of being one. No one so accused would have been given an ounce of credence by the North American majority who found no reason to believe Orenthal James Simpson and no reason to doubt Mark Fuhrman.

Subj: Re: Your writing

Date: 97-03-16 23:19:24 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Pat, Trooper

Pat— We all bring to the table only what we have. We are a special group, different in so many ways, alike in so many others. Together, we reflect many different walks of life united in our opinion of the treatment of OJ and the larger issue of racial inequality demonstrated by this treatment.

You bring more than most. Your clear thinking and quick responses to the questions we all mull around is an inspiration to us all. I think we have formed a bond that will last far beyond O.J. Hopefully there are other groups like ours. We may never convince the nation OJ is innocent but we will never tolerate small-minded, nasty-mouthed attacks against anyone again when it is based on bigotry and lies. —Paula

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD