

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

“MINORITIES, WHETHER IN RACE, RELIGION OR THOUGHT ARE OFTEN RIDICULED BY PEOPLE WHO DON’T KNOW ANY BETTER.” —Patricia Crowe Whetham, VSL (very sharp lady)

The following exchange shows how tough it can be to figure out who said what to whom and when they said it in a forum where copies of copies can be pasted onto letters with or without names or dates. It’s hard to keep track of, and sometimes, when things are going hot and heavy, simple mistakes can creep in and make a huge impact on group dynamics. This time it worked for the good. Watch what happens in the end when Tiger takes one of Trille’s letters for her own and turns it inside out, and Peggy misreads the time on another. The issue was whether or not Judge Stock did the right thing in taking custody of O.J. and Nicole’s children away from the Browns and giving it to O.J. Peggy argued that all available evidence, including a court-ordered psychological evaluation, indicated that O.J. was a good father. You can guess the OJG response....

Tiger wrote:

Peggy: Good fathers do not murder the mothers of their children, regardless of the test findings of a court psychologist.
—Tiger

Trille wrote:

And certainly good grandparents don’t sell pictures of their deceased daughter topless to tabloids. OJ was found not guilty. Lou Brown had to admit he sold everything he could find to get money while the story was HOT. —Trille

Subj: OJ’S kids

Date: 97-03-17 22:00:24 EST

From: Peggy

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

To: Tiger, Lion
CC: All

Tiger and Lion: Please remember there are those of us who do believe that OJ is innocent. By the same standards, believing 100% in the DNA evidence and sluffing off a report by a psychologist who obviously tested both OJ and Lou Brown as nothing, is not only ludicrous but hypocritical. OJG's swear by the DNA but will accept nothing that points to another side of this man you all term as a "murderer, abuser."

It's the same old same old. No matter what questions we (OJI's-OJU's) ask we get the same answer. Whatever points to guilt is true, whatever points to doubts or innocence is false, a lie, silly, inane, not worth discussing, not logical, not authorized. Lou Brown (if he was the one who sold the pictures) did so for money! Nothing more. What good was going to come out of having nude pictures of his deceased daughter in the tabloids? But you can accept that. This I just don't understand. —Peggy

Subj: Re: OJ'S kids
Date: 97-03-17 23:17:07 EST
From: Lion
To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
CC: All

Peggy, where in my message did I imply Lou Brown's deed was acceptable?

It is not acceptable! No more acceptable than Simpson's approval of letting the defense trash the mother of his children for the record! Those children will read those transcripts someday, in their search for the truth.

You comment that "no matter what questions we OJI's or OJU's ask (actually I didn't see any questions asked) we get the same answer." Peggy, the truth doesn't change. I fail to see where this article points in another direction. Simpson

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

was tested. There were a series of questions and answers. He is intelligent enough to know what to say and what not to say. I only wish his time with the children could be monitored, it would be interesting to see just how much of his time he gives to the children. According to past reports he never spent much time with his kids. That was one of the problems Nicole wrote about in her diary. —Lion

Subj: [Fwd: OJ's Kids]

Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 10:57 PM

From: Chameleon

To: All

Hi All—Thought I would forward this *[newspaper article about psychology tests on O.J.'s fitness to take care of his minor children]* for what it is worth to each of you. Obviously these children love their father and he loves them. It would appear that he is capable of being a good father no matter what each of you may think of him as an individual. —Chameleon

Subj: Re: OJ'S kids

Date: 97-03-18 00:06:43 EST

From: Lion

To: Chameleon

CC: All

Chameleon— Let's see if I have this right. Simpson went through a series of questions and answers. Being an intelligent man, he made the right choices in his answers. As a result, he scored quite high, and now this should put his in a "good light!" If he answered the questions with a lie detector attached to his arm, I just might have another opinion. Sorry, Pat, but this question and answer stuff is elementary to Simpson. Nobody ever said he didn't know how to be a good father! —Lion

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Christine Armas wrote:

Hi Paula— Isn't it weird how the OJG's just won't quit in their obsessive hatred for O.J.? They will use any means, any information no matter how silly or irrelevant to make OJ or any OJI look bad, even if it makes them look bad or if it doesn't fit their theory. It is kind of sad how they use even this information of OJ's fitness to be a good father—even that, somehow, is a negative, even if they have to use contorted logic in the process! Talk to you guys later. —Trille

Subj: Re: OJ's kids

Date: 97-03-17 22:33:40 EST

From: Lion

To: Trille (Christine Armas)

CC: Hhhana, Tiger, Trooper, Pat, Peggy, Diana, Dable, Connie, Ted

Christine— a comment or opinion on the article would be nice! There really is nothing to be gained by sending comments like this and copying OJG's. —Lion

The letter Lion is accusing Trille of copying is the one below that Tiger, in fact, copied from Trille. Throw that one in your memory bank; you'll need to draw on it later when Trille takes one of Tiger's letters about me and turns it around the way Tiger did to hers. Don't ask how Lion got Tiger's letter before it appears to have been written; it's one of those mysterious things that sometimes happens in cyberspace which is best left unexplored.

Subj: Re: Re OJ's kids

Date: 97-03-18 00:39:31 EST

From: Tiger

To: Trille (Christine Armas), Hhhana

CC: Lion, Trooper, Pat, Peggy, Diana, Dable, Connie, Ted

Hi Paula— isn't it weird how the OJI's just won't quit in their obsessive love for OJ, they will use any means, any information no matter how silly or irrelevant to make OJ or

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

any OJI look good, even if it makes them look bad or if it doesn't fit their theory. It is kind of sad how they use even this limited information of OJ's fitness to be a good father, and use it somehow as a positive, even if they have to use distorted logic in the process!! Talk to you guys later. —Tiger

Subj: OJ's kids
Date: 97-03-17 22:56:44 EST
From: Peggy
To: Lion
CC: All

Lion: Check the time, mine says Trille's went out at 22:15:21 and Tiger's went out at 22:23:12, some 8 seconds later. Maybe great minds work in the same way. What does your time say? —Peggy

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: 97-03-17 23:14:10 EST
From: Bear
To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
CC: Lion, Matlock, Tiger, Cougar, Rabne, Pat, Chameleon, Bull, Mary Hedman, Puma, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Mike, Panther
Peggy— That would be 8 minutes later...not seconds. —Bear

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: 97-03-18 00:43:33 EST
From: Tiger
To: Peggy, Lion
CC: All

Peggy—Trille's went out first. Mine went out second. I thought turnabout was fair play, here. God help us if this comes under the heading of great minds. I suspect you were joking. I hope you were joking. The nice thing about Trille's messages to you is that they are in lower-case letters. Just as

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

an aside—the times printed on the messages are often wrong. We've had some say 1998. This time they were accurate. — Tiger

Subj: Re: Re OJ's kids

Date: 97-03-17 23:55:48 EST

From: Lion

To: Pat

CC: Tiger, Hhhana, Trooper, Trille, Peggy, Diana, Dable, Connie, Ted

Pat (Crowe), I haven't seen the photo's he supposedly sold, have you? Somehow we have gone from topless to naked! If Lou Brown was removed as guardian for selling photo's, then how does someone found liable for the death of two people, one being the children's mother, get custody? —Lion

Subj: Re Lou

Date: 97-03-18 00:03:10 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Lion

CC: Trooper, Trille, Tiger, Pat, Peggy, Diana, Ted

No Lion— Lou Brown was removed as guardian of the children before the custody hearing. This was done strictly on the basis of his selling the photos and receiving the payments for them. One of the girls sold pictures also. —Paula

Subj: Re: Re Lou

Date: 97-03-18 00:19:48 EST

From: Lion

To: Hhhana

CC: Trooper, Trille, Tiger, Pat, Peggy, Diana, Ted

Pat (Crowe)— what difference does it make when he was removed? The point I was making is the same. —Lion

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

Subj: Re: Re OJ's kids

Date: 97-03-18 01:27:55 EST

From: Tiger

To: Lion, Pat

CC: Hhhana, Trooper, Trille, Peggy, Diana, Dable, Connie, Ted

Lion—We live in a world where being topless is criminal and wife-beating is condoned. Time will tell. As you said, one day, the kids will read the transcripts of the trials. And Johnny Cochran will not be there to put the blame on Fuhrman. —Tiger

Subj: Re: OJ'S kids

Date: 97-03-18 01:32:49 EST

From: Tiger

To: Lion, Pat

CC: All

One question— Even though you guys don't answer any questions asked of you: Are you suggesting that this finding casts doubts on OJ's guilt in the murders? Is that what you concluded? If he got a high score on a test, he appears less guilty of a crime in which he left tons of evidence? —Tiger

Just between us, folks...the crime we're talking about is one in which somebody left tons of evidence against O.J. You might even say the difference between OJG's and OJI/OJU's is who we think left that evidence. To put a finer point on it, the difference is in who we are willing to consider may have left it. For our OJG's it was O.J., period. All other thoughts worth thinking grew from that branch of logic only. Now, on to the discussion....

Subj: OJ's kids

Date: 97-03-18 10:51:36 EST

From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

To: Tiger

CC: Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Pat, Chameleon, Bull, Puma, Lion, Bear, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Wildcat, Ted, Panther, Mike

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Tiger— I sit here red-faced. I did so well in math at school I used to tutor some other students, and now I can't tell the difference between 8 seconds and 8 minutes? Old age must be catching up with me. Anyhow, thanks for setting the record straight.

At Christine's request, I removed her name from my list a long time ago, but I still get messages from her, and Lion dug in the spurs so I had to go and put my foot in it.

As far as the article mentioning OJ, yes, I have a comment. Perhaps if they would have checked into the "abuse" question after 1989 they would have seen that Nicole was not as "afraid" of OJ as she claimed to be, that it was another case of "pushing each other's buttons." I think Nicole knew exactly what it would take to cause OJ to shout and kick down doors, or whatever. There was no physical contact proved after 1989. I've said before that I thought this was a volatile relationship and that both sides were involved. Nicole was no cowering little thing. From what I have read, she gave as good as she got. She could shout and curse as well as anybody.

Now I will probably be set upon for saying things about someone who is dead, but I'm speaking about a person who was alive, functioning as a human being. And although I will say from all that has been said, Nicole was a good mother, but I don't feel that Nicole was a good wife once she got mixed up with Faye Resnick. Everything I've read points to the fact that she was afraid of growing old, that she was experimenting with drugs and sex and she wanted it all, the money, the youth and OJ, at her convenience.

You mentioned that OJ played golf instead of being with his kids. At the time, weren't the kids with the Browns? It would have been kind of difficult for OJ to be with his kids in an atmosphere where everyone was concerned with the

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

children's welfare. I can image what they were hearing from Denise during this time. Even subliminally, children can pick up on things. And I'm not saying that it was right that he played golf instead of being with them. I honestly don't think that OJ knows how to handle the situation.

As I have said, many times before, OJ is not an educated man, even though he did go to college. He was a great football player, a persuasive spokesperson and a minimal movie actor. He obviously has a huge ego that will not allow him to believe that people actually think he committed this crime. Otherwise he would have not made the mistakes he made on the witness stand.

There is so much wrong with the system, the way they treat abuse, both spousal and child, and any step that is taken to improve it is a step forward. It's a shame that we have to have something like a murder trial of a celebrity to force the legislature to look at things differently. What about all the cases of spousal abuse where the children are also abused that have come before the courts?

It was never shown during the OJ trial, either criminal or civil, that these children were abused. One judge makes a decision to return custody to a father who has not been shown to abuse his children, whom the children obviously love, and all of the sudden, this judge is on the verge of having her career taken from her. I'm sure she would have received high praise from all the OJG's had her decision been to give custody to the Browns. Maybe if Sydney grows up to be as beautiful as her mother was, her grandfather will someday sell pictures of her to the tabloids.

Yes, OJ and his lawyers did "trash" Nicole during the civil trial, but nothing was said during the criminal trial, and OJ was on trial for life imprisonment there. And was what was said proven false? You know if they really wanted to trash her they could have put Cora Fischman on for OJ and let her tell

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

about the three-way sex game. Did this come out during the trial? I think it was only in her deposition, wasn't it?

I just fail to understand why when something is printed that might show something even the least bit favorable to OJ, it's jumped on like a pack of wolves on a kill, with nothing left but a skeleton when they are through. I just don't understand. —Peggy

Patricia Whetham wrote:

Peggy— How eloquent. I agree with every word you said. It's a shame that the judge in the custody case may lose her career because of people's hatred of OJ. I think when laws need to be changed they should not be changed just because of one case. They did it when they changed the law about diaries etc. being used in a trial. They changed the law just in time for the OJ civil trial. Sometimes the law is an ass. I forget who said that but it's true. Never mind Peggy—people who don't agree with the mob are often ostracized, but if we stick together, who cares. Minorities, whether in race, religion or thought, are often ridiculed by people who don't know any better. Keep the faith. Your pal —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Came across this just now [*African-American doctor's analysis of Dr. Golden's autopsy report—says killer had to be left-handed*]

Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 10:50 AM

From: Tiger

To: Chameleon, Dianne Able (Dable)

CC: All

Chameleon— this is an autopsy report on an autopsy report. You cannot evaluate wounds unless you see them. Everybody wants to get into the act. Just the assumption that the gloves were worn when Nicole was killed, because there was blood on them, shows me the mentality of this person. Blood was all over that scene. The conclusion now is that the blood came off in the struggle with Ron Goldman, and that Ron

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

inflicted the wounds in O.J.'s hand. Nicole probably was finally killed after that—even though she had been attacked first.

This is an African-American doctor with an agenda. He discounts the fact that the way the wounds were inflicted by the right hand is consistent with commando tactics (as illustrated during the trial) in which OJ had been recently trained. I resent the use of this report to present the murders as black/white issues. Enough of that already. These were murders, period. —Tiger

Subj: Re: Came across this just now...
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997
From: Patricia Whetham
To: Chameleon, Tiger
CC: All

Tiger—What do you think the coroner they had on the stand for 8 days testified from? He did not see the bodies. He saw the autopsy report that Dr. Golden wrote. Dr. Golden agreed with the two knife-scenario, which is why he wasn't used in the criminal trial because he did not agree with the prosecution's theory of OJ as the only killer. —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Came across this just now...
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 12:07 PM
From: Tiger
To: Patricia Whetham, Chameleon
CC: Barbara Keegan, Mary Hedman

Pat— That's not why he was not called. He wasn't called because he's a jackass. [Editor's Note: According to Robert Shapiro, the coroner controversy was actually a Trojan horse to get the grisly autopsy photos in front of the jury. Without the testimony of the man who did the autopsy, the judge was more likely to let the prosecution use the photos]. He comes across like a fool. Dr. L. was the supervising coroner. Golden did not have a two-knife theory. He did not rule it out,

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

which is quite different. Anyway, with Fuhrman's Swiss Army knife explanation, it all falls into place anyhow. Whatever, none of that is important in light of the overwhelming blood evidence, the shoe prints, and the lies told by O.J. under oath. I'm still waiting to hear which blood evidence you and Peggy doubt? How about the shoes—still doubt that, too? —Tiger

Subj: Re: Came across this just now...
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 4:13 PM
From: Patricia Whetham
To: Chameleon, Tiger
CC: All

Tiger— In my opinion Laks whatever-his-name-was came across as more of a jackass than Golden. Now you're taking the word of a racist liar, a convicted perjurer about the knife. There is no talking to someone who will not listen and twists everything to suit themselves. Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: 97-03-19 00:10:41 EST
From: Tiger
To: Pat, Chameleon
CC: Trooper, Kim (Kim McAuley), Dable (Dianne), Bear, Peggy, Hhhana

To my knowledge Fuhrman told one lie under oath—an understandable but stupid one. OJ told so many more lies on the stand and was not charged with perjury. How come you believe him? —Tiger

How does one begin to answer a question like that? The question itself tells you that there's no point in trying. One lie under oath? Could Tiger have forgotten all the questions and answers involving the search warrant and the blood Fuhrman said he saw on the Bronco that could only be seen with the door open? Could she have forgotten that he testified to not knowing whether or not he had his gun in his hand when he went down

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

the dark path where he said he found the glove? What about the cobwebs that supposedly stopped him from going further—was that true? And the crooked angle of the Bronco (two degrees out of line) as reasonable cause to inspect the vehicle? Then there was his denial of knowing Kathleen Bell and all of the things he said on tape that contradict what he said on the stand....

And what were all of the lies O.J. was supposed to have told on the stand? Are we supposed to believe everyone who contradicted him? Why? Where are all the medical reports of Nicole's beatings at O.J.'s hands? What do the photos really show? What does the 911 call really say? Why did Nicole really call 911 so often? Who really wrote "Nicole's diary" and why?

O.J. said that he never beat Nicole? Was it ever proven that he did? He said that he never owned the Bruno Maglis in the Schull/Flammer photos. Maybe he didn't. Schull and Flammer were the only photographers in Buffalo with photos of O.J.'s shoes on that day—both had the same publicity agent, who was also a professional photographer. And while the Bruno Maglis were rare, the Silga treads were not. Thousands of them attached to other shoes were sold throughout the continent—which is amazing because they are UGLY. They're worse than ripple soles, and call attention to themselves because they look so much like tire treads. I know that I'd never wear "ugly-ass" shoes like that. So, how do you answer Tiger's question about Fuhrman's one "understandable" lie vs. O.J.'s many lies? You don't.

Subj: Re: Came across this just now...

Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 9:35 PM

From: Bear

To: Patricia Whetham

CC: Chameleon, Tiger, Barbara, Mary, Trooper, Kim McAuley, Dianne, Petlady, Hhhana

Crowe— there were 4 experts who agreed with Fuhrman's account of the Swiss Army knife as the murder weapon. Are you saying they are all racist liars? —Bear

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Re: Came across this just now..
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 11:11 PM
From: Patricia Whetham
To: Chameleon, Tiger
CC: All

Tiger— Who were the four experts? —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 2:18 PM
From: Bear
To: Patricia Whetham
CC: All

Crowe— the judge in the custody case doesn't stand to lose her position because of the decision made in the OJ custody suit. It has to do with the decision she made in another case, where she gave the mother custody of her children, then, sadly, the mother killed the children and herself! Her position is on the line because of that case, not the Simpson vs. Brown case. —Bear

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 9:54AM
From: Patricia Whetham
To: Bear
CC: All

Bear—the judge gave the kids to the mother 5 or 6 years ago. Is she supposed to be a mind reader? How is someone supposed to know what a person will do in 5 or 6 years? That's still no reason for a recall. —Pat

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997 2:02 PM
From: Diana E (Deflemi)
To: Bear, Patricia Whetham
CC: All

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

The judge in Orange County IS being recalled because of her decision to grant Simpson custody of his children. The other incident, where the unstable mother granted custody of her children back in 1991 then kills them and herself, is just an excuse used by those who want to get back at her because they did not like her decision in the Simpson case. No one seems to care that in 1991, at the time the judge had to make a decision about granting custody to the mother or the father, the father was homeless and living in his truck. Apparently, no other family members stepped forward to offer to take custody. So given the choice of placing the children in the custody of the mother who did have a home, or the father who was homeless, the judge chose the mother. —Diana Fleming

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 1997
From: Patricia Whetham
To: Deflemi
CC: All

Diana— Don't worry. Tiger et al will not let the truth of the matter get in the way of kicking O.J. in the teeth again. — Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: OJ's kids
Date: 97-03-19 01:16:31 EST
From: Tiger
To: Pat, Bear, Diana
CC: Peggy (Margaret Richardson), Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Chameleon, Bull, Puma, Lion, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Connie, Wildcat, Ted, Panther, Mike

Pat—I have not sent one message regarding the judge or her decisions. Why are you singling me out in this matter? Learn to debate fairly. It works wonders [*Editor's note: Does this sentence ring a bell? "Good fathers do not murder the mothers of*

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

their children, regardless of the test findings of a court psychologist.” Whose court was Crowe supposed to think she was talking about?]. —Tiger

Subj: Equal Time
Date: 97-03-19 08:16:58 EST
From: Pat
To: Hhhana, Trooper
CC: Jaguar (Halle), Dable, Peggy

I watched a really disgusting interview last night on Equal Time with Mark Fuhrman. I thought it was a political show and don't know what he was doing on there anyway. The hostesses were Bay Buchanan and Victoria Toensing. Toensing was filling in for the other regular hostess. Toensing was actually flirting with the creep. It was awful. I don't care for Buchanan but at least she asked a few tough questions. What the hell does this guy have that would make a person like Toensing, who doesn't seem to like anyone, kiss his a** on national television. I don't understand. Oh yeah. When they introduced Toensing as an expert on the OJ case I fell off my chair laughing. —Pat

P.S. He was lying through his teeth as usual.

Subj: Be still my heart!
Date: Wednesday, March 19, 1997 8:28 AM
From: Paula
To: Patricia Whetham, Trooper

Pat— ...She would be disgusting! Maybe it's a good thing, though. At least the nation can see how ridiculous it is to embrace this creep MF. —Paula

Subj: Equal Time
Date: 97-03-19
From: Pat
To: Hhhana, Trooper
CC: Jaguar (Halle), Dable, Peggy

Chapter 22: IN THE NAME OF THE CHILDREN

Hi Paula— ...I am going to paste a nice message I got from Bear first thing this morning. I used to delete all the nasties, but now am keeping it for posterity —Pat

Bear wrote:

Crowe— I have been reading all that has been put forth today and I have made an observation concerning your remarks. You seem to be the only one that is doing the “badmouthing.” Everyone else has been discussing the issues and their thoughts on it, however, you have contributed nothing but insults. Is that how you were taught to discuss issues—if you can’t win any points then just try to make the other side look bad? You’re only making yourself look like a fool, Crowe. —Bear

One trait that all of our leading OJG’s had in common was an incredible lack of self-awareness. They simply could not see themselves in the mirror of their own words. It may be hard to believe that Bear missed the irony of ascribing the words that best described her own participation in the group to someone else. No one else did.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD