

Chapter 24: BEATING THE MACHINE

“...HOW DO YOU KNOW YOU’RE NOT THAT 1 OR 2 PERCENT?” Jim Morant, television talk show host

OK, so now we know that the best polygraph administrator in the country was Paul Minor. Since “the head honcho of the testers” validated his findings, how can any sensible person question the results? What do you say we hear from a 1 or 2-percenter?

Subj: Re: Fuhrman
Date: 97-03-20 04:27:35 EST
From: Wildcat
To: Tiger
CC: All

Tiger— While you are literally correct, you can “rehearse” for a polygraph by convincing yourself you are telling the truth. If Simpson could do it, Fuhrman could.

Has anyone here besides me ever taken a polygraph test and passed it when they were lying? It’s remarkably easy to do.
—Wildcat

Subj: Re: Fuhrman
Date: 97-03-20 12:57:10 EST
From: Bull R
To: Wildcat
CC: All

Wildcat—You weren’t examined by Paul Minor and 2nd opinion by Warren Holmes, were you? Come on, the results are in. —Bull R

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: 97-03-20 01:05:52 EST

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

From: Tiger
To: Chameleon, Dable (Dianne Able)
CC: All

Chameleon, Dianne— I hate to see this turned into an LAPD feud. It's a distraction the OJI's will enjoy. His book is number one. Cochran's book never got off the ground. Ha, ha. —Tiger

Subj: Class Act
Date: 97-03-20 08:15:32 EST
From: Hhhana
To: Wildcat
CC: Tiger, Rabne, Pat, Bull M, Peggy, Lion, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Diana, Bear Dable, Connie

You nailed it, Wildcat. Psych 101. —Paula

Subj: Flea Who?
Date: 97-03-20 09:03:39 EST
From: Hhhana
To: Tiger
CC: Rabne, Chameleon, Pat, Bull M, Peggy, Lion, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Diana, Bear, Dable, Connie

Tiger—I watched the gauntlet drop on national TV. You are right up to a point. I heard it a little bit different. Mr. Bailey challenged Fuhrman to take a lie detector test performed by the tester of his (Bailey's) choice. He then said he would pay for the test and issue a national apology if Fuhrman passed.

I know you noticed how the questions were structured. Even OJG's would have to have noticed it. Did you see blood on the door above the handle? Yes. That doesn't say anything; the question to answer was "did you put the blood on the door?"

There was nothing computerized about this test.

Chapter 24: BEATING THE MACHINE

I also would make the point Pat McKenna is the investigator still working the murder case. He is an affiliate of F. Lee's. They don't do anything by accident. We saw that in Mr. Bailey's cross-examination of Fuhrman. —Paula

Subj: Re: Fuhrman
Date: 97-03-20 11:54:49 EST
From: Diana
To: Chameleon ('Chameleon'), Peggy ('Margaret Richardson'), Tiger
CC: All

Tiger—Poor post on my part. Of course, you cannot rehearse for a polygraph test. I will be more careful in posting in the future. I meant that failing this test or passing this test does not necessarily certify that the person is not being completely truthful. If it did, the courts would allow it into evidence, or the laws would be changed to allow every witness in a case to be hooked up to a polygraph machine when they took the stand. That way juries would not have to guess at whose telling the truth, the polygraph machine could tell them, instantaneously. —Diana Fleming

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: Thursday, March 20, 1997 10:02 AM
From: Tiger
To: Dianne , Bull, Chameleon
CC: All

Dianne—There was no suspicion at any time that Fuhrman planted blood. He had just come on the scene, and no blood had been taken from OJ. The argument is between Fuhrman and Vannatter about a bloody print on the gate. Also, opinions are irrelevant in a criminal investigation. There is not one shred of evidence, not an iota—that anyone else but Simpson was at the crime scene. —Tiger

Tiger— Funny, I thought there were two victims present at the crime scene [*Editor's note: The athletic condition of the two*

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

victims before the attack, and the wounds on their bodies when they were found offered plenty of evidence that someone other than O.J. was in the “killing cage” with them]. —Diana

Tiger— Everything we’ve seen has been based on opinion. What about the good Dr. Werner Spitz? It was his “opinion” and he stated it. It was the investigators’ “opinion” of the type of crime, i.e., personal vs. random, vs. rage, vs. revenge, etc....

It really is possible to skate on a lie detector, Tiger, it really is. Read up on it. There’s probably a web site telling everybody exactly how to do it. —Paula

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: 97-03-20 13:22:16 EST
From: Bull M
To: Bull R
CC: All

Bull— There seem to be a couple of posters here that claim lie detector tests can be beaten with a little practice and a little mind control. It’s easy they say. Duh, they say. I did it myself, they say. Well I have a challenge. If these tests are so easy to beat, why doesn’t (hasn’t) the great one himself, in over two years, taken a public test to prove his contention that he is innocent? After all his dream team lawyers said how smart and how incredibly sharp O.J. is, and he has certainly talked himself and a few other stalwarts into believing his innocence. Come on OJ, didn’t you take Psych 101, or were you too busy beating up and raping young girls when you were in college to study? — Bull

I don’t know if anyone bothered to answer this message. I sure didn’t. How much space had already been devoted to the polygraph test O.J. took and “failed miserably with the lowest possible score?” No amount of explanation for the inappropriate timing and stressful conditions of that test were ever sufficient for O.J., though perfectly acceptable for MF. If O.J. got a failing test score on an incomplete polygraph test, when he knew he was telling the truth, how

Chapter 24: BEATING THE MACHINE

could he trust that the results of a complete test would be any better? And if they were, can't you just hear the OJG's rejecting the validity of the test if he passed the second time around? There was no way for him to win by taking it over and a million ways to lose.

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: 97-03-20
From: Tiger
To: Phil
CC: All

Right, Phil— Expert Bailey will stall as long as possible. Then he'll have to pay the piper. Remember, if Bailey admits that Fuhrman did not plant the glove, he is acknowledging OJ's guilt. We'll see. —Tiger

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: 97-03-20 13:25:25 EST
From: Phil (Philip T. Rabne)
To: Tiger
CC: All

Tiger—Hold it, Hold it, Time out! Among other things, Bailey wanted the head tester of the LAPD to do the testing and also wanted to look at the readout (the tapes and not a report) himself. I heard that with my “only”ist little ears when F. Lee Bailey was on Larry King Live! All that said, that doesn't mean the tests aren't good. They probably were and even if done by the LAPD tester they'd probably come out the same. —Phil

Hhhana didn't make a copy of the Lion letter she is responding to below and I didn't keep a copy myself, so I'm afraid you'll have to infer what she said from Hhhana's reply.

Subj: RE Discussion
Date: 97-03-20 13:52:18 EST
From: Hhhana

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

To: Lion

CC: All

Lion— It sure is. Wildcat put it really well. Wanted to add for those considering the issue it is something covered in Psych 101 at most colleges and universities.

This goes against the opinions of others in the group, but if you have enough time to prepare, you can skate a polygraph. It takes focus, but it can be done.

I'm not even saying Fuhrman did it. I really don't think he needed to. He wasn't asked the questions he would have if the test had been given by someone hired by Mr. Bailey.

See, Lion, this is intelligent discussion. I'm so glad you noticed the footnote to Wildcat's message or we might not have been able to share this. —Paula

Hhhana didn't make a copy of the Tiger letter she is responding to below and I didn't keep a copy myself, so I'm afraid you'll have to infer what she said from Hhhana's reply.

Subj: Put it to rest

Date: 97-03-20 15:38:42 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Tiger

CC: All

Tiger— The mind is a powerful teacher. It teaches our body everything it will ever know. As you are, I'm sure, aware, we can easily lower or raise our body heat, slow or hasten our heartbeat, raise or lower our metabolism just by using the mind.

We can easily travel through our bodies with our mind and untie the knots of tension that plague today's citizens.

In a demonstration to get through the Master's program, I hypnotized a fellow student, suggested I was going to burn his hand with a cigarette but that he would feel no pain. I

Chapter 24: BEATING THE MACHINE

then held the eraser end of a pencil in the palm of his hand. There was an immediate change in color in the palm area and a blister began to form. Don't you see? His mind was forming scar tissue under the area it assumed I had injured. These are not unique. I wouldn't want to share what I did when a fellow did a demonstration using me as the subject.

Again, I'm not saying Fuhrman skated the test. I'm just telling you it is not hard to do. —Paula

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter

Date: 97-03-20 17:35:24 EST

From: Phil (Philip T. Rabne)

To: Bull

CC: All

Bull—Let's just say Mark passed "a" lie detector test. I need to know more about the "kinds" of questions he was asked and the significance of the "structure" of those questions. I want to listen to FLB's criticisms of the methodology. If MF was tossed "puff balls" or asked benign questions then that speaks for itself. If, on the other hand, he was asked very direct and pointed questions, that too will speak for itself. Bottom line is, the issue is very complex and I don't feel we should glaze it over. The event (his test) should be carefully and thoroughly critiqued by all. —Phil

Subj: The Biased Media

Date: 97-03-20 17:26:28 EST

From: Bull M

To: Chameleon

CC: All

Chameleon—Have you found anything at all about the Fuhrman lie detector test? One would have thought the biased media would be falling all over itself today to inform their readers of the Mark Fuhrman interview. Not. The internet is silent. No mention of this momentous event on

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

any of the Home Pages (CNN, USAToday, LATIMES) I read. Search engines provided no content either. What does this mean to the theory that the media is out to get OJ?

—Bull

Subj: Re: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-20 17:31:41 EST

From: Cougar

To: Dable

CC: All

Two of the “did you see” questions were regarding the blood on the back gate and on the Bronco. If my memory serves me right there were several “did you plant” questions. One was in regard to the Rockingham glove and another was “did you plant/smear” blood (in regard to a couple of locations on or in the Bronco. I thought the questions were pretty straightforward—not geared toward allowing him to hedge at all. —Cougar

Subj: Re: Fuhrman

Date: 97-03-20 17:31:41 EST

From: Dable

To: Bull

CC: All

Bull— Actually I found the test very interesting. The only problem I had with it was that the question was ‘did you see’ the blood and not ‘did you plant’ the blood. I intend to try to get the transcripts as my VCR was being used on another project and I couldn’t tape the program. Did the questioner specifically ask if Fuhrman planted the glove? I’m thinking he did ask that specifically and the response indicated a truthful answer. I am aware that it is possible to ‘fool’ the test, but still consider it very interesting. I would think a person of the quality that did this exam would be able to discern if the respondent was able to queer the results.

Chapter 24: BEATING THE MACHINE

Also I thought the previous information regarding Fuhrman indicated that he was very good at his job. The question being, was he of a mind to help along an investigation so that an obviously guilty person (in his opinion) was convicted . If this lie detector test removes that suspicion, we can move on (or at least I can). My real opinion/feeling has always been a second person/ party was involved in the actual crime. —
Dianne

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD