

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

“THE TRUTH IS IN THE DETAILS.” —Dan Petrocelli, attorney for the Brown family in the wrongful death action against O.J. Simpson

*The truth about the OJG/OJI debate is in the details we thought were significant. If O.J. is guilty what about all those pesky little details that argue in his favor and dispute the big things that argue against him? The OJG's were not worried about getting everything right since it's reasonable to expect that there will be some loose ends. Before Fuhrman announced his theory that a Swiss Army knife was used, the OJG's simply ignored the prosecution's failure to tie O.J. to the weapon or any weapon that might have been used in the crime. Never mind where it went; where did it come from? The OJG's couldn't be bothered with details like that. It was enough for them that he got hold of it "somehow" because he used it to bash Nicole in the head and to butcher her and Ron Goldman.*

*It was enough that O.J. got rid of the blue/black sweats "somehow," until Fuhrman said he found them in the washer. To accept that report, they had to forget the details. They had to forget that no blue/black fibers were found in the washer, the dark clothes were positively identified as Arnelle's underwear, and the timeline was too short. But how did he leave that pattern of blood-drops on his property, bang into Kato's wall and get rid of the shoes and the knife? Well, first you take a weak OJI position—even if you have to make it up. Then apply a little Lion logic...*

Subj: Re: No blood on stairs  
Date: 97-03-23  
From: Lion  
To: Maggie  
CC: All

Maggie—If you are suggesting that Simpson's blood was planted at Rockingham, perhaps you should know that Vannatter did not arrive with Simpson's sample until after

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

4pm on Monday, June 13th! The blood was seen in the foyer, in the driveway and in Simpson's upstairs bathroom 12 hours earlier. Would be pretty darn hard to plant Simpson's blood even before they took the sample from him, now wouldn't it! As for there being blood in the foyer and not on the white carpeting on the stairs, would you walk on white carpeting with bloody shoes? You would take them off, wouldn't you? If your finger was dripping blood, wouldn't you grab a paper towel from the kitchen before you went upstairs to the bedroom? So, we have blood in the foyer, no blood on the stairs, and blood in the upstairs bathroom. Really not that hard to logically put it together! —Lion

Lion— He wouldn't even need the paper towel—if he carried the shoes in the hand that was bleeding the blood would just drip inside the shoes. —Cougar

Cougar— Certainly that's another possibility! But, I have always contended that the bloody shoes were in the black bag with the knife left out in the driveway —Lion

Lion—Yes, I agree it's more likely the shoes were in the black bag outside. Of course the most simplistic way to stop the dripping (once he noticed he was bleeding) is to stick the cut finger into the mouth—it's almost instinctive to do that. —Cougar

Maggie— It is my recollection that the 4 blood-drops in the foyer contained "only" OJ's DNA. —Chameleon

Subj: Good-bye for awhile

Date: 97-03-24 14:42:38 EST

From: Hhhana

To: Peggy

CC: Crowe, Trille, Trooper

Everybody— I have read the mail going back and forth and, of course, I am very disappointed in the elevated status Mark Fuhrman has achieved among some. I was furious when I

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

read it, have tried to put the shoe on the other foot and imagine how OJG's feel when they butt up against those of us who still admire O.J. Simpson. Maybe it's a similar feeling...not sure.

I do know Mark Fuhrman to be a racist and a liar. Was he a good police officer? I think it depends on your race and sex. If you are a white American male, he was probably wonderful. Should he be a police officer anywhere? No!

...Mark Fuhrman, whose book is #1 on the bestseller list... is more dangerous now.... The more he feels accepted, the more powerful he will become. He was not a good cop. The citizen's watch group in LA had many complaints filed against him for brutality to blacks. He is rotten to the core and cannot be allowed any status....

Please get a copy of the tapes....please read his words for yourselves. "The main thing you need to know about niggers is the first thing out of their mouths is a f\_\_\_\_\_ lie" laughing... "you can't bruise a nigger" These are words that will haunt me always. I hate them, but I don't ever want to forget them. If you can set them aside, Mark Fuhrman will become a good guy and he is not. If we let him back in, we are in much more trouble than many of you realize.

Many in this group KNOW OJ is the killer, some in the group believe him to be innocent. It doesn't matter which way any of us think regarding OJ. OJ is a snowball in the summer. You'll believe what you have to and I'll believe what I have to. You don't agree with me, it's okay. I'll never agree with you unless OJ calls me and says, "Paula, I did it." Again, it's O.K.

But if we can only agree on one thing, should it not be Mark Fuhrman? Those who think OJ guilty and those of us who believe him innocent can at least stand together against Fuhrman and the likes of Fuhrman? There is no place in our country for him. —Paula

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Re: Fuhrman's clean record

Date: 97-03-24 21:32:09 EST

From: Tiger

To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

CC: Matlock, Maggie (Rita Lava), Cougar, Rabne, Pat, Chameleon, Puma, Lion, Bear, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Panther, Bull

Peggy— I will not be put in a position of defending Fuhrman. Focusing on him is falling into the same trap as in the trial. Fuhrman, so far as I am concerned, is no different from any cop who deals with the lowest form of criminals— of any color or race. They do not deal with them as gentlemen, and sometimes get down to the same level of the street people they accost on a daily basis. I don't know. I am not a police officer or a criminal.

I am not about to judge the words above the deeds. All I say, and stand by, is that Fuhrman's past has no bearing on this case. If you believe he planted the glove, eliminate the glove from the evidence, and you still get a murderer named Simpson. Fuhrman passed a polygraph with flying colors. Enough said. There is enough sleaze in this case, on both sides, to go around many times. I really have no interest in a discussion of the other personalities, unless it adds to a discovery of the truth about the murders. I'd like to know how many times Bailey has used the N word in the past ten years. You can bet it was more often than Fuhrman. —Tiger

Subj: Fuhrman's clean record

Date: 97-03-25 14:57:43 EST

From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

To: Tiger

CC: All

Tiger: You say you will not be put in a position of defending Fuhrman, yet this is the second time this month that you have done so. On March 3rd you wrote "Fuhrman was

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

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.” And then your latest post about his clean record. Whether you like it or not, you are defending Fuhrman.

I’m beginning to see a trend here. It’s kind of a thrust and retreat type of thing. You thrust with Fuhrman’s clean record, and the minute someone comes back with anything refuting that clean record, you retreat into the “I will not be put in a position of defending Mark Fuhrman” mode.

Maybe there are some of us who feel Mark Fuhrman’s past has a definite bearing on this case. I can only request of you what you have requested of me. When you make a statement, prove it. You have commented twice, within one month, about Fuhrman’s clean record. Where is your proof? I have given you mine, and since Mr. Fuhrman passed his lie detector test with such flying colors, we know he doesn’t lie. Of course, he was not asked about the “N” word or about Kathleen Bell. I agree with Matlock. I too wonder why he wasn’t asked about Kathleen Bell. That would have been one way to tell whether he or she was lying. He has continually denied saying anything to Kathleen Bell.

Perhaps his publisher who footed the bill for this little fiasco didn’t want any questions asked that would show the world what kind of individual Mr. Fuhrman is. So, Tiger, since you, Lion, Bear and Bull are always so fast to demand proof from us (and I think I speak for the majority of OJI’s), let’s see some “proof” of Mr. Fuhrman’s “clean record” and distinguished career on the streets protecting us from the criminal element out there. —Peggy

Subj: e-mail

Date: 97-03-24 15:04:18 EST

From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

To: Pat

CC: Maggie (Rita Lava), Rabne, Hhhana, Trooper, Dable, Connie

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Hi Pat— You know, what is so strange is that when you and I, or I and Paula, or Jasper want to talk we do it between each other and don't subject the rest of the group to our chitchat. But the one-liners between the Big 4 will go on forever, I guess. Diana Fleming wrote to have her name off the list, which I have done. She said she had 350 messages, and I'll bet over 1/4th of them were the one-liners. Personally, I don't even find them funny.

Anyhow Bear and Tiger have requested a list of questions. It may take me a day or two, but I plan to go back over a lot of stuff, and get a list together for them. I will probably send them to you, Paula, and Jasper first and see if you all can add any and then we will send them on and see what kind of answers we get.

I can just see it now; "the DNA, the blood-drops, the photographs, the Bruno Magli shoeprints, the hair, the knit cap, the fibers!" Or, "well that doesn't have anything to do with the fact that there were 30 inconsistencies in OJ's testimony," or, "Mark Fuhrman is just misunderstood"—I thought I would gag on that one.

Let's work on a list and see if we can get them to put their money where their mouths are. Phil, I have included your name, but if you're not interested that's okay. Let me know what you think. —Peggy

Subj: e-mail

Date: 97-03-25

From: Trooper

To: Peggy

CC: Maggie (Rita Lava), Rabne, Hhhana, Dable, Connie, Pat

Peggy— What can I tell you? These people are gone. I stopped conversing with them a long time ago—at their request, and they still send me tons of their useless junk. It's

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

like I told Trille, I think it's a deliberate plan to keep us from getting anything useful done. Don't know now how we can include them in the book. Maybe if I approached them now, the games would stop. What do you think? —Jasper

Subj: Re: Fuhrman's clean record

Date: 97-03-26 01:03:21 EST

From: Tiger

To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)

CC: All

Peggy— The LAPD spent thousands of hours investigating Fuhrman. Nothing came of it. The proof is in the absence of any complaints against the man during his entire career on the force. In fact, just the opposite. He was considered a very good cop, and worked with a Hispanic partner who vouches for Fuhrman's fairness. The Bell incident goes back lots of years, and has no relevance on the case. I don't go back and forth, as you suggest. I just don't want to get sidetracked from the issue at hand. I have never seen a case in history where the vocabulary of an arresting officer was put on trial *[Editor's note: Just flashed on a session of Congress before W.W.II when the Rape of Nanking was summed up as an argument over a bean patch in China].*

I don't want to defend Fuhrman, that is true. But, if need be, I will. If you want this discussion to become a Fuhrman Discussion group, I'm just not interested. There has not been one shred of EVIDENCE to back up any wrongdoing by Fuhrman in this case. I remember when Jesse Jackson made a remark about "Jew York." He apologized and life went on. If you show me evidence that OJ is less guilty because Fuhrman said the N word at ANY time, I'll consider it seriously.

You are using backward logic. You are saying Fuhrman planted evidence. The burden of proof is on YOU, not on me to substantiate that. You are saying he was a racist cop. The burden is yours again. If we eliminated every cop who

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

used the N word or any other racial slur, we'd have no police force. Let's train our cops to become more sensitive to minorities, and clean up our acts all over the country. But let's not say that OJ is innocent because Fuhrman used the N word or did anything else outside of this case, unless YOU have proof. —Tiger

Subj: Re: Why am I surprised?  
Date: 97-03-30 15:37:06 EST  
From: Pat  
To: Trooper, Trille (Christine Armas)  
CC: Hhhana, Peggy, Dable, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie

Trille and everyone—Hi. You know up here in Canada, a lot of people think we don't have a problem with racism but that's baloney. Maggie probably knows this more than I do as she lives in a big city. I think racism is everywhere. It's just a matter of degree and openness. Not far from where I live now there is a place that was a stop on the underground railway when the slaves escaped and ran to freedom. We all like that idea, I think of being unbiased etc. but I'm not so sure it's real as much as it is an ideal. Well we can only hope that someday "people will be judged, not by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character" I think that's a wonderful quote and I think of it a lot. —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Why am I surprised?  
Date: Sunday, March 30, 1997  
From: Trooper  
To: Hhhana  
CC: Christine Armas, Patricia Whetham, Peggy, Dianne, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie

Paula— We cry for our country (our continent) together. What gets me more than anything else is how blind people are to their own bigotry. They say that their feelings about

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

OJ have nothing to do with race, but when you read the e-mails, you know, absolutely, that it isn't true.

What happened to OJ and what is continuing to happen to him and his youngest children, is beginning to look more and more like an excuse for millions of Americans to show the resentment they had all along for OJ's place in their lives. It's like seeing people who had to be kind to a rich uncle they despised, stripping the gold off of his coffin with glee. As long as OJ was OJ he had to be treated with the respect and admiration his accomplishments entitled him to or it would reflect badly on us. Now that he can be called a murderer, even if you have to close your eyes to a "mountain of evidence" that says he isn't, he is entitled to nothing. He's just another nigger.

Pay no mind to the "n" word. It's not really important. As Tiger so astoundingly noted in defense of Mark Fuhrman, it's not the word that counts, it's the deed.

God forgive them, for they are seriously fucked-up. —Jasper

Subj: Re: Why am I surprised?

From: Christine Armas

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

To: Trooper

CC: Hhhana, Patricia Whetham, Peggy, Dianne, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie

Hi guys— Trooper, how perfectly you expressed it, that people only behaved nicely when they had to, and now we see how they really are! Notice the racial beating in Chicago, indicative of the new lack of shame, they are only young men but they thought that everyone thought it was OK to be a racists and do something about it. Those young men were only acting out what they thought they saw around them.

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

One reason I like Pres. Clinton so much is that he overcame his Southern “poor white trash” background and is not a racist. He was able to see beyond the hate and evil that was all around him. Of course, it helped him that he got an education, esp. his time in Oxford and Georgetown. I don’t know if you know this, but Sen. Fulbright apparently was a racist and it pained the people who otherwise loved and respected the Senator that he was so blind in this area. I guess that is what it is, blindness, and it affects people who are thought to be educated and intelligent. But this blindness is a disability. You know, Ronald Reagan had it, too, only his ideas were that racism didn’t exist. That in a way is even worse, not even acknowledging it.... —Trille

Subj: Re: Why am I surprised?

Date: 97-04-04 01:08:03 EST

From: Trooper173

To: Trille

CC: Hhhana, Pat, Peggy, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie

Hi Christine— Four or five days ago, I promised you a letter in response to the one you wrote about the racist attack by the five boys in Chicago, and the reasons for your feelings about Clinton, Fulbright and Reagan. Here it is:

As always, your observation about the effects and manifestations of racism went to the heart of things. The boys in Chicago, who were arrested for brutalizing a kid because he was black, were as much victims of racism as the boy they assaulted. The same is true of all the folks on the bottom of the economic pyramid who have put billions of dollars into the pockets of the media elite by their appearances on television. I mean sponsors, producers, anchors and commentators of “mainstream” news and information programs as well as sponsors, producers and hosts of talk shows like Jerry, Sally, Jenny, Montel and Geraldo.

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

Give the people what they want and they will reward you. “The people” want to be entertained. They want their emotions stirred. They want to feel superior to somebody. They want to see their favorite stereotypes in “real life” so they can rest assured that their feelings about “them” are justified by “reality.”

It seems there is little that some people won't do for attention of any variety and nothing they won't do for applause. Why the Chicago case got national attention, I don't know. Since the verdict in the criminal trial of OJ Simpson, incidents like that have been popping up all over. It's almost as though they are in retaliation for what black men on television seem to be doing to white people in general, especially white women. Within the past year or so, television has shown me so many faces of black men who raped or killed white women, and those who were accused of raping or killing them, that I am conditioned to expect it.

Knowing that a white woman is far more likely to be raped and killed by a Ted Bundy than a Rufus Jones, doesn't matter. I picture a black male perpetrator and a white female victim whenever I hear a news report of a woman being sexually assaulted. I'm sure that the Chicago kids did, too. Black women assaulted by black men don't get much air time. Poor white women assaulted by poor white men don't either. This is the numerical truth of the situation, but it's not what we've been seeing lately. What does get airtime is what leaves an impression.

Our common visions are what drive us all in a common direction. We behave according to how we see things and what our print and electronic eyes and ears on the world allow us to see.

During the '60s and '70s we saw enough to be ashamed of our bigotry. In the '80s there was a subtle change with a profound effect that culminated in how a majority of people

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

judged the jury in the OJ Simpson murder case. Rosalynn Carter said it best in her observation about Ronald Reagan: "He made people feel comfortable with their prejudice." To hold a set of values that effectively kept black people (and others like them), "in their place," by allowing for a few high-profile exceptions to the rule, all people needed to do was call themselves, conservatives.

Fulbright was no conservative. He understood that many of the conservative policies that kept poor blacks from improving their lot, hit poor whites even harder, because in terms of absolute numbers, there were more of them. The image of Fulbright being a good-guy comes from his "opposition to the war in Vietnam."

The war is where I got my first taste of the power of images now being used against OJ and OJI's like us. The truth is, there were racists, assholes and fools on both sides of the Vietnam debate, but most people only saw the ones on my side. I bet you never even heard of thinking, caring Vietnam vets on "the wrong side of the issue."

Bill Clinton and I fought on opposite sides in that war. His side won. They persuaded the country that the Viet Cong and the Khmer Rouge were the good guys. They convinced the public that we had nothing to win and no way to do it. Conviction is what wins wars.

With the peace movement's victory came genocide on a scale unmatched since WWII, and the entrenched Americans who won their war against Americans like Dennis and me, firmly in power. They have one thing in common besides the pride they took in "ending the war": They made the American people comfortable with their lack of concern for anyone but themselves. They led us into our new role in the world as covert, low-risk mischief-makers who could peacefully coexist with genocide.

## Chapter 26: DETAILS

I got so fed up with that policy of complicity by non-action, that I wrote and published a book, a copy of which I sent to the President as soon as possible after the books were printed in July of '95. I never made money or got recognition for any good I was able to do, but when I heard Clinton and his advisors using arguments almost word-for-word from my book to justify sending American troops to Bosnia, I knew that I had won a battle that mattered.

With our OJ book, we may be able to win the war.

Your friend —Jasper

Subj: Re: Grand Jury Testimony

Date: 97-03-31 21:38:47 EST

From: Kim

To: Trooper

Trooper— Why are people so quick to discount Faye Resnick anyway? May the forces of evil become confused on the way to your house —Kim

Kim— Beats the hell out of me. I know she's important. OJ thinks she's the key to finding the killer. But she may be a decoy—someone the killer knew that OJ would fix on to divert attention from himself. Whoever the killer is, he's a master manipulator who understands human psychology better than most. I just wish I knew more about Resnick's friends and her relationship to Kato. What do you know about them?  
—Jasper

Jasper— I think Resnick would make a good suspect. She's cunning, manipulative, did/does drugs, and knows OJ's layout pretty well. I'm not sure about her friends. But it is possible that she and Nicole were fooling around with Ron. Maybe a little lovers spat gone wrong? —Kim

Maggie— What I'm trying to do with the book is to raise the level of our e-mail and CTV thread conversations about OJ

## IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

to the national level of debate. The fact that you and at least three others are Canadians puts us in an even wider arena of ideas. I want everybody north of the Rio Grande to know that there are intelligent people who believe, for intelligent reasons, that OJ is innocent. I want people to see how the evidence against OJ compares to the evidence against Fuhrman. I want them to consider the possibility that the murderer might be Fuhrman and that the “travesty in Brentwood” could be a disaster for all of us down the road...

...It is possible for “the little guy” to do big things with the written word. I’ve had some huge successes with letters to the right people at the right time, and with a book that I lost money on but I know has done some good. It’s not every day that you get to use the special gifts God gave us to right a terrible wrong. To me, it’s a moral obligation to do more than just talk. —Jasper