

The Washington Post, like all the electronic media of which I am aware if not also of most of the media, has been prejudiced in its reporting of the O.J. Simpson murder trial in Los Angeles. They all feature and afvor the prosecution. Particularly dishonest is the Post's reporting of the August 1 trial in its August 2 edition. The headline across the top of three columns of type equalling more than a full column and a half is "Prosecution Has Plan on 'Gloves,'" the gloves Simpson is said to have worn when he killed his former wife and her friend. The subhead is "Tapes of Simpson Wearing Leather Gear Will be Introduced, Clark Vows." Marsha Clark is the chief prosecutor on the case. And what she "viewed" is more, much more, than this head says. She promised they would prove that those videotapes would prove that Simpson wore the actual gloves in evidence said to have been worn during the crime. Whether or that is true, even possible, remains to be seen. But it has not happened and what did happen the Post used this to avoid reporting. What did happen is the beginning of the utter destruction of the so-called scientific evidence linking Simpson to the crime, including the so-called linking of him to those gloves- that did not fit him, that he could not get on, on coast-to-coast TV. In brief, the sublimated testimony amounts to proof that the police faked the blood evidence. and what was entirely suppressed by the Post was that day's most dramatic testimony, testimony that in the past got sensational cases thrown out of court. Two such cases that come to mind ^{are} ~~is~~ the Cleveland acquittal of Dr. Sam Sheppard for killing his wife and Billie Sol Estes for assorted crookedness.

Writer Sam Bosco, who had written a Simpson story for Penthouse, testified that he had written that the DNA testing on a sock said to have been worn by Simpson had the blood of his former wife on it. This is specimen that from Herbert MacDonnell's testimony was planted on that sock. He also testified that the sock was without trace of having been worn since it was last washed, no perspiration, etc. Now Bosco testified to the date on which a uniformed member of the LA police Department leaked that information to him. That date was before ^{that} those socks ^{were} even sent for the DNA testing. So the only way the police could have known that Nicole Simpson's blood was on it is by the police having put it there. (The day before a TV reporter testified that the information had been leaked to her by more than one in a position to know and the timing indicates the possibility that Marsha Clark could have been one of those who leaked this propaganda to her.)

I have been interested in the Simpson case because the identical official misconduct and many dishonesties in the assassinations cases were being duplicated in it, beginning with successful efforts to prejudice potential jurors. Early on I tried to interest the AP in this, without success.

I watched the MacDonnell testimony, part of it, on TV. The Post seriously exaggerates the so-called "admissions" he made. He testified to the probable impossibility of the self-serving questions Clark asked him but said they were remotely possible. The story says he testified only that it was possible.

8/3/95

Prosecution Has Plan on Gloves

Tapes of Simpson Wearing Leather Gear Will Be Introduced, Clark Vows

8/2/95

By Lorraine Adams
Washington Post Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 1—The story of the gloves in the O.J. Simpson murder trial has another chapter coming.

Prosecutor Marcia Clark said today that videotapes of the celebrity defendant wearing the same leather gloves as those found at the murder scene will, after all, be presented in court.

On Monday, it looked as if defense tactics had kept that important piece of evidence from the jury. But Clark told Judge Lance A. Ito this morning that she intends to use the videotapes during the rebuttal phase of Simpson's trial to "refute planting and conspiracy" theories of the defense.

Her comments came after defense attorney Johnnie L. Cochran Jr. tried to draw out a clarification of comments Clark made yesterday. She had indicated she could prove the gloves found at the scene and at Simpson's estate matched gloves Simpson was wearing in a videotape taken when he was a television sports commentator. Cochran said today in court that a spokesperson for the District Attorney's Office was quoted in news reports as saying that Clark's comments were misunderstood.

After Clark and Ito made several icy protestations that they do not read newspapers on the case, Clark would not say she was misunderstood. Ito said: "So you stand by your statements. That's fine."

An indignant Cochran said the prosecution "will never be able to prove" the gloves were the same. The exchange on the gloves ended with Ito saying he had just received from the FBI a package of photographs and videos regarding shoes and gloves.

The gloves promise to stay important in the case. The pair police found seemed too small on Simpson's hands during a courtroom demonstration in June. But the prosecution said they did not fit because they had shrunk. The defense had planned to put on an experiment that showed similar leather gloves did not shrink when soaked in blood. But when Clark said she would put on the videotape of Simpson wearing a similar pair of gloves, the defense decided to forgo their shrinkage experiment. They may have, after all,

gained nothing by holding back.

Later in the morning, Clark cross-examined defense expert Herbert MacDonnel for a second day. He agreed with still two other scenarios that were in keeping with the prosecution view of how Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald L. Goldman were slain.

A specialist in blood spatters, MacDonnel said the blood on the sock

could have gotten there when the murderer's ankle made contact with a step slick with Nicole Simpson's blood. It could also have gotten there when it touched the bloody neck of Nicole Simpson.

MacDonnel has testified that the blood on the inside of the sock was wet when it got there, not flaked, as

*An indignant
Johnnie L. Cochran
Jr. said the
prosecution "will
never be able to
prove" the gloves
were the same.*

the prosecution had said. That distinction bolsters the defense's contention that the blood was planted, and poured on top of the sock as it lay flat.

But there are scenarios other than planting that fit MacDonnel's central claim, and Clark succeeded in getting him to admit to even more of them today.

One such scenario could have occurred during testing of the socks. MacDonnel said it was possible that a very wet cotton swab run across the socks to test them could have resulted in blood dripping through the other side, but only if the experiment were conducted "sloppily." To do the test properly, he said, only a damp swab is necessary.

Clark also nudged gently at Mac-

Donnel's peerless scientific reputation. MacDonnel, a gray-bearded man with glasses and a grandfatherly manner, acknowledged readily that he lives above his crime lab, had only one full-time employee, and that his results are not monitored by any independent agency.

Clark also made sure the jury knew MacDonnel was paid. Under questioning, he said he has billed the defense \$10,500 so far for his work in the case, and that if he charged his regular fee, an additional \$18,000 would be due. But he said he wasn't sure he'd charge that much because he's never before had a case like this one.

On redirect with attorney Peter Neufeld, the defense recovered some lost ground.

MacDonnel told the jury that blood clots between four and six minutes.

If the blood were deposited on the glove at the crime scene at Bundy, he said, "I would expect to see traces of

clot material on the surface." He conceded that clot material could have been removed during handling of the sock, but that he did not see any when he examined it.

Neufeld also raised questions about another prosecution theory about how Nicole Simpson's blood got on the sock. Yesterday, MacDonnel had acknowledged her blood could have gotten on Simpson's hands. But why, Neufeld asked, was none of her blood found on the light switches, the banisters, the white bedspread or the carpet?

Ito sustained Clark's objections to the questions about the light switches and the banisters, but the jury heard MacDonnel say there was no such blood found on the bedspread or the carpet.

More transcripts on jurors dismissals were released today, including Ito's investigation of Francine Florio-Bunten, who told The Washington Post that she was wrongly dismissed.

The transcripts show the investigation began with an anonymous letter from a receptionist at a literary agency, who wrote Ito that her boss had met to discuss a book deal with the husband of a juror, who was about 40-years-old and white. Florio-Bunten was the only white female juror of that

age.

Florio-Bunten denied she was writing a book. But the transcript shows Ito did not dismiss her because he believed the anonymous allegation. Instead, it was a note from another juror, Farron Chavarria, who was also eventually dismissed, that led to Florio-Bunten's dismissal.

During questioning about the book, a third juror told Ito that she saw Florio-Bunten reading a newspaper on which Chavarria had scribbled something. When Ito asked Chavarria if she had scribbled a note, she denied it. Only when she was shown the note, did she admit it. Chavarria had written: "They asked about a juror writing a book."

Florio-Bunten also denied seeing the note. "Somebody may have written something on that newspaper, but I didn't see it," she said. Ito said he dismissed her for not being truthful about the note.

FOR MORE INFORMATION 

To read Post coverage of the Simpson case over the last year, see *Digital Ink*, The Post's on-line service. To learn about *Digital Ink*, call 1-800-510-5104, ext. 9000.