

Rank (R)  
R 11 OF 18

Database Mode  
OREGONIAN Page

**CLARK ARGUES FOR THE PROSECUTION**

Oregonian (PO) - WEDNESDAY, September 27, 1995  
Edition: SUNRISE Section: WIRE STORIES Page: A16  
Word Count: 1,271

**TEXT:**

Excerpts Tuesday from prosecutor Marcia Clark 's closing arguments in the O.J. Simpson murder case, taken from unofficial trial transcripts compiled by West Publishing Co.:

- -

First, I want to take this opportunity to thank you, and I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart. You have been through so much. You have made a tremendous sacrifice. You haven't seen your children enough, you haven't seen your family enough, you haven't seen your loved ones enough, and all of this in the name of justice, service of justice.

In the exhaustive examination and cross-examination of all of the witnesses in this case and the exhaustive investigation and work that's been done, one thing is clear: This defendant has received the ultimate in a fair trial. And at least we know that. You have that assurance.

Now, in the course of presenting all of this evidence, in this trial, just like every trial, some evidence has been presented to you that really is not relevant to answer the core question of who murdered Ron Goldman and Nicole Brown. And it's up to you, the jury, to weed out the distractions, weed out the side shows and determine what evidence is it that really helps me answer this question.

- -

Although the brutal and callous way in which Ron and Nicole were murdered may understandably make you feel sorrow, pity, even anger, it would be wrong to find the defendant guilty just because you felt sorry for them.

On the other hand, although it would be completely understandable if you were to feel angry and disgusted with Mark Fuhrman, as we all are, still it would be wrong to find the defendant guilty -- not guilty -- just because of that anger and disgust.

- -

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



And let me come back to Mark Fuhrman for a minute, just so it's clear.

Did he lie when he testified here in this courtroom saying that he did not use racial epithets in the last 10 years? Yes.

Is he a racist? Yes.

Is he the worst LAPD has to offer? Yes.

Do we wish that this person was never hired by LAPD? Yes. Should LAPD have ever hired him? No. Should such a person be a police officer? No.

In fact, do we wish there were no such person on the planet? Yes.

But the fact that Mark Fuhrman is a racist and lied about it on the witness stand does not mean that we haven't proven the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and it would be a tragedy if, with such overwhelming evidence, ladies and gentlemen, as we have presented to you, you found the defendant not guilty in spite of all that because of the racist attitudes of one police officer.

--

Because the defense has thrown out many other questions, they throw out questions about whether LAPD has some bad police officers. Does the scientific division have some sloppy criminalists? Does the coroner's office have some sloppy coroners? And the answer to all these questions is, re. Yes, they do. That's not news to you. I am sure it wasn't a big surprise to you. But those are not -- they are important issues, you know, we should look into the quality control, things should be done better, things could always be done better in every case at every time. There is no question about that, but we are not here to vote on that today.

--

We have proven to you that (the blood) was not contaminated. We have even proven to you that it was not planted, for lack of a better term, and I am going to go through the evidence and demonstrate how we have proven that to you.

--

So why were these issues raised? Why were these questions raised? Well, they are all questions and issues that were raised as a distraction. There were roads raised, roads created by the defense to lead you away from the core truth and the issue that we are searching for the question -- for the answer to -- which is, who murdered Ron and Nicole?

But these roads, ladies and gentlemen, these are false roads. They're false roads because they lead to a dead end. The false roads were paved

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



with inflammatory distractions, but even after all their tireless efforts, the evidence stands strong and powerful to prove to you the defendant's guilt.

- -

We don't guess anybody guilty; we prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, which is what we've done in this case.

- -

What kind of evidence did (the defense) present to demonstrate something to you, to prove something to you? If they try to prove something to you, their witnesses, their evidence gets evaluated by the same rules ours do. The same jury instruction applies.

- -

The defense would have you believe that the thumping and the appearance of that glove, the defendant's glove, were unrelated events. And the thumps themselves, just think about that. Regardless of where or how they happened, just the fact that they happened, shortly after the murders, at the defendant's house and just before the defendant walked up his driveway in dark clothing, like the dark blue or black sweat outfit that Kato described, you just put those facts together, and you realize what has happened.

And it was just as simple as that. Simple common sense tells you that the thumping, the gloves and the defendant's appearance on the driveway almost immediately thereafter are all part of one set of events, all connected in time and space. You don't need science to tell you that. You just need reason and logic.

- -

Now, let me ask you this. Why didn't the defendant let Allan Park drive into the driveway? Why leave him sitting out there at the gate? Why make him wait outside? Because the defendant was frazzled, ladies and gentlemen. He was hurried. And he needed to buy some time. Time to wash himself up, wash off the blood, change the clothes, and to compose himself to appear normal, to appear calm, business as usual. So he bought himself that time, and he did not let Allan in.

\*

- -

So now the little amplicons, the little DNAs, they're co-conspirators,  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



too, because they know they've got to rush to only the places where you can attribute the blood to the murderer. When you think about that, just think about that one point logically. Obviously, it's common sense if contamination is going on, you're going to see it going on all over the place.

--

I mean, there is what, there is 5 billion people on the planet? That means you would have to go through 37 billion people to find the DNA profile that matches Mr. Simpson's. There are only 5 billion people on the planet. Ladies and gentlemen, that's an identification. OK? That proves it's his blood, nobody else's on the planet. No one. . .

--

And now, you see, to summarize, on the knit cap we have the defendant's hair and the Bronco fiber from the carpet in his Bronco -- and another piece of the puzzle.

--

This is another important piece of evidence that proves the defendant's guilt. The shoe prints are all size 12. . . . And these are not just any size 12s, they are expensive shoes, casual shoes that cost 160 bucks, not dress shoes, shoes that would be worn by a rich man, the kind of man who would wear cashmere-lined gloves.

-- The Associated Press

Copyright (c) 1995, The Oregonian Publishing Company  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



Rank(R)  
R 10 OF 10

Database      Mode  
OREGONIAN     Page

CLOSING ARGUMENTS - EXCERPTS FROM CLOSING ARGUMENTS BY DEPUTY...  
Oregonian (PO) - THURSDAY, September 28, 1995  
Edition: SUNRISE Section: WIRE STORIES Page: A18  
Word Count: 1,599

## MEMO:

The O.J. Simpson Trial  
TYPE: National Quotation

## TEXT:

Excerpts from closing arguments by Deputy District Attorney Christopher Darden, and by the chief defense lawyer, Johnnie Cochran Jr., as transcribed by The New York Times:

\* DARDEN -

## THE TWO FACES OF O.J.

It's 10 o'clock. He's in his Bronco. He's at Nicole's house. It's nighttime. But we're not even talking about June 12. We're not talking about June 12, 1994; we're talking about Oct. 25, 1993.

All along I've asked you to be open-minded. To be open-minded about this man and who he is. And we have suggested to you -- and I think we've proven to you -- that he is not the person that you see on those TV commercials at half-time in those football games. That is his public persona. We all have one. We all have one. We behave a certain way when we're in public, and we behave another way when we're at home. You know what they say: Nobody knows what goes on behind closed doors.

## A RAGE KILLING

He made a choice that day. He chose Nicole over Paula, and he lost them both.

And so he arrives at Bundy. And Ms. Clark discussed with you yesterday the details of the murder, of both murders, and I don't want to, you know, repeat all that she said. But one of the things that she said that I just want to elaborate on a little bit is his choice, his weapon choice. His use of a knife.

This is a rage killing; and it is up front, and it is personal. And that is why you see all the brutality that you see. Common sense tells us that. I mean we know that just from life experience and from living in L.A., we know what kind of killing this is. This is a rage killing.

And he's using a knife because he is there to settle a personal score, a personal vendetta that he has.

He stabs this woman, all right, in the neck. And he's right there. I  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



mean it's one on one. And the rage that he has, the anger, the hate that he has for her that night at that time, it's like it -- it flows out of him and into -- into the knife and from the knife into her.

Into her.

And he kills Goldman. And he kills her in this rage. And let me -- let me make it clear to you: He's enraged but he has made a conscious decision, a premeditated decision, a deliberate decision to go there and do what he is about to do to this woman. Otherwise why would he take a big knife with him, right?

\* COCHRAN

- IMPORTANCE OF DIGNITY

We all understand our various roles in this endeavor that I'm going to call a journey toward justice.

Let me ask each of you a question: Have you ever in your life been falsely accused of something? Have you ever been falsely accused? Ever have to sit there and take it and watch the proceedings and wait and wait, all the while knowing you didn't do it?

All you could do during such a process is to really maintain your dignity, isn't that correct? Knowing that you were innocent, but maintaining your dignity and remembering always that all you're left with after a crisis is your conduct during it.

So that's another reason why we're proud to represent this man, who's maintained his innocence and has conducted himself with dignity throughout these proceedings.

- POLICE MISCONDUCT

From the very first order issued by the LAPD's so-called brass, they were more concerned with their own images, the publicity that might be generated from this case, than they were in doing professional police work. That's why this case has become such a hallmark. And that's why Mr. Simpson is the one on trial. But your verdict in this case will go far beyond the walls of Department 103 because your verdict talks about justice in America and it talks about the police and whether they're above the law. And it looks at the police perhaps as though they haven't been looked at very recently.

Remember I told you, this is not for the naive, the faint-of-heart or the timid.

So, it seems to us that the evidence shows that professional police work took a back seat right at the beginning. Untrained officers trampled -- remember I used the words in the opening statement -- they traipsed through

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



the witness -- through the evidence.

They delayed unconscionably routine procedures and notifying the coroners. They didn't call the criminalists out on time. And, yes, they allowed this investigation to be infected by a dishonest and corrupt detective. They did that in this case and they may try to back away from it all they want, but that's very important, as you're going to see, to this case and the resolution of my client's innocence.

Because of their bumbling, they ignored the obvious clues. They didn't pick up paper at the scene with prints on it. Because of their vanity, they very soon pretended to solve this crime and we think implicated an innocent man.

And they never, they never ever, looked for anyone else.

We think, if they'd done their job, as we have done, Mr. Simpson would have been eliminated early on.

And so this case is not -- let me say at the outset -- is not about attacking the Los Angeles Police Department. We're not anti-police in making these statements. You're not anti-police. We all need the police. I just said we have so much crime in this country, we need the police.

But what we need and what we must demand -- what all of us should have -- are honest, effective, nonbiased police officers. Who could demand less?

#### - THE TIMELINE

You look back and see what Ms. Clark promised you a year ago, 10:15, 10:15 was all they talked about and they were going to use. Because of the incompetence of this investigation, the wail of a dog, that's what we've been relegated to in this case because of this very, very poor investigation.

But having said the defense doesn't have to prove anything in this case, we did in fact. So Mr. Darden can talk all he wanted to about his theories about motive, and they're just that, his speculative theories about motive. But when it came down to the end, he wasn't talking about motive, was he?

He was trying to talk about our timeline. And why would he do that? Let's talk about why he would. Because the defense in this case called many witnesses who corroborate each other and who shatter the prosecution's timeline. Now, these are witnesses to a person who were known by the prosecution but discarded by the prosecution.

Why? Because they didn't fit their tortured narrow window of opportunity. So when you -- you would visualize for me that jigsaw puzzle where they want to reduce this down to a jigsaw puzzle, the part that deals with opportunity is the timeline.

- BLOODY SHOES

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



But what does she tell you yesterday? Well, he still has the knife. And he's in these bloody clothes and, presumably, in bloody shoes. And what does he do? He goes in the house. Now, thank heaven Judge Ito took us on a jury view. You have seen this house. You have seen this carpet.

If he went in that house with bloody shoes, with bloody clothes, with his bloody hands as they say, where is the blood on the doorknob? Where is the blood on the light switch? Where is the blood on the bannister? Where is the blood on the carpet? It's like almost white carpet going up that stairs. Where is all the blood trail they have been bandying about in this mountain of evidence?

- THE GLOVES

As I started to say before, perhaps the single most defining moment in this trial is the day they thought they would conduct this experiment on these gloves.

They had this big build-up with Mr. Rubin (Richard Rubin, a former executive of Aris Isotoner), who had been out of the business for five, six, seven, eight years. He had been in marketing even when he was there. But they were going to try to demonstrate to you that these were the killer's gloves and these gloves that fit Mr. Simpson. You don't need any photographs to understand this.

I suppose that vision is indelibly imprinted in each and every one of your minds of how Mr. Simpson walked over here and stood before you and you saw four simple words, the gloves didn't fit. And all their strategy started changing after that. Rubin was called back here more than all their witnesses, four times, all together. Rubin testified more than the investigating officers in this case, because their case from that day forward was slipping away from them and they knew it and they could never, ever recapture it.

- MARK FUHRMAN

Did he lie? Did he lie? Did he lie under oath? Did this key prosecution witness lie under oath? . . .

And I'm going to end this part and resume with him tomorrow morning: Did he lie? . . .

This man cannot be trusted. He is central to the prosecution. And for them to say he's not important is untrue. And you will not fall for it. Because as guardians of justice here, you can't let it happen.

CAPTION:  
PHOTO

Photo - Johnnie Cochran Jr. by The Associated Press  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.





Rank (R)  
R 15 OF 27

Database Mode  
OREGONIAN Page

**CLOSING ARGUMENTS**

Oregonian (PO) - FRIDAY, September 29, 1995  
Edition: SUNRISE Section: WIRE STORIES Page: A20  
Word Count: 839

**MEMO:**

The O.J. Simpson Trial  
TYPE: National

**TEXT:**

Following are Thursday's closing arguments , excerpted by topic, by defense lawyers Johnnie Cochran Jr. and Barry Scheck, as transcribed by The New York Times: **COCHRAN**  
- TWINS OF DECEPTION

We had started talking about the messages in this case. We talked briefly about (Detective Phillip) Vannatter and about all of his big lies. His lies become very important because he's the co-lead investigator in this case.

From the very beginning he was lying to you.

It was interesting, and I thought about this last night after I left you, about 10 days ago -- a week or 10 days ago, Vannatter took that stand again and you saw him. You had a chance to again observe his demeanor. You're smart, you know when somebody's lying and not telling you the truth.

I mean I don't have to go into that, you don't need the jury instruction. You've got this visceral reaction, you've got your experiences in life and you know when somebody's lying.

But, you know, he said something really interesting. And it was really preposterous when you think about it. He said, "Mr. Shapiro, Mr. O.J. Simpson was no more a suspect than you were."

Now, who in here believed that? Did he really think he's going to come back in here and we're going to believe that? That O.J. Simpson was no more a suspect than Robert Shapiro? That's what he told you.

Big lies. You can't trust him. You can't believe anything he says because it goes to the core of this case. When you're lying at the beginning, you'll be lying at the end.

The Book of Luke talks about that. It talks about if you're untruthful in small things, you should be disbelieved in big things. There's no question about that. We've known that all along.

So this man, with his big lies and then we have (retired Detective Mark)  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



Fuhrman coming right on the heels, and the two of them need to be paired together because they are twins of deception.

Fuhrman and Vannatter: twins of deception, who bring you a message that you cannot trust. That you cannot trust.

- THE COVER-UP

Why did they all try to cover up for this man Fuhrman. Why would this man, who is not only Los Angeles' worst nightmare, but America's worst nightmare, why would they all try to turn their heads and try to cover for him?

Why would you do that if you're sworn to uphold the law?

There is something about corruption. There's something about a rotten apple that will ultimately infect the entire barrel. Because if the others don't have the courage that we've asked you to have in this case.

People sit sadly by. We live in a society where many people are apathetic. They don't want to get involved. And that's why all of us, to a person, in this courtroom have thanked you from the bottom of our hearts. Because you know what? You haven't been apathetic. You're the ones who made a commitment. A commitment toward justice.

And it's a painful commitment, but you got to see it through. Your commitment, your courage is much greater than these police officers'. This man could have been off the force long ago if they'd done their job, but they didn't do their job. People looked the other way. People didn't have the courage.

One of the things that's made this country so great is people's willingness to stand up and say, "That's wrong, I'm not going to be part of it. I'm not going to be part of the cover-up."

That's what I'm asking you to do. Stop this cover-up. Stop this cover-up. If you don't stop it, then who?

- AN INNOCENT MAN

This is a case about an innocent man, wrongfully accused. You've seen him now for a year and two days. You observed him through the good times and the bad times.

Soon, it'll be your turn. You have the keys to his future.

You have the evidence by which you can acquit this man. You have not only the patience but the integrity and the courage to do the right thing.

We believe you'll do the right thing. And the right thing is to find this man not guilty of both of these charges.

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.



Thank you very, very much. I appreciate your attention.

- SCHECK
- BURDEN OF PROOF

You can't brush this off as Miss Clark did in her arguments by saying, "Bah, sloppy criminalists, sloppy coroner." And that's all she said. I -- I fully anticipate that most of the matters I'm going to be addressing to you she's been planning to address in her rebuttal summation, because she certainly didn't address them in her closing argument, did she?

They argue the defense has to prove exactly how, exactly where, exactly when tampering occurred with any of this evidence. That's not our burden. They have to prove to you that this evidence has integrity beyond a reasonable doubt.

Copyright (c) 1995, The Oregonian Publishing Company

DESCRIPTORS: MURDER

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



Rank (R)  
R 13 OF 27Database Mode  
OREGONIAN Page

## THE FINAL ARGUMENT

Oregonian (PO) - SATURDAY, September 30, 1995  
Edition: SUNRISE Section: WIRE STORIES Page: A11  
Word Count: 1,168

## MEMO:

The O.J. Simpson Trial  
TYPE: Quotes Speech

## TEXT:

Following are closing arguments , excerpted by topic, by prosecutors Christopher Darden and Marcia Clark on Friday, as transcribed by The New York Times and The Associated Press:

**DARDEN****- NO ONE ABOVE THE LAW**

The law is a tough thing to enforce in this town. Not everybody, not everybody wants to live up to the law, or follow the law. Not everybody thinks that the law applies to them. I have been a prosecutor for almost 15 years and if there is one rule that I have lived by, if there's one rule that means a lot to me, it's this one: No one's above the law. Not the police, not the rich, no one. And I hope you agree with that. I hope you agree with that rule; I hope you consider that motto, OK?

Simpson isn't above the law.

You can't send a message to (retired Detective Mark) Fuhrman, you can't send a message to the LAPD, you can't eradicate racism within the LAPD or within the L.A. community or within the nation as a whole by delivering a verdict of not guilty in a case like this where it is clear, and you know it is clear, you feel it, you know it, you know it in your heart, you know it.

**- TWO INNOCENT PEOPLE**

We just want you to be fair. I just want you to do the right thing, that means the right thing under the law. We believe we've proven this case beyond a reasonable doubt. And it's unfortunate, it's unfortunate what jealousy does to you, it's unfortunate that obsession can do these things to you. It is unfortunate that two innocent people are dead because they got in this man's way.

That's the message we wanted to deliver and I'm the messenger, and I'm proud to have delivered it.

**CLARK****- A PROSECUTOR'S ETHICS**

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



In this case we have seen what the defense has done and it's been a very contorted, very inconsistent thing. I'm going to point out the inconsistencies to you. But basically they have jumped from we are stupid bumlbers or we are brilliant conspirators.

And he includes us in this. And I find that particularly painful, ladies and gentlemen, particularly painful. Because I've been doing this for many years. I didn't start here, I started on that side of counsel table, I was a defense attorney. I know what the ethical obligations are of a prosecutor, I took a cut in pay to join this office, because I believe in this job. I believe in doing it fairly and doing it right and I like the luxury of being a prosecutor. Because I have the luxury on any case of going to the judge and saying guess what your honor, dismiss it, it's not here.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can come to you and I can say: 'Don't convict. It's not here.' I have that right, I have that luxury. This job gives me that luxury. It doesn't give me a lot of money but it gives me that luxury. I can get up in the morning and look at myself in the mirror and say I tell you the truth, I will never ask for a conviction unless I should, unless the law says I must, unless he is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt on credible evidence.

- FUHRMAN AND THE BRONCO

First of all, defense counsel wants you to believe that Mark Fuhrman went into that Bronco and that's why he was able to describe blood inside the Bronco that couldn't be seen on the outside of the Bronco. And let me just make a logical point to you. If he was in that Bronco doing all these nefarious things, why would he then go out and describe what he saw when he was in the Bronco doing these nefarious things, doing these bad things? He wouldn't admit to knowing anything about the inside of that Bronco. He wouldn't admit to making detailed observations of blood that's inside the Bronco. That's just a logical point.

- UNREFUTED EVIDENCE

The killer dropped blood to the left of the shoe prints at Bundy. That's testimony that is uncontradicted.

The defendant had fresh cuts on his left hand during the week of June the 13th, 1994. Uncontradicted.

A blood drop on the Bundy trail was typed as the same as the defendant's. And this is the conventional serology I was telling you. This is the PGM typing that they did, not the DNA. This is uncontradicted. No one, no one contradicts the accuracy or the integrity of that. No one claims that that's the product of contamination. . . .

JUDGE LANCE ITO: Overruled, counsel.

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



CLARK :Blood transfers were visible in the defendant's Bronco. Don Thompson, Officer Don Thompson, who was at Rockingham that morning, said he saw blood in the Bronco.

Blood drops are on the street and the driveway at 360 Rockingham. Uncontradicted.

Blood drops were found in the foyer and in the master bathroom at Rockingham. Testimony that's uncontradicted. It's also uncontradicted that it's his blood. (Yes, now, your honor, thank you. OK?)

Fibers consistent with the carpet from the Bronco found on Rockingham glove. Uncontradicted.

Blue-black cotton fiber found on Ronald Goldman's shirt, the defendant's socks and the Rockingham glove. Uncontradicted.

Fiber consistent with the carpet from the Bronco found on the dark knit cap at Bundy. Uncontradicted.

Hairs consistent with the defendant found on the dark knit cap at Bundy. Uncontradicted.

Hairs consistent with the defendant found on Ron Goldman's shirt. Uncontradicted. And in this, I refer to head hair as well as limb hairs.

JUDGE ITO: Overruled.

CLARK : Motive? You know. Full circle. Spousal abuse, domestic violence against Nicole Brown. Unrefuted.

You can see, ladies and gentlemen, this is just what hasn't been contested. Now you add to that the fact of all of the evidence that they've tried to claim was contaminated or planted -- I've shown you how it wasn't -- add all of that to this. It is truly overwhelming.

- THE CONCLUSION

But, you see, equal justice under the law is an ideal, it is an abstract principal, and it takes you to make this principle a reality. Only you can make this ideal real. . . .

This is a compilation of the 1989 taped 9-1-1 call, the 1983 9-1-1 call, photographs from the 1989 beating, and photographs from her safe deposit box and the photographs from Rockingham and Bundy.

COCHRAN : Objection.

ITO: Overruled. ...

(The 9-1-1 tape montage is played)

(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.



I don't have to say anything else. Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the people of the state of California, because we have proven beyond a reasonable doubt, far beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant committed these murders, we ask you to find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree of Ronald Goldman and Nicole Brown. Thank you very much.

Copyright (c) 1995, The Oregonian Publishing Company  
(C) 1995 THE OREGONIAN ALL RTS. RESERV.

