


Cage
A5
36
N6
P455
1996
ND.8

The O.J. Simpson Trial:
National Coverage v. Regional Coverage

A Thesis
Presented to
the Chancellor's Scholars Council
of Pembroke State University

In Fulfillment
of the Requirements for Completion of
the Chancellor's Scholars Program

by
Kimberly D. Bridgers
April 1996

Faculty Advisor's Approval 
Date 6 May 96

Running Head: NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF THE SIMPSON TRIAL

The O.J. Simpson Trial:
National Coverage v. Regional Coverage
Kimberly D. Bridgers
Pembroke State University

Abstract

The nation has always been concerned with issues in the news. Among such concerns are murder trials. They seem to sweep the nation with magnificent force. One such trial was the case against Orenthal James Simpson in the murders of his ex-wife, Nicole Brown Simpson, and her friend, Ronald L. Goldman. More people watched this trial than any other reported trial.

Television, newspapers, and magazines covered every aspect of the trial. Each, of course, covered it in a different way. But did anyone stop to question whether or not they were gaining the same information from their regional newspaper as their national one? The following study seeks to answer the above question. Regional and national coverage may have been quite different in the trial of O.J. Simpson.

The O.J. Simpson Trial:

National Coverage v. Regional Coverage

The O.J. Simpson murder case stirred the emotions of our nation. He was considered a hero and idol by many people. He was not a person who should have been accused of murder. Therefore, when the infamous car chase could be seen on almost every television channel, the nation became engrossed in the saga.

The media manipulated every detail of the O.J. Simpson trial. Television cameras were allowed in courtrooms, and newspaper reporters could be found at any location that may hold information about the case (Kaplan, 1994). The coverage was so extensive that some thought it may have caused a sort of media "overdose" ("O.J. Coverage," 1994). Never had the media become quite so involved with a case, and audiences became just as involved.

Different types of media used different tactics in covering the story. Television had continuous live coverage of the trial. Newspapers and magazines had reporters on hand during the trial for any newsbreaking aspect that the public would be interested in knowing. The case did indeed capture the attention of the media (Jensen, 1994).

The different forms of media that covered the trial can also be categorized by national or regional coverage. National media may have had an advantage on their coverage of this case. Regional media may have had access to the

information, but it may have lacked the ability to gain all information for reasons such as not being able to have a reporter in the courtroom in Los Angeles.

For the purpose of this study, two newspapers were used: The Raleigh News and Observer and The New York Times. One represents a regional angle and the other represents a national angle. The objective was to find the differences or similarities in the hard news information, pictorial coverage, and editorials. The time frame studied was the first seven days of the trial and the last seven days of the trial.

Definitions

For the purpose of this paper, these are the operational definitions:

1. Media-- When not specified entirely, the media will be referring to the newspaper medium. Because more than one newspaper is viewed, it is termed media.

2. Hard news-- Hard news refers to that news where information was taken directly from the incidents that happened usually in a governmental or crime case (Brooks et al., 1992). In this paper, it will be the information relative to the case taken from the courtroom.

3. Editorials-- Editorials refer to the news that contains opinions of the writer. Often editorials may be described as soft news which tend to be about personalities (Brooks et al., 1992).

4. Sidebar-- A sidebar is a secondary story that is run in correlation to another story (Brooks et al., 1992). In this study, sidebars often accompanied stories with separate but relevant information such as statistics or comments made in court.

5. Regional-- A regional newspaper refers to one within a state or specified region of a state (Brooks et al., 1992). The regional newspaper used in this study is the News and Observer in Raleigh and representing the state of North Carolina.

6. National-- A national newspaper refers to one that represents a country or nation (Brooks et al., 1992). The

national newspaper used in this study is the New York Times representing the United States.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this paper, these are the following assumptions:

First, it must be assumed that the O.J. Simpson case was sufficiently covered by the newspaper medium.

Secondly, it must be assumed that one regional newspaper and one national newspaper provide a standard sample for reviewing news material.

The final assumption is that a regional newspaper and a national newspaper provide different coverage in large news stories that cover a lengthy amount of time.

Method

Two newspapers were included in the study of the print medium's coverage of the O.J. Simpson trial. The New York Times represented the national spectrum, and the Raleigh News and Observer represented the regional spectrum.

The first seven days of the preliminary hearings and the last seven days of the trial were viewed to compare the information. The period of June 30, 1994, through July 06, 1994, was considered to be the first seven days of the trial because it was during this time that the preliminary hearings took place and the actual trial began. The period of September 28, 1995, through October 4, 1995, was considered to be the last seven days of the trial. The judgement was actually delivered on October 3, 1995, but sufficient coverage of the verdict was found on October 4, 1995.

The dates of June 19, 21, and 29, 1994, were viewed for background purposes only. Both newspapers covered the arraignment on June 21, when O.J. Simpson pleaded not guilty. Both covered his attire of a dark suit, no tie, belt, or shoelaces for fear of suicide, and the fact that he was being closely watched. The News and Observer continued to run editorials about domestic violence and the escalation of the issue. Both newspapers also covered the request for DNA, blood, and hair samples on or around June 29.

In recording the comparisons of both newspapers, each date will be stated with the information from the News and

Observer regional paper first and then the New York Times national newspaper information next.

The First Seven Days of the Preliminary Hearings

Thursday, June 30, 1994--News and Observer--no information

New York Times--no information

Friday, July 01, 1994--News and Observer--The request for witnesses by Robert Shapiro, Simpson's leading attorney, and Marcia Clark, the prosecutor, was covered on this date. The defense lawyers wanted to suppress the blood-stained gloves and other evidence because they were obtained by police who entered the premises without a warrant. Judge Kathleen Kennedy-Powell postponed hearing the motion about suppressing such evidence because a warrant was not issued. This hearing was the first time Simpson had worn a tie. The victims' families were present for this hearing. Shapiro made a request that the court allow the defense to do its own forensic tests. Clark requested at least 100 hairs from Simpson's head to compare with those found at the murder scene, but Shapiro felt that one hair was sufficient. The prosecution called their first two witnesses, the owner and an employee of Ross Cutlery in Los Angeles where Simpson supposedly bought a 15 inch stilleto knife for \$74.98. The third witness was the manager of Mezzaluna, the Brentwood

restaurant where Ron Goldman, the other murder victim, worked. Philip L. Vannater, a detective, said that he found blood on the handle of Simpson's Bronco at 5 a.m., six hours after the murder. The blood led from the Bronco in the street to the front door, and a man's leather glove was found on the south side of the residence. The defense stated that one of the detectives entered by climbing the wall to the grounds.

An editorial by Derrick Z. Jackson sought to reveal how television commercials, especially beer advertisements, show women as "bimbos" and actually persuade violence against women. He said that "television commercials are selling male domination, violence, and hero-worship along with beer and athletic shoes." The People's Forum, a section for editorial letters written by local people, did not hold any information regarding the Simpson case.

A picture of O.J. Simpson in the courtroom was on the front page.

New York Times--A story by Michael Janofsky, the reporter on assignment in the courtroom, reported basically the same information, but in greater detail and with more specific statistics. Detectives found 13 bloodstains inside Simpson's Bronco. Shapiro had a list of 34 items that police had obtained from Simpson's home attached to his motion that police did not rightfully enter the home. Prosecutors were expected to rely on the numerous bloodstains and Simpson's blood samples. Detectives apparently took control of the

premises after climbing a wall to gain access which was described as illegal by the defense. Victor Gold, a law professor at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, was included in the story as an evidence expert.

A chart was included that named the items and samples that were collected at Simpson's house just hours after Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman were found dead. The defense team wanted to suppress the blood in the Bronco, the cap found in the Bronco, the trail of blood from the street to the interior of the home, a stick found on the lawn, a cigarette butt in the street, the bloody glove, a plastic bag near the fence, socks in the bedroom, an airline ticket receipt, a baggage tag, a vial of O.J. Simpson's blood, tennis shoes, and hairs and fibers found on the glove. Other evidence discussed that was included in the chart was the stilleto knife, 34 hairs found on a cap at the scene, and hairs found on the cap in the Bronco.

Another story was included on this date by another correspondent, B. Drummond Ayres, Jr. The story was about the testimony of the clerk from the cutlery store where Simpson bought a 15- inch knife. The man admitted that the National Enquirer paid him \$12,500 for his story. Also included was Simpson's lawyers' explanation of where Simpson was on the night of the murders. There was discussion of Clark's patience running out with Shapiro because they were having a heated argument about how many hairs from Simpson's head would

be sufficient for a DNA sample.

A large picture was included of Robert Shapiro and Marcia Clark as they addressed the judge. A picture of a stilleto knife like the one Simpson had purchased on May 3 was also included.

No editorial information was included.

Saturday, July 02, 1994--News and Observer--The manilla envelope was the topic of the story. It apparently had mystery evidence in it. Kathleen Kennedy-Powell, the municipal judge, said that it was found by the defense, and it could be opened in the courtroom. She asked that both sides submit briefs about how they thought it should be handled in the courtroom. Prosecutors listened to tapes of interviews by the defense with a house guest of Simpson and a limousine driver. A resident of the neighborhood said that he heard a dog wailing about 10:15 p.m. on the night of the murders, and it continued until 11:00 p.m. when he went to sleep. Another neighbor saw the dog at about 10:55 p.m. with bloody paws and acting agitated. Simpson's attorneys said that Simpson was waiting in his home about two miles away from the murder scene for a limo to take him to the airport in Chicago at 11:00 p.m. Sukru Boztepe and his wife found the dog and the bodies. It was introduced that the co-owners of the cutlery story had sold their story for \$12,500 to the National Enquirer. A photograph from the scene was released in court, and it was reported that Simpson blinked and took deep breaths and the

family of the victims bowed their heads and closed their eyes.

No editorial information was included.

New York Times--Information about Nicole Brown Simpson's dog and about the testimony of neighbors was reported. Comparisons of the neighbors' testimony and the alibi of Simpson were made. The type of dog was revealed as being an Akita. Quotes from the man who found the body were included. More in depth descriptions of Simpson's reaction and the reaction of the victims' families when they saw pictures from the scene were cited. Simpson was apparently more "animated" on this day that he had been at any other hearing. He even glanced at Nicole Brown Simpson's family and slightly smiled. Many quotes from the neighbors who heard the dog were included. Discrepancies between what the witnesses said and what police reports said were pointed out by Shapiro and another defense lawyer, Gerald Uelman, in cross-examination.

Another shorter story dealt with the mystery manilla envelope that Judge Kennedy-Powell had received. She said that it was going to take her a week to decide if she was going to open it. Shapiro revealed two cassette tapes with witness interviews. Another envelope arrived at the end of the day, and no information was provided about it. Part of a knife was found in a waste tank at O'Hare International Airport at the American Airlines Terminal. However, the knife

was much smaller than the knife that they were looking for--one about 15 inches long.

A chronology chart was included that told of the events that occurred on Sunday, June 12, 1994, when Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman were murdered. At 9:33 p.m., Ronald Goldman, clocked out of Mezzaluna restaurant where he was a waiter. At 9:35, Nicole Simpson called the restaurant about a pair of glasses that the bartender had picked up outside of the restaurant. Between 9:48 and 9:53, Goldman left the restaurant, apparently with the glasses. At 10:15, a neighbor reported hearing a barking dog. At 10:30, another neighbor was walking his dog. At 10:55, the second neighbor saw an Akita with bloody paws, and the dog followed him. At 11:00, the first neighbor still heard the dog barking. At 11:05, the second neighbor went to his apartment and the Akita was following him. At 11:40 p.m., the dog led Sukru Boztepe to the murder scene where the bodies were discovered. A map was also included that showed the Brentwood area.

The consensus of the people in the Los Angeles area was reported in another story by correspondent Sara Rimer. It was told from the angle of Denise Brown, the sister of Nicole Brown Simpson. Rimer wrote that Brown had to walk by vendors who were selling "Save O.J." t-shirts everyday to enter the courthouse. The people in the area had become obsessed with the case. A sidebar to this story reported that one out of four homes in the country was tuning in to the case. Even

ABC, CBS, and NBC "preempted their regular programs for live coverage on Thursday," (June 30).

A large picture was printed of a neighbor of Nicole Brown Simpson, Bettina Rasmussen, as she testified to Marcia Clark. Two pictures were included of O.J. Simpson as the murder scene photographs were shown.

No editorial information was included.

Sunday, July 03, 1994--News and Observer--There was no information because the court had recessed until after the Fourth of July holiday.

New York Times--There was also no hard news because of the court's recession until July 5. However, editorials were noted. In one letter to the newspaper, a woman in San Leandro, California, expressed her sadness that reporters treated O.J. Simpson as a hero. She believed that potential jurors were probably "silently shouting, 'Go, Juice'." She was extremely upset that Simpson had once described beating a woman as "no big deal." A man also wrote a letter about the unfairness of letting celebrities have certain breaks when justice should be the same for everyone.

A letter by a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute was about domestic abuse. He wrote that his father had abused his mother, and his father had killed himself by drinking. He stated that good people do indeed have tragic flaws, and no matter who they are, they must be accountable for their behavior. His overall motive was to inform the public that

the children should not be forgotten in such cases because they are often the ones affected most.

An "Ideas and Trends" column by Michiko Kakutani sought to answer why people are obsessed with watching O.J. Simpson on television. He said that the story had a narrative appeal to the 95 million Americans who are watching. He said most of the supporters probably believed that Simpson was innocent. He even cited the incident where one woman stated "Guilty or not, we love you O.J." on CNBC television while standing in front of the courthouse. A picture of supporters holding a large banner reading "Free O.J." accompanied the article.

A cartoon by Bill Schorr of the Kansas City Star was printed that depicted a television store with every television showing something about O.J. Simpson. The man in the cartoon said to his wife, "I miss Amy Fisher."

No editorial information was included.

Monday, July 04, 1994--News and Observer--A story syndicated from the L.A. Times was printed about Ronald Goldman as seen by his friends. Many rumors about him and Nicole Brown Simpson having an affair started when their bodies were found. His friends said that he was a dreamer and was having a hard time finding his way in Los Angeles.

The People's Forum held a letter written by a woman who thought that it was shameful that someone convicted of wife battering, (as O.J. Simpson had previously been), was essentially "only smacked on the hand" and then he was

released. She said that first-time offenders should get more punishment to make them think twice about committing such crimes again.

New York Times--no information

Tuesday, July 05, 1994--News and Observer--Information about prosecutors having to make their case more on scientific evidence was released. They may not be able to rely on the 34 items that were found at the Simpson residence because Shapiro was trying to get that evidence suppressed because it was acquired without a warrant. Judge Kennedy-Powell was still contemplating on what to do with the mystery envelope that may have contained evidence found by the defense. Peter Arenella, a criminal law professor at the University of California in Los Angeles, said that scientific evidence could be major in this case. Myrna Raeder, a professor of trial advocacy and evidence at Southwestern School of Law, said that the prosecution may not be extremely hurt without the bloody evidence because of the scientific evidence that may be used.

A picture was included in the above story of a large sign put up by a homeowner one block south of the murder scene that read, "Go Home--There Is Nothing 2 See."

No editorial information was included.

New York Times--no information

Wednesday, July 06, 1994--News and Observer--Testimonies of a limousine driver and a house guest of O.J. Simpson were released. Allan Park, the driver, said that he was at

Simpson's home at 10:45 p.m. on the night of the murders to pick up Simpson. He said no one answered and then he saw someone (a black person about 6 feet and 200 pounds) sneak into the house at about 11:00 p.m. He said that Simpson finally answered the page and said that he was running late and had just gotten out of the shower. Park said that he had never met Simpson before but his behavior seemed normal when he got in the car, but he said that Simpson continued to complain of being hot. Brian "Kato" Kaelin was the house guest. He said that he had been to McDonald's with Simpson and returned about 9:45 p.m. He said that he heard thumps about 10:40 p.m. and saw Simpson when he went out to see what the noise was. Evidence had shown that Simpson may have had the opportunity to kill, but nothing had directly related him to the murders at that time. Prosecutors revealed that bloody shoe prints ran from the bodies to an alley behind Nicole Brown Simpson's condominium. Judge Kennedy-Powell had not revealed the contents of the envelope yet. Detective Mark Fuhrman, who had initially climbed the wall to the Simpson estate stated that he did so because he saw blood in the Bronco (he had a warrant to search it) and thought there may have been trouble inside. Fuhrman said that he soon found the glove, and Kaelin said that he heard the thumps in about the same area as the glove was found.

Mike Royko, a syndicated columnist from Chicago, took a humorous approach in an editorial about the battle over how

many hairs O.J. Simpson should have to surrender. He said that he looked up "hair" in his Encyclopedia and found that the average person has 100,000 of them and loses 70 to 100 a day. He did not understand why Shapiro only wanted Simpson to have to surrender one hair. His final statement referred to what a man should do if he may anticipate being accused for his wife's murder--"Shave your head first and it will cut down on your legal bills."

Another editorial by John Leo, a contributing editor to U.S. News and World Report out of Washington, took on the topic of domestic violence. He said that this is a very difficult subject for journalists to deal with, and stated facts about how prevalent the issue happens to be.

Two small pictures accompanied the hard news story. They each were of the testifying witnesses Brian "Kato" Kaelin and Allan Park.

New York Times--A lengthier version of the testimonies of Brian "Kato" Kaelin and Allan Park was given. More specific times were stated, and the fact that the prosecution was trying to move the original murder time of 11:00 p.m. to a time earlier than that was also discussed. The testimony by Park was slightly different here in that the paper reported he said that Simpson finally replied over the intercom that he had fallen asleep when the driver paged him. Kaelin stated he returned to his guest house where he had been living since January of 1994 about 9:45 p.m. from McDonald's and went

outside about 55 minutes later when he heard a noise. The paper reported Kaelin said the noise was so loud it almost knocked pictures off of his wall, but he was in fact too frightened to approach the exact area where he heard the noise. It was stated that a bloodstained glove was found in the area of the noise. Shapiro sought to prove discrepancies in Park's testimonies. Detective Mark Fuhrman said when he arrived at the house, he saw "a white Ford Bronco parked in a haphazard manner with the rear end kicked out to the street." He said that he found out that Simpson was out of town through the security agency Westtec. Then he saw red bloodstains on the Bronco and decided that they needed to investigate because someone may have been hurt inside. A sidebar to the above story was about the envelope given to Judge Kennedy-Powell. She agreed to delay opening the envelope because both sides did not want her to do so at that time. She said that the envelope had been given to her by a judge who had received it from the defense lawyers.

Another article told of a young boy coming to a corner store for bubble gum. It was about the young O.J. Simpson of a Portrero Terrace housing project in California. The store owner, Jack Woo, was interviewed as was Herschel Brown, an old friend of O.J. Simpson, and a 12-year-old boy, Marquez White. These people fully believed in Simpson's innocence and could not believe that he was being brought up on such charges. A photograph of Jack Woo holding an autographed picture of O.J.

Simpson in his store accompanied the article.

A photograph of Allan Park and another of Brian "Kato" Kaelin each marking a diagram of the Simpson home and yard was published with the hard news story.

No editorial information was included.

The Last Seven Days of the Trial

Thursday, September 28, 1995--News and Observer--It was reported that Johnnie Cochran, Jr., one of Simpson's lawyers stated that O.J. Simpson did not have the time nor the motive to commit the murders. In his closing argument, he used a "journey to justice" to trace the case. He even put on a black cap to ask the jurors if they thought that a cap like that could disguise O.J. Simpson if he went to commit the murders. "I'm still Johnnie Cochran with a knit cap. O.J. Simpson in a knit cap from two blocks away is still O.J. Simpson. It's no disguise," he stated. He continued, "If it doesn't fit, you must acquit." Cochran sought to discredit police because the crime scene was destroyed and because they were apparently more concerned with their image. Deputy District Attorney Christopher Darden gave his closing argument first before the defense. "We have shown you that he would have killed, could have killed, and did kill these two people," Darden said. The 911 tape of the phone call by Nicole Brown Simpson on October 25, 1993, was played again for

the jury. He spoke of this incident when Simpson battered his wife and of another incident in 1989, and both times, the children were in the house. Excerpts from the closing arguments of Darden and Cochran were included in separate boxes after the article.

A large picture of Johnnie Cochran, Jr., making his closing argument was included with Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden watching.

No editorial information was included.

New York Times--Also included here was the "if it doesn't fit, you must acquit" line by Johnnie Cochran in his closing argument. He was referred to in the article by David Margolick as "part politician, part preacher, part emcee." He accused one detective, Mark Fuhrman, of planting the glove in O.J. Simpson's yard. "Why would it be moist and sticky unless he brought it over there and planted it there to try to make this case?" he said. He accused the police of spiking the evidence, especially a blood-saturated sock. He accused police of racism because Simpson was the only suspect. The "journey toward justice" was also referred to in this newspaper. Cochran said that prosecutors dwelled on certain instances in the marriage when O.J. Simpson and Nicole Brown Simpson did not get along, and that was not fair. He showed a videotape of Simpson after his daughter's dance recital hours before the murder, and Simpson appeared extremely happy. Photos were shown of Simpson the night before at a charity

dinner where he also appeared very happy. He concentrated on the fact that Simpson did not have time to commit the crime, and the gloves did not fit his hands. Mention was also made of Cochran's placing the black cap over his head. The reactions of the jurors to Cochran were also recorded as being relatively few. Also included was the crowd in the courtroom. Apparently there was only room for standing. Tanya Brown, the youngest sister of Nicole Brown Simpson, was noted to have had a worried look on her face, and the Brown girls' mother was noted to have been quite nervous. Darden, one of the prosecutors, was reported to have been talking very quietly to the jurors, often in a whisper. He traced Nicole Brown Simpson's life from her last few months reportedly while Simpson spoke with his lawyers and "Judge Lance A. Ito cleaned his fountain pen." Darden also told the jurors that they should not let Simpson's demeanor fool them. "Murderers don't walk around with neon signs saying, 'I just killed someone,'" he said.

Another portion of the page focused on excerpts of the closing arguments of Christopher A. Darden and Johnnie L. Cochran, Jr., on the charges against Simpson. A photo of each lawyer was included with a closing quote under each. Darden's quote read, "He's enraged, but he had 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 said,

"We may all live to be 100 years old, and I hope we do, but you'll always remember that those gloves, when Darden asked him to try them on, didn't fit. They know they didn't fit and no matter what they do, they can't make them fit." The excerpts of the arguments were presented by the topics and transcribed by the newspaper. The topics by Darden was the rage that caused the murderer to commit such a crime, with the insinuation that the murderer was Simpson, and the topic of justice. Topics by Cochran were O.J. Simpson as a football hero, the trip to McDonald's with Brian "Kato" Kaelin, the supposedly bloody trail, the black knit cap that Cochran tried on in court, the gloves that did not fit, Fuhrman's testimony, and the fact that Simpson was indeed under oath when he stated that he did not commit the murders.

A photograph was included of Cochran trying on the black knit cap with Marcia Clark watching. Another photo showed Darden holding a picture of Ronald L. Goldman. A picture of O.J. Simpson and his lawyers taken when Darden was speaking was also included.

An editorial by the Dean at Yale Law School, Anthony T. Kronman, criticized the case. He said that it would take a while for lawyers to regain respect after the O.J. Simpson double murder case.

Friday, September 29, 1995--News and Observer--The newspaper mentioned the predominately black jury. Johnnie Cochran, Jr., said that the jury needed to acquit O.J. Simpson

in order to help end racism. He called two policemen "the twin devils of deception." The newspaper said that Cochran used "the style of a revival preacher" when he was trying to convince the jury. He compared Mark Fuhrman to Adolf Hitler when describing Fuhrman's racial slurs on interviews that were tape-recorded. He said that Fuhrman and Philip Vannatter were trying to set O.J. Simpson up into being the murderer. The Ronald Goldman and O.J. Simpson family members participated in news conferences outside of the courtroom during the lunch break. Race became an issue there. Fred Goldman, the father of Ronald Goldman, said of Johnnie Cochran, "He compares racism of the worst kind in this world to what's going on in this case. This man is sick. He is absolutely sick." Simpson's sister, Carmelita Durio, responded in defense of Cochran, "We have waited all this time, and now the attorneys are telling my brother's story. And it's very shocking that once Johnnie gets up and starts telling what we feel happened that this has rocked somebody's world." The sequestered jurors (nine blacks, two whites, and one Hispanic) were not exposed to this press conference. Defense Attorney, Barry Scheck, spoke of corruption in the Los Angeles Police Department. Cochran said the Fuhrman did not approve of interracial marriages. Cochran told of racial slurs allegedly made by Fuhrman to Kathleen Bell, who testified in court. Judge Lance Ito planned to send the case to jury that afternoon.

Highlights of Cochran and Scheck's arguments were included in a sidebar in no particular order.

A story of a poll by ABC news also appeared. The majority believed that Simpson was guilty. There was a big difference between blacks and whites. More white people believed that he was guilty. Out of all 685 adults polled, 68 percent thought he was guilty, 26 percent thought that he was not guilty, and 6 percent had no opinion. Out of all white people polled, 77 percent thought he was guilty, 18 percent believed Simpson was not guilty, and 5 percent had no opinion. Out of all black people polled, 72 percent believed that Simpson was not guilty, 20 percent believed that he was guilty, and 9 percent had not opinion. There was a 4.5 percent margin of error. A poll done only in Los Angeles had the same result.

One photograph was included of O.J. Simpson speaking with Johnnie Cochran, Jr., and another defense attorney, Robert Blasier.

No editorial information was included.

New York Times--Much of the same information included in the first hard news story in the News and Observer for September 29 was included in an article by David Margolick. Johnnie Cochran, Jr., spoke of racism, and he told the jurors that they have no choice but to acquit O.J. Simpson. He told the jurors that if they acquitted him, "they would make themselves custodians of the Constitution and the conscience

of the Los Angeles Police Department." A more descriptive version of Barry Scheck's statements was given. He said that police planted evidence and spoke of Guhrman saying "nigger." Cochran said that "someone has taken these children's mother. I certainly hope that your decision will not take their father, and that justice will finally be done in this case." Cochran slid a list of questions to Marcia Clark about the 15 holes that he thought prosecution needed to fill in their case. The article included that Clark did not look appreciative. Judge Lance Ito told the jurors to weigh the case until a verdict was reached. One black woman juror was so moved by Cochran's words that she cried. He often compared Fuhrman to Adolf Hitler. The bloody socks, hairs, fibers, and tubes containing no blood were mentioned often by Cochran. Scheck said the evidence was destroyed. Peter Arenella, a law professor at the University of California in Los Angeles, did not approve of the Hitler comparison, and he did not like Cochran's choice for the jury which was between the acquittal of O.J. Simpson or condoning racism. Scheck spoke of the bad way that the DNA was handled. He said that the blood was planted on the sock found in O.J. Simpson's bedroom and on the rear gate to Nicole Brown Simpson's home. Fred Goldman, who is Jewish, did not like the Hitler statement. Included was the fact that Judge Lance Ito granted Roshha-Shanah and Yom Kippur court holidays because of the Goldman family's religion. Comments from O.J. Simpson's oldest sister, Shirley

Baker, were included. "It's wrong, even when you're hurting, for someone to get up and personally attack our lawyers and say they're liars," she said. Cochran was also compared to an evangelist by this correspondent. Cochran even hinted that the jury had been selected by God.

Excerpts from the closing arguments of Johnnie Cochran, Jr., and Barry Scheck were included on September 29, transcribed by the New York Times by topic. Cochran's topics were the two policemen conspiring together in which he referred to as the "twins of deception," the cover-up of Mark Fuhrman, the 15 questions about evidence that he posed to Marcia Clark, and the request for the jury to do the right thing. Scheck's topics were the burden of proof in the DNA testing and the sock as being compared to a plate of spaghetti.

Photographs included one of O.J. Simpson holding Johnnie Cochran's hand during closing arguments and Barry Scheck using his sock to illustrate a point about the sock found in Simpson's master bedroom.

No editorial information was included on September 28, 1994.

Saturday, September 30, 1995--News and Observer--The prosecution ended their case the day before with the cassette tapes from 911 of Nicole Brown Simpson pleading with an enraged O.J. Simpson not to hurt her. The trial went to the jury that day after going on for nine months, and the jury was

to begin its deliberations on the following Monday. The prosecution told the jury that they should not be influenced by the racial connotations that some were placing on the case. Crime scene photographs were placed on a screen by Marcia Clark as the 911 tapes played. The final photo was of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman lying in pools of blood. Clark stated to the jury, "Because we have proved beyond a reasonable doubt...we ask you to find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree in the murder of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Lyle Goldman." She also said that through the tapes, Nicole Brown Simpson was saying that she knew that if she was killed, O.J. Simpson would be the murderer. Clark said that Goldman had resisted the attack which caused so much evidence to be left behind. She pointed out O.J. Simpson's jealousy, which stemmed the attack on June 12, 1994. The jurors, as instructed by Judge Lance Ito, elected a foreman in five minutes. Legal analysts estimated that deliberations would last several days to more than two weeks. Christopher Darden began the prosecution's closing arguments on the last day by saying that one racial slur by one detective should not acquit a murderer. Approximately 60 objections were used to interrupt Darden.

A sidebar to the story contained the jury's schedule. They were to go home for the weekend after selecting a foreman. Beginning the following Monday, they were to deliberate from noon to 8:00 p.m. with one hour for lunch. On

Tuesday, they were to end at 7:00 p.m., and they were not to deliberate on Wednesday in observance of Yom Kippur. They were not to resume until Monday because the courthouse was closing for repairs.

Excerpts from the closing arguments of the prosecution were also shown in a separate sidebar. Each was introduced as "Darden on..." such as "Darden on racism."

A photograph showed two people arguing outside of the Los Angeles courthouse because of their opposing views on the O.J. Simpson case.

No editorial information was included on September 30, 1994. New York Times--The article began as the News and Observer article did with reference to the 911 tapes and the photographs place on the screen by the prosecution. Also included were the words of Nicole Brown Simpson as she called 911 in a frantic: "He's back. He's O.J. Simpson. I think you know his record." Clark said that it was this record that made Nicole Brown Simpson have a will drawn. Clark also added, "But in this case, Ron and Nicole, they're speaking to you. And they're telling you who murdered them." She said that Nicole Simpson and Ronald Goldman were telling the jurors that O.J. Simpson did it through the evidence. Johnnie Cochran objected to the tapes and the photographs saying that it was outrageous. Clark said, "I don't think that Mr. Cochran has the right to use the word 'outrageous.' This is the man who argued Mark Fuhrman was commensurate with Adolf

Hitler." Clark showed a chart that showed the evidence that the prosecution thought could convict Simpson. Clark also said that Cochran's notion of conspiracy by the police was impossible. The members in the courtroom such as the Brown family were included. The lawyers were told not to shake their heads or grimace by Judge Ito. The bodyguards of each side were described. Christopher Darden commented that he had recently reviewed the Constitution and said, "I saw some stuff about Ron and Nicole. The Constitution said that Ron and Nicole had the right to liberty. It said they had the right to life. It said that they had the right to the pursuit of happiness." Speaking of O.J. Simpson, Darden said, "It said he doesn't have the right to take these lives. The Constitution says that a man has no right to kill and then get away with it because one of the investigating officers is a racist." Darden pointed to his sock to illustrate that blood could have landed there. He referred to Ronald Goldman as a hero because he was trying to rescue Nicole Brown Simpson. One white woman juror and the only Hispanic man smiled occasionally at Darden's comments. Reference was made in the story to the fact that Marcia Clark did not respond to the questions posed to her by Johnnie Cochran on the previous day. However, she was very energetic in asking her own questions. "We all wanted to believe that our image of him was right. And it's really kind of hard to have to believe that the man we saw in the movies and commercials could do this. But he

did," Clark said in her final argument.

Excerpts were included from Christopher Darden and Marcia Clark as transcribed by the New York Times and categorized by topic. Darden's topics included Simpson's not being above the law just because he was a celebrity, everybody knowing that he was the murderer, Ronald Goldman as a hero, and Ronald Goldman and Nicole Brown Simpson as innocent victims. Clark's topics included the fact that there was more blood than the defense admitted, prosecutor's ethics, the element of the planted evidence, the unrefuted evidence, and her final words about Simpson's guilt. Darden was quoted as saying, "They have to attack our science because all the science points to O.J. Simpson, to the defendant, it all points to him as a killer." Clark was quoted saying, "If you're standing behind somebody cutting their throat, they're bleeding out and they're not bleeding on you. So you'll get some on your hands. Maybe you'll get a little bit of spatter but you're not going to be covered in blood."

Another story described the mood outside of the courthouse. For months, vendors had parked their belongings there to sell ideas displayed on items such as t-shirts and to preach their opinions on the case. However, on the last day of the trial, police had blocked off the street. It was closed because of traffic hazards and the risk of people getting hurt. The atmosphere around the courthouse was reported to have become more tense when Johnnie Cochran, Jr.,

began using six bodyguards when entering and leaving the courthouse.

Frank Rich wrote an editorial entitled "The Circus Folds" about the trial's ending. He said that no matter what the verdict was going to be, "this trial will leave only division and anger in its wake." Crime novelist Scott Turow said that O.J. Simpson was "the Othello of the 20th century."

In an unsigned editorial, the writer asked, "Does the verdict really matter?" Each side was described as being hateful. The Fuhrman tapes were entirely matched by Johnnie Cochran's exploitation of them. The writer was angry because of the exploitation. He said of Cochran, "He likened Mr. Fuhrman to Hitler to pander to a largely black jury."

In the excerpts article, a photograph was included of Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden. A photograph of Judge Lance Ito yelling for Barry Scheck to sit down was included in the hard news story.

Sunday, October 01, 1995--News and Observer--An article dealt with the jurors having the fate of O.J. Simpson in their hands and the power that comes along with such responsibility. The jurors remained anonymous throughout their 368 days of duty. They were sequestered in a hotel in downtown Los Angeles during the trial. Experts had their own opinions on how long the deliberations would be, and some had ideas that a verdict may never have been reached. Laurie Levenson, a Loyola Law School professor, believed that the jurors were

very anxious to discuss the case. The jurors were selected as any jury would be with a summons in the mail. They were everyday people with jobs such as postal workers, a Pepsi truck driver, a computer repair person, and a hospital worker. The jurors' marital status and average age of 43 were included. The youngest, however, was 23 years old and the oldest was 72 years old. The jurors had to withstand the investigators at the Sheriff's Department scrutinizing them. Out of 24 panelists, 10 did not last to go through the trial. Their phone calls and visits were completely monitored.

A chart was printed that showed what the judge would do in different decisions. If O.J. Simpson was found guilty by the jury, Judge Ito would have to give him a sentence within 20 days. The number of years would depend upon the degree of the murder charge. The possibilities of parole were also indicated. In the case of a hung jury the case may be retried as decided by the prosecution.

An article in the "Insights" section described how the O.J. Simpson trial became a television show to many. The writer, Tom Maurstad, of the Dallas Morning News, discussed how the trial had in a sense affected television. He said, "The craziness makes perfect sense in a world where a murder trial is the hottest entertainment ticket going, and life is just something else to watch on TV."

New York Times--The only article discussed the surge of authors since the O.J. Simpson trial. The writer told of all

of the books that are being written now about the case.

An editorial by Ann Jones, author of Next Time, She'll Be Dead, described a technique that she called "gaslighting" after a Charles Boyer movie. She said that abusive men use this in making "the victim crazy by denying her perception of reality." She used examples of men who beat their wives and then turn around and ask her how she got that bruise. She made reference to the 1989 incident when Nicole Brown Simpson was left standing outside in her bra for fear of going back in to an enraged O.J., and she also wrote of the 911 call in 1993. Jones ended her article with "justice for all, it seems, is still a guy thing."

Monday, October 02, 1995--News and Observer--An article discussed the possibility of the jury nullifying the law which would mean going outside of the law according to Laurie Levenson, a Loyola University law professor. She said that the concept means "We don't care about the evidence; our gut reaction is that this man should go free." This is exactly what Johnnie Cochran wanted the jury to do. The idea of jury nullification was essentially used years ago so that white people would not have to be punished for lynching black people. Early cases where this concept was used were discussed. They included cases of protesters during the Vietnam War, the trial of the unlawful assembly of William Penn, and the John Peter Zenger case where truth was first used as a defense in a libel case. Jury nullification is only

implied because there are never any records for it. U.S. District Judge Jack B. Weinstein said in 1992 in his speech on this subject, "Nullification occurs when a jury, based on its own sense of justice or fairness, refuses to follow the law and convict in a particular case even though the facts seem to allow no other verdict but guilt." If this were to happen in the O.J. Simpson murder case, the jurors probably would not even take the time to review the evidence.

No editorials or photographs were included on October 02, 1995.

New York Times--One article focused on the task that the jury in the O.J. Simpson trial faced when they were to begin weighing the verdict. As usual, estimates were ranging from days to weeks. "I have yet to find 12 people anywhere who agree on any aspect of this case. I hope these 12 can," Robert Shapiro said. The jurors' ages and races were discussed again as were their gesture and facial expressions which all seemed familiarly "stone-faced." Predictions were made as to who was the foreman of the jury and who would most likely be able to influence other jurors. The jury had to weigh 1,105 pieces of evidence and 45,000 pages of testimony. Johnnie Cochran told one juror who had been on a previous murder case and stood her ground although no one agreed with her, "You are a very strong lady, and that is to be commended for at least standing up for what you believed." The actions and thoughts of many of the jurors, who are referred to as

Juror No. 1, 5, etc., were analyzed in this article.

Another article dealt with the interpretations of Salim Muwakkil, a black Chicago writer, on why the case has become racial. He said that he remembered being a little boy and watching a police officer grab his 10-year-old brother by the neck for standing in front of a store. He said that many black people can recall such incidents, and that is why they consider the O.J. Simpson case a racial one. He said that many black people may not trust the police or the legal system. He believes that many people do not even look at O.J. Simpson but look at the racial aspects. A chef at a local hospital, Cynthia Webb said, "If he's convicted, there will be riots all over the country. I think he's being framed. It's all about race." Many think that the media had a bad influence on the case. Dr. Martin Travis, a physician, said "Historically, law enforcement officers are known to be racists and bigots. Even though it's 1995, things haven't changed that much." Polls show most white people thought O.J. Simpson was guilty, and most black people believed he was innocent.

A sidebar to the story was about a survey of opinion on the case. According to a Gallup Poll in July 1994, 62 percent believed the charges were true and 21 percent believed that they were not true. In a more recent poll by CBS, 57 percent thought O.J. Simpson was guilty and 18 percent thought that he was not guilty. Two photographs of respondents accompanied

the article on racism.

No editorial information was printed.

Tuesday, October 03, 1994--News and Observer--One article revealed that the jury in the trial had reached a verdict on the previous day, but it would not be revealed until October 3. Attorneys were surprised that the jury reached a verdict so quickly. The jury would not listen to the testimony of limo driver Allan Park again as Marcia Clark wanted them to do. Because Johnnie Cochran and Marcia Clark were not in the courtroom when Judge Lance Ito was handed the envelope holding the verdict, it was not to be read until October 3 at 10:00 a.m. Many legal experts had already pointed out that quick verdicts usually mean that the person standing trial has been acquitted.

Another article dealt with the wait that America was experiencing in seeking to find out about the verdict in the murder trial. People from the Raleigh area were asked what they thought was going to come of the trial.

Another article revealed that the Los Angeles courthouse was so stunned by the fast verdict that they alerted the police. Reporters rushed out of the courtroom to speak with their producers and editors.

A small article told of the times that CBS, NBC, ABC, CNN, Court TV, and ESPN would be covering the announcement of the verdict. CBS was planning a Simpson special with Dan Rather that evening.

One advertisement told of the Internet address where one could find updates on the O.J. Simpson case.

A photograph appeared of Judge Lance Ito holding the sealed the envelope that the jury gave him. Another picture was of O.J. Simpson looking at Carl Douglas, one of his defense attorneys, while the testimony of Allan Park was being read. A photograph was included of Allan Park from preliminary trial hearings looking at his watch.

New York Times-- One article was also focused on the short deliberations of the jury, but the main idea was that the legal experts had been proven wrong. Experts thought that it would take days for the jurors just to express their emotions on the case since they had not been allowed to talk about it for nine months. The verdict was one of the quickest in any murder trial. Comparisons were made to the convictions in the Charles Manson case that took the jury nine days, and to the Branch Davidian cult charges which took the jury four days to decide. A criminal defense lawyer, Bradley Bruon, said, "In my experience, I've never had a jury come back with a guilty verdict so quickly. It would have to mean the evidence was so overwhelming that no one would dispute Simpson's guilty. I don't think that could be done in that short of time in this case."

Another article focused on what the lawyers thought about the quick verdict of the jury. Robert Shapiro said, "My hope always was that this jury would reach a verdict, and for that

I'm thankful." Johnnie Cochran, Jr., said, "I'm not going to speculate. I'll wait until tomorrow and find out." Christopher Darden said, "I think I have to believe it. It's happening. Nothing shocks me anymore." Carl Douglas, a defense attorney, said, "Surprise doesn't begin to describe my feelings. I'm stunned at the speed."

The focus of another article was to announce that the verdict of the O.J. Simpson trial could be seen on live television. It listed the television stations and the times. The television channels were rearranging their entire schedules to accommodate the verdict.

Russell Baker wrote an editorial about how lost America would be once the trial was over because it became a regular television show to many. He described the trial as "utterly absorbing even when it was unbearably dull."

Photographs included Judge Ito addressing the jury after the verdict was reached and O.J. Simpson standing by Carl Douglas as the jury entered the courtroom to announce that they had reached a verdict.

Wednesday, October 04, 1995--News and Observer--Several articles were under the large headline on the front page that read "NOT GUILTY" and under that "After 16 months, Simpson is free man."

One article described O.J. Simpson as looking extremely relieved after the verdict was read. He mouthed "Thank you" to the jurors. The jurors did not immediately explain their

verdict. "I think we did the right thing--in fact, I know we did," said one juror. "The prosecution team didn't lose today. I deeply believe that this country lost today. Justice was not served," said Fred Goldman. Judge Ito ordered Simpson back to the jail where he had been since June 17, 1994, for release procedures. A chart was shown giving a breakdown of the jurors and alternates with their statistics such as race, occupation and age.

Another article described what people were doing in the Triangle area of Raleigh, Chapel Hill, and Durham during the time that the verdict was being announced. Many people were closely watching a television screen at 1:00 p.m. The opinions were fairly split as to whether the verdict was right, but more people were quoted that were in agreement with the verdict.

A sidebar to the article about the Triangle area watchers told of the 2,000 people who were unable to watch the trial because their cable lines had been severed. One man found an old television set and used an antenna.

One article based the decision of the jurors on the fact they did not think O.J. Simpson had enough time to commit the murders on June 12, 1994. Los Angeles District Attorney Gil Garcetti said, "Apparently their decision was based on emotion that overcame reason."

In a column entitled "Briefly," different areas of the country were focused on for trial information. In Washington,

D.C., the Justice Department said that it was soon going to begin investigation on the tapes of Mark Fuhrman speaking racial slurs and its correlation to civil rights violations. In San Francisco, cyberspace was being flooded with people using the Internet to discuss the trial. In New York, extra electricity was in demand because so many television sets were being used. Also in New York, the Rev. Jesse Jackson expressed his opinion on the racism in the case. He did not think that it was made too big of an issue. In one area out of the country, Rosa Lopez, of El Salvador, the housekeeper who provided Simpson's alibi, was praising the jury's verdict of not guilty.

In an unsigned editorial by the newspaper, the writer questioned the speediness of the jury in coming to a decision, but the readers were told that the jury must be trusted in their judgement.

An advertisement block encouraged readers to call the News and Observer CityLine service to voice their opinions. Readers were also told that more information could continue to be found on the Internet, and the address was given.

Photographs included Johnnie Cochran hugging a smiling O.J. Simpson, the crowd outside of the Wake County courthouse in Raleigh as the verdict was being read, Shaw University (of Raleigh) students rejoicing over the verdict, two citizens arguing over the verdict, and a small photo of Rosa Lopez.

New York Times--One article dealt with the racial split

at the end of the trial as it was at the beginning of the trial. A restaurant manager and a customer who had always talked over coffee got into a heated argument after the verdict was announced because they had opposing opinions. This happened to be at the Pasqua Coffee Bar in Manhattan, but such scenes could be found all over the country.

Another article entitled "After 474 days as a prisoner, he is free" touched on the disputes between the defense lawyers, Robert Shapiro and Johnnie Cochran, Jr. The reactions of Simpson were also recorded as wearing a forced smile and "Mr. Simpson's body instantly uncoiled." The families of the victims went into seclusion. Simpson did not talk to reporters. However, he did give a statement to his oldest son, Jason, who said that Simpson said, "They are out there somewhere. Whatever it takes to identify them and bring them in I'll provide somehow. I can only hope that some day, despite every prejudicial thing that has been said about me, people will understand and believe that I would not, could not and did not kill anyone."

According to another story, the day of October 3, 1995, experienced a stand still from 1:00 p.m. to 1:10 p.m. Everyone was listening to the verdict of the O.J. Simpson case. A chart illustrated the increase of long-distance phone calls during the time of 12:50 p.m. to 1:10 p.m. on that day.

The views of people from around the country were also

investigated. In Atlanta, Georgia, the majority of the population was rejoicing. In Lansing, Michigan, people were discontented with the verdict. In Fairfax, Virginia, most of the people were in disbelief.

One article told of the treatment that police officers in Los Angeles experienced once the verdict was read. "A mostly black throng of spectators" shouted at the officers.

In an article about the families, Charisse Jones said that all three families were crying, although their tears were for different reasons.

A story about the jury said that once one of the jurors smiled, everyone knew the verdict. A chart illustrated the profiles of the jury including their race, marital status, and age.

Another article dealt with what was going to happen to O.J. Simpson now that he was a free man. Some thought that he may become even more wealthy.

In a sidebar, Deirdre Carmody examined the rush to fax machines after the verdict was reached because so many new books were going to be published.

In an editorial by the newspaper, the flaws of the case were discussed. There were errors and possibilities of tampering, and there was much incriminating evidence.

Scott Turow wrote an editorial about the mistakes by the prosecutors. Their main mistake according to him was their "ugly tactics" from the beginning that "aroused suspicions

about the criminal justice system among members of racial minorities in Los Angeles and elsewhere."

Photographs included the same large photo of O.J. Simpson smiling as Johnnie Cochran hugged him as appeared in the regional paper that same day; Christopher Darden and Marcia Clark with looks of dismay; O.J. Simpson arriving home; people outside of the "Today" show studio at Rockefeller Center as the verdict was announced; people in South-Central Los Angeles, Buffalo, Atlanta, Manhattan, and Ossining, N.Y. as the verdict was read; and the families of Ronald Goldman and Nicole Brown Simpson.

Analysis

The News and Observer and the New York Times covered the O.J. Simpson case with in-depth methods and sufficient information. Each newspaper continued to have up-to-date information about the case almost everyday. However, some differences were noted in the content of the material from each paper and the type of coverage that each newspaper had.

The News and Observer had to rely on wire reports for most of its information. It often did not have many photographs and seldom had charts or graphics that described case information. Most of the stories appeared first on the front page in bold headlines. A more local angle was placed on stories because people from the region could be interviewed. More opinions of "everyday" people were often included through the option to write to the "People's Forum." The newspaper even offered a phone service for people to call in their opinions on the verdict of the case for later publication.

The New York Times had more in-depth stories probably because it was able to have its own reporters present in the courtroom during the trial. More detail was given to certain statistics in this newspaper's articles. Extra relevant information was often brought into the stories that the News and Observer did not publish. This newspaper would have a small front page article, and then several different related stories would appear on the jump page. The editorials that

did appear were often more powerful and came from very educated people such as lawyers and professors at well-known universities. Cartoons and charts were also used much more than in the regional paper. The pictorial coverage was much greater in the national paper than in the regional paper, most likely because the New York Times had their own photographer there. The national paper also seemed to choose to print quotes from the attorneys that were more powerful and relevant to the case.

Conclusion

The case of Orenthal James Simpson captivated the nation. Addiction could possibly be the word that best describes the fascination with this case. Many people in this country tuned in to this trial available on cable television almost every day for nine months. Others at least maintained their knowledge of the trial through reading newspapers every day.

The newspapers that were included in the previous study did in fact provide full coverage of the O.J. Simpson murder trial. In reading either one on a regular basis, one could know exactly what was going on with the trial and exactly when the events happened. However, there were noted differences in the coverage by each newspaper.

In viewing an extremely well-known event such as the O.J. Simpson case in a regional and national newspaper, it became obvious that the most complete and full coverage came from the national newspaper, The New York Times. It gave more detailed information and much better pictorial coverage. However, the regional paper, The News and Observer, did provide a more regional angle on several occasions.

In conducting the study of the two newspapers, questions did arise. First, it was interesting to see the different quotes that each newspaper would use in telling the same event. Granted, the national newspaper probably had access to more information, but through the wire service, the regional papers probably had access to much of the information also.

In each instance, it seemed that the quotes used by the national newspaper were more powerful. Second, the regional paper placed more emphasis on front page articles and larger headlines. It seems that the opposite would occur because the case was a national incident, not a regional occurrence.

It was obviously seen that both newspapers were competent in their coverage of the O.J. Simpson trial. Although there were differences, some of which were quite significant, both papers could be trusted to provide accurate and complete coverage. Most likely, the newspapers did provide complete coverage because their readerships demanded it. However, it will never quite be understood why people around the nation stopped their own daily lives to keep up with every detail of the O.J. Simpson murder trial.

Works Cited

- Brooks, B. S., Kennedy, G., Moen, Daryl R., et al. (1992). News reporting and writing. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Jenson, J. (1994). Simpson's saga arrests magazines' attention. Advertising Age, 65(28), 23.
- Kaplan, J. (1994). In praise of the media's O.J. Simpson case coverage. Editor & Publisher, 127(47), 56.
- The News and Observer. (1994, June 30-July 06; 1995, September 28-October 04).
- The New York Times. (1994, June 30-July 06; 1995, September 28- October 04).
- O.J. coverage: OK or OD? (1994, July). Broadcasting & Cable, 124, 106.