Abundant popular discourses surround the O. J. Simpson double murder case. By contrast, Darnell Hunt scrutinizes these very discourses in order to further our understanding of the interests underlying them. Exploring the relationships between O. J.’s trial, the social location of television viewers (their race, gender and class) and everyday consciousness of social issues, his textual and audience analyses consider the incredible allure of the trial as “media event.” Looking beyond the obvious explanations of celebrity, scandal and voyeurism, Dr Hunt asks: Why was America so obsessed by this case? Why were so many people invested in particular outcomes? And what are we to make of the apparent racial divide in attitudes about the case, as shown in the opinion polls? *O. J. Simpson Facts and Fictions* incorporates insights from sociology and cultural studies to examine the implications for race relations in the United States at the dawn of the new millennium.
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