Reasonable Doubts: The O.J. Simpson Case And The Criminal Justice System
Alan Dershowitz, one of the foremost legal thinkers of our time, explores a series of questions raised by the most watched criminal trial in American history. Through this brilliant, eye-opening account of the O.J. Simpson case, he exposes the realities of the criminal justice system in this country. Here, Professor Dershowitz examines the issues and social forces - media, money, gender, and race - that shape the criminal justice system in America today. Among the fascinating questions raised: Was this really a case of circumstantial evidence? Did Simpson’s wealth “buy” the acquittal? How could one of the longest trials in the history of America’s judicial system produce a verdict after less than four hours of jury deliberation? Reasonable Doubts is a work of lasting importance; it will force us to rethink our assumptions, not only about the case itself but about the strengths - and weaknesses - of the criminal justice system. This book is for the many thoughtful observers who sincerely and understandably believe that O.J. Simpson murdered Nicole Brown and Ronald Goldman, and that the jury’s verdict of not guilty was therefore a miscarriage of justice.

**Synopsis**

When the word came... that there was a verdict... I also thought I would have to begin preparing for an appeal. Indeed, from the moment I learned that the jurors had reached their verdict, I began to outline the likely issues for the appeal. As an appellate lawyer... My job is to prepare for the worst... That is why O.J. Simpson always referred to me as his “God forbid™ lawyer...” God forbid there should be a conviction, you™ve got to get it reversed on appeal.™ â| But there was no
mistaking the jury’s verdict: not guilty. There was silence in my office. No one cheered. It was not a moment for celebration. There were two victims, brutally murdered. There was a man who had spent sixteen months in jail accused of a crime of which a jury had just ruled he was not legally guilty, but of which most Americans though he was factually guilty. (Pg. 13-14)

He continued, ‘œI have written this book primarily for the majority of thoughtful observers who sincerely and understandably believe that O.J. Simpson killed Nicole Brown and Ronald Goldman. I will try to explain why even jurors who thought that Simpson ‘œdid it’œ could reasonably have found him not guilty as a matter of law—and of justice. It is my intention to explain how, under our system of criminal justice, the Simpson jury could properly have reached a verdict so at odds with the conclusion reached by millions of intelligent and decent people who watched what they believed was the same trial.’œ (Pg.

Reasonable Doubts

Alan M. Dershowitz was first in his class at Yale Law School and later became a full professor at Harvard Law School at age 28, the youngest in the school’s history. He was involved in many famous cases. This book is written for those who believe OJ was guilty and the jury’s verdict wrong. The ‘œIntroduction’œ tells about the suspense in waiting for the verdict on October 4, 1995. [I believe this crime was over-publicized to distract people from the war scare of May 1994. Don’t remember it? That was the purpose. How many other double murders occurred in 1994?] Why was there a racial bias among people? Didn’t it occur before (‘œIntroduction’œ)? That TV program ‘œHard Copy’œ presented the facts in this case and suffered by being moved to a later time slot then taken off the air (p.16). It is unfair to compare it to a weekly tabloid. This book will explain why the jury voted ‘œnot guilty’œ to those who were misled by the coverage in the press. The LAPD worried about Simpson’s favorable public image and began to demolish it (Chapter I). Robert Shapiro asked him to join the defense team, he did (p.25). Shapiro called in forensic experts Dr. Henry Lee and Dr. Michael Baden. The Grand Jury was recused because of leaks by the prosecution (p.29). He lists ten items of evidence against OJ (p.30), and ten items mistakes made by the police (p.31). Their case was won in the first month by the work of their forensic experts and their legal strategy that locked the prosecution into their initial mistakes. Is a criminal trial a search for truth (Chapter II). No, it’s a process to seek justice that uses truth (p.38). Why do so many people believe OJ did it? Was it merely due to biased reporting (p.45)? Do people love being fooled?
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