

# Sociological journal



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

A situation that has been in the news lately is the O. J. Simpson robbery case out of the United States. In order not to judge events, I will only write about what the courts have found. In the current trial, O. J. Simpson was found guilty of twelve counts of robbery and kidnapping. However, Simpson was the focus of another famous trial. Simpson was found not guilty in the criminal trial of the murder of his wife, Nicole Brown Simpson, and her friend, Ron Goldman. In this entry, an analysis of the current trial will be undertaken, with a little bit of history from the first trial.

After Simpson was found not guilty in his criminal murder trial, a civil trial found him guilty of the same act. This labeled Simpson a murderer. Under the Social Bond Theory, Simpson's bond with society was broken. He was no longer considered just an actor or football player. Simpson was treated like a freak or pariah. This would increase his chances of committing a deviant act in the future.

Simpson was put in the position for armed robbery by the civil ruling regarding Simpson to pay the Goldman and Brown family monetarily for their loss of loved ones. This would fall under Access to Illegitimate Opportunities. O. J. Simpson hid most of his assets from the courts. The armed robbery was of things that Simpson claimed were his own. If the Goldmans had not tracked down and taken most of Simpson's possessions and money, then Simpson would not have had the opportunity to hide his possessions or reclaim them through force. This would also fall under the Differential Association Theory. When hiding his possessions from the Goldmans, Simpson could not hide them in a legitimate place. He had to associate with other criminals. This association could have pushed him into taking back what Simpson believed was his own. This association could have blurred

right and wrong in Simpson's mind.

Under the Labeling Theory, the strength of labeling lies within those who are doing the labeling. In this case, the majority of the world followed the first case. Thus the strength of this labeling was strong. The Primary Deviance was Simpson's involvement in the death of his ex-wife and her friend. The Secondary Deviance was the armed robbery.

Simpson's first crime was indictable, because it involved homicide. The second crime was also indictable, since it was a robbery. Both crimes would be defined as a Street Crime or Conventional Crime, since both were violent. This does go against the societal norm, because of Simpson's age. Simpson is in his sixties. After the 34, the criminal rate for violent and property crimes decline. Since Simpson is a man, he falls in the gender most likely to commit a violent crime. In the U. S. African Americans statistically fall with in higher crime rate percentage. Simpson is African America.

Simpson has not been sentenced yet. Punishment is Retribution, Social Protection, Rehabilitation, and Deterrence. The sentence for armed robbery would not be retribution, since Simpson was robbing associates with his own memorabilia. Social protection could be reason for Simpson's sentence.

Simpson has proven that he is a danger to others. Rehabilitation would not be a deciding factor, since Simpson is in his sixties. Any behaviors are unlikely to be changed now. Deterrence would not be a factor, since people are sentenced for armed robbery daily.

Simpson is a product of the society surrounding him. That does not mean society made Simpson commit his crimes. To relate Simpson and society is a way to understand why the events happened, not justify them. Simpson was fated for another crime when the world labeled him thirteen years ago.