

Reginald rose: using personal prejudice and bigotry assignment

[Sociology](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

How does the play use the Jurors to show the conflict between right and wrong? A play written in the 1950s by an American Film writer Reginald Rose showed how conflict can be raised when twelve men of different background and class enter a room where they must decide on the accused guilt or innocence. Rose uses Jurors with high prejudice and bigotry to bring conflict to those Jurors who seek Justice and truth.

He also uses jurors who have no interest or know nothing at all to raise conflict between those who are willingly to fight for the boy's life and give him a decent chance. However Rose chooses to show that there is hope and Justice for the boy by introducing juror eight whom raises conflict by choosing to oppose the other Jurors and providing evidence that the boy is innocent. He shows the audience that there is hope and Justice for Americans in the 1950s In the play 12 Angry Men.

Rose uses Personal prejudice and bigotry on Jurors three and Juror ten's verdict towards the case within the play. Throughout the novel the case triggered an emotional response with Juror three and this resulted in him acting in ways which were considered to be wrong and untruthful. He became too involved and emotionally attached to the case and let his emotions block out the facts and evidence that were being presented to him by Juror eight.

He relates this case to his son and the fact that he didn't punish him and sought out the problem he instead would take his feelings out on the accused and send him to death sentence. Conflict rises between Juror three and eight, after Juror eight had heard him talking about his relationship with

he's son he then says, " I feel sorry for you. What it must feel like to want to pull the switch Ever since you walked into this room, you've been acting like a self-appointed public veneer. You want to see this boy die because you *personally* want It, not because of the facts!

You're a sadist! ", this is evident that once the truth is told and conflict rises " I'll kill him! I'll – *kill him! *", said juror three "[calmly] You don't *really* mean you'll kill me. Do Herodotus by Juror eight. Jurors such as seven were deliberately put in the play to show that, there are people who shouldn't be their Judging on someone's life, if they cannot provide reasonable evidence on their part of the vote and also If they have no Interest to be there at all, as If there be holding there against heir own will.

Juror seven raises conflict when he says " I don't know about the rest of ' me but I'm getting' a little tired of this Yakima-hack and back-and-forth, it's getting' us nowhere. So I guess have to break it up; I change my vote to " not Is evident that he doesn't care about the case and only wants to attend his game, juror eleven responds " " He's right. That's not an answer. What kind off man are you? You have sat here and voted " guilty" with everyone else because there are some baseball tickets burning a hole in your pocket?

And now you've changed your vote because you say you're sick of all the talking here? , " I *can* talk like that to you! If you want to vote " not guilty", then do It because you are convinced the man Is not guilty. Not because you've " had enough". And if you think he is guilty, then vote that way! Or don't you have the guts to do what you think is right? ", this shows how

conflict can rise when evidence on his vote as to Juror eleven raising conflict because of how upset he was hearing Juror seven's comment.

Rose purposely chooses to put a hero or a Justice seeker in the play to bring conflict between right and wrong. Juror eight showed how his reason and logical approach demonstrates one of the few rights in the play. During the initial vote it was Juror eight's courage to rise above everyone and vote not guilty despite what the others would say to him that showed the reader that Rose used his character to demonstrate the right way to act.

His good and Justice behavior is shown from the first vote right through to the end of the play. " It's Just that we're talking about somebody's life here. I mean, we can't decide in five minutes" was his attitude at the first vote even though he did not believe he was guilty or not guilty he couldn't leave that room without doing the Job that he was in there to do which separated his heartsickness from the other Jurors.

With Juror eight's explanation and reasons towards the evidence why the boy isn't guilty, Juror three provides prejudice evidence by saying " He was an old man! Half the time he was confused! How could he be positive about anything? " it is evident that when truth is explained, Juror three will always use his bigotry ways to counter them. Rose deliberately made Juror eight have these characteristics to show the conflict between being right and being wrong in this situation and also the importance of standing up. Sorry no conclusion.