

Juror 8 in 12 angry men



Could the boy be accountable for murdering his father? The play 12 Angry Men written by Reginald Rose in 1957, presents a homicidal case that confronts twelve jurors who vote whether the boy is or is not guilty of murdering his father. Out of the twelve jurors about eleven voted that the boy is indeed guilty of murdering his father. While one juror voted the boy is innocent. This juror is a man named Davis his way of having a different vote, while all of the people around him share a similar vote. Davis presents a skill of leadership. Davis one different opinion gives doubt to the rest of the crowd, for him to change the mind of the rest of the crowd with persuasion.

First, Juror eight uses imagery to help recreate the scene of the murder in the jury's head of the scene where the father was murdered. An old man testified that he witnessed the boy fleeing the crime scene. However, Juror eight points out that it couldn't have been possible for the old man to hear or know what's going on. He proves that by using the rhetorical jiu-jitsu. Juror eight goes on to say, "The old man would have to hear the boy say, 'I'm going to kill you,' while the front of the el was roaring past his nose. It's not possible that he could have heard it." (Rose pg. 15) ENDING SENTENCE

Secondly, Juror eight then uses evidence in the jury to certify the boy is telling the truth. He uses the evidence of the weapon used at the crime scene, which is a switchblade. The jury provides a replica of the switchblade. Juror eight goes on to explain how the jury is incorrect about this weapon being hard to get, but instead the weapon is easily accessible to everyone.

First and foremost, Juror eight recreates the scene of the incidence the place the boy's father used to be as soon as murdered to persuade the jury nearer

to an imagery which paints a photo in their minds on what occurred. This he does via a rhetorical jiu-jitsu to show the thing that the historic man, who claimed to have witnessed the ordeal, ought to now not have limped to the front door in 15 seconds to see the boy run down the stairs. He says, “ The historic man would have had to hear the boy say, “ I’m going to kill you,” at the same time as the front of the el was once roaring preceding his nose. It’s no longer possible that he have to have heard it.”(Rose pg. 15). This Juror has indeed mastered the persuasive ability that you require something chromatic that yields thoughts that have an impact on humans to go in the route of the thought (Kotter, pg. 3).

Also, Juror eight turns into influential to his eleven exceptional colleagues when he produces tangible proof in the jury to exhibit the honesty of the boy. The proof is a switchblade, an proper replica of the one used in the crime, which the jury purchased. He proves that the murder weapon is now no longer as special as referred to in the jury room as it is greatly on hand to anyone. He does this with utmost decorum, acknowledging the opinion of other Jurors. (Rose, pg. 9). This makes him a alternate catalyst and his colleagues are left to interact in inductive reasoning as they find out the probabilities as a end result are making an attempt to locate out the truth.

Moreover, the Juror influences the jury when he demonstrates his cognitive ability. This he does thru analyzing, by means of capacity of phronesis, the truth that the woman in the course of the avenue no longer have certainly viewed the defendant stabbing his father thru the home windows of a passing elevated train. The juror eight declare that the girl saw the most insignificant small print as the train had 5 cars and she observed the ordeal

with the aid of the windows of the remaining two. This may also favor to as well make her a liar. He says. “ How come you believed her? She’s one of “ them” too, is no longer she?”(Rose, pg. 7).

The Juror employs the method of leveling and soliciting comments to persuade his colleagues towards the ideology of innocence of the boy. This he does via his open-receptive persona the vicinity the degrees with the others with the useful resource of admitting overtly that he is now no longer sure whether or not or not the boy is accountable of the murder or not. He then goes ahead to solicit remarks so as to make a concrete decision. He states that “ I simply don’t think we want to ship a boy off to die barring at least speakme about it first.”(Rose, pg. 5) The occasion he gadgets buoys up the one-of-a-kind eleven jurors to level and as a end end result makes them open to take delivery of feedback. This subsequently makes them change their vote closer to the defendant.

He initiates a alternate and fights to manage it imparting proof of his decision. He is the solely character to vote “ not guilty” for the case, besides being influenced by way of others decision. (Rose, pg. 9) He stimulated others to discuss about the case with self-confidence which ultimately led them to vote “ NOT GUILTY”. Also, he continuously asks unique Jurors for input and seeks their opinions, through kairos which is a effective non-defensive way of communication which brings them to a commonplace, contributing to the alternate in the choice via the special participants of the jury.

Conclusively, the juror 8 is depicted as a excellent influencer for this reason an high nice leader in making changes to other people's gibberish opinions in the jury room. This is as a stop end result of his personality and skills which he employs in the case towards the defendant boy (Kotter, pg3). As the jury goes by the rigorous method of inspecting the statistics from the initial votes, he convinces them one after the other, in that at the factor of balloting questioning about all the facts, the complete jury vote for the boy's innocence. As a fact, therefore, besides the Juror 8's persuasive talents and eunoia, there would be prejudice over the boy's case and genuinely be charged accountable of the offense. Thus, justice wouldn't have been served.

Works Cited

- Kotter, John. "Change Leadership." *Executive Excellence* 16. 4 (1999): 16. Business Source Premier. Web. 5 Oct 2016.
- Goleman. Daniel. *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam, 2000. Print.
- Peg Bouges. "12 Angry Men 1957." *YouTube* YouTube, 16 Jan. 2016. Web. 5 Oct. 2016.
- Rose, Reginald. *Twelve angry men*. Penguin, 1955.