

CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSION

After analysing the social conflict in Reginald Rose's Twelve Angry Men, I would like to present the conclusion. In my opinion, the eight social conflicts show how the author represent the United States judicial system, he shows that on the one hand maybe the system has a flaw because the jurors sometimes get swayed by their emotions and prejudice in taking the verdict but on the other hand when juror number eight successfully presents the reasonable doubt it reassure the audience that they can rely on the system. The progress of how the reasonable doubt is developed can be seen in each of the conflict.

In the first conflict all the jurors agree to vote without discussing the case first. This is mainly because the majority of the jurors think that this case is very convincing and they should not waste their time to discuss it again. But this is not how juror number eight thinks. He has a doubt in his mind and he thinks all the jurors have responsibility to discuss the case first because someone's life is at stake. Through the first conflict all the jurors agree to discuss the facts in this case to prove whether there is a reasonable doubt or not.

In the second conflict juror number eight is able to present the exact kind of knife that is used to kill the victim. This knife is believed to be the only one of its kind by the group who votes not guilty. This conflict is the first reasonable doubt that juror number eight presents and it successfully convinces juror number nine to change his vote to not guilty. The third conflict gives the idea that one of the witnesses, the old man, might have lied. After juror number five hears the argument from juror number eight and nine, he starts to believe that there is a reasonable doubt in this case and changes his vote to not guilty.

The fourth conflict is a proof of strong reasonable doubt, because after this conflict three of the jurors change their vote to not guilty. In this conflict juror number eight shows that the old man's testimony cannot be trusted. In the court the old man testifies that he is sure he can reach the door in his room in fifteen seconds despite his physical condition. But this testimony is broken when juror number eight reconstructs the event. After this conflict the vote is six to six. After the third vote, now there are five jurors change their vote to not guilty. It is a proof that juror number eight's reasonable doubt is not just a feeling but it is based on the fact and it can be discussed.

In the fifth conflict juror number four tries to convince the other jurors that the boy is guilty. He thinks the old man might be wrong on some facts but he really sees the boy run downstairs. After this conflict juror number two changes his vote again to guilty. But for the group who votes not guilty this conflict is a proof of doubt, because there is a 50:50 chance to the old man's testimony.

The sixth and seventh conflicts are also strong proofs of reasonable doubt. In the sixth conflict juror number eight supported by juror number five

successfully convinces three more jurors to change their vote to not guilty. The defendant is an experienced knife fighter and juror number eight proves that the stab wound in the victim is not from an experienced knife fighter. This makes the fact about victim's stab wound debatable and this is a room for reasonable doubt. After the sixth conflict three more jurors change their vote to not guilty, and the vote now is nine to three in favour of not guilty. In the last conflict there are jurors number three, four, and ten who still vote guilty. Juror number four still holds one fact that makes him believe that the boy is guilty, while juror number three and ten are just following juror number four's argument. Later in the seventh conflict the one fact that juror number four holds is also debatable. This makes juror number four and ten change their vote to not guilty. In the eighth conflict the last juror who still believes that the boy is guilty changes his vote to not guilty because he fails to give an argument.

After reading and analysing Reginald Rose's *Twelve Angry Men*, I found that reasonable doubt is the most important issue in the play. The play shows how the reasonable doubt works. It also reflects how the judicial system in the US works. The eight conflict presented in the play show that it is not easy to declare if the defendant is guilty or not guilty because the jury's verdict must be unanimous, if not there will be a hung jury which means the court will retry the defendant with different jury panel. When one of the jurors has reasonable doubt he also has the responsibility to give an explanation about it to the other jurors. This confirms that the US judicial system is very cautious on taking the verdict when it comes to the most serious charge with death penalty in it. The jury cannot simply declare

the defendant guilty and send him off to death if one of the jurors has a reasonable doubt.

In the play, we clearly see the majority of the jurors are affected by their prejudice, emotion, and feeling in taking the verdict in the first vote. Without discussing the case first there are eleven jurors instantly give a guilty verdict. It is difficult to reach the true justice in the court, sometimes human are limited by their prejudice, emotion and feeling which lead to a false decision. The false decision could have a big impact on the verdict and certainly this kind of verdict is far away from the true justice. No matter how hard the jurors try to separate their prejudice, emotion and feeling from their verdict, in reality it will always affect them. This is where the reasonable doubt takes place to break these three things to create the true justice, because reasonable doubt should not be based on those three things but on reason and common sense instead.

