**Juror number 10**

Ladies and gentlemen, today I am here to discuss with you the play written by Reginald Rose. It is called 12 Angry Men and is set in the 1950s. A group of 12 jurors are set to make the decision of sentencing a young 19 year old boy to death due to the murder of his father. The men have received multiple accounts from witnesses of the crime and experts in the field of psychology. Although convincing, not all are so keen in deeming his guilt quite so fast. One by one, these frustrated gentlemen turn their votes from guilty to not guilty however much persuasion was needed in doing so.

Rose is a very clever writer in the sense that his thinking process for the play was thoroughly developed. We notice that the title states ‘12 Angry Men’, instead of the likes of ’12 Angry People’. This is simply because in the 1950s women were not allowed to sit on juries and therefore there could not be any female jurors in the script. Rose crams countless examples of prejudice into this piece to highlight the discrimination that was happening at the time. At the beginning, everyone’s decision was purely based on assumption instead of logic. Through juror 8, the rest of the panel are able to clearly see his reasoning as to why the slums-reared boy is guilt free.

For this presentation I would like to discuss with you the mind-set of Juror number 10. He is described as ‘an angry, bitter man – a man who antagonizes almost at sight. He is also a bigot who places no value on human life save his own. Here is a man who is going nowhere, has been nowhere and knows it deep within him.’ He is one of the last jurors to change their vote. He represents someone who is prejudiced towards all ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds. Juror 10 often refers to people with a less fortunate lifestyle to himself as ‘one of them’ which shows his arrogance and ignorance towards equality and respect.

“These people are born to lie. Now it’s the way they are and no intelligent man is gonna tell me otherwise. They don’t know what the truth is… They are different. They act different”

I would like to point out the fact that Juror number 10 never came forward with his own ideas. He merely shot down anyone else’s theories and his bias made him close-minded. He speaks with a powerful voice that is very stern and menacing. This is to make others feel inferior because as the play-write says in the description, Juror 10 knows deep within that he is going no- where in life and so belittling people will help him gain power, self- control and self- respect. His behaviour begins to become so intolerable that other jurors start to call him out on his rudeness.

Juror #11: I beg pardon...

Juror #10: "I beg pardon?" What are you so polite about?

Juror #11: For the same reason you are not: it's the way I was brought up.

It is not until the final scene that Juror 10 reveals the fact that he does believe there is reasonable doubt that the boy murdered his father. Prior to this, the man makes a speech about how ‘they’ all lie and how human life does not mean as much to ‘them’ as it does to ‘us’. He begins to become agitated when he realises that the rest of the group don’t seem to care about his allegations as it was all except three who had changed their vote. It is Juror 4 who has the courage to stand up to him and silence him right up until the miraculous point that he sides with everybody else. In my opinion, his ego needed to be brought down to the same level as others before he could clearly see what everyone else had realised. There was reasonable doubt. This was all that was needed in order to save the boy’s life. Reasonable doubt. Finally it is here we can accept the Juror number 10 as another ‘not guilty’ voter rather than a strong antagonist of the storyline.

Thank you for listening and I hope you enjoyed it!