

Eyewitness Evidence in Criminal Investigations Analysis

Posted on September 30, 2019

An eyewitness is a person who is a witness to the happenings of a particular event and gives a first-hand description and details of the event. In many criminal cases, the testimony of an eyewitness is an important part of convicting a criminal. It is admissible in many countries, including America. Should eyewitness testimonies be admissible in court? This is a controversial topic, and many scholars and professionals present their arguments in favour of or against this practice. I think that it should be admissible in the court because, firstly, it can influence the jury's decision and help them to a better understanding of the case, as the eyewitness describes how the crime was committed and who committed the crime.

Testimonies of eyewitnesses are reliable when they are recorded right after the occurrence of the event. There are many cases in which eyewitness is the only evidence available, and convicting a criminal is not possible if the testimony is not admissible in court. The criminal lineup is a process in which a suspect can be identified by the crime victim or an eyewitness, and it can be used as evidence at trial. I also believe that in a criminal line up eyewitness identification is a good opportunity for convicting a criminal. An eyewitness can be termed as a reliable person who can identify the criminal in the criminal lineup process, and this can be double-checked in various ways. Contrary to my belief, there are many factors that prove that eyewitnesses to crime are often unreliable. Primarily, eyewitness testimonies rely only on the memory of the person. There are many studies conducted on human memory which show that human memory can easily be altered; pressure and fear can also affect a person's memory, and they can convict the wrong person. So, recognizing the pros and cons of eyewitness testimonies, I can say that they should be admissible in court after crosschecking them multiple times.

For broader context, see [Managing Criminal Investigations Methods Ethics and Evidence](#).

Many animals like cats, dogs, apes, and ducks are used by scientists in psychological research. These animals are kept in a controlled environment, and scientists use different medicines on them, affecting their hormonal makeup. There is much discussion about the use of animals in psychological research. I consider that animals should not be used in psychological research. Animals are kept in cages, different kinds of drugs that are meant for humans are tested on them, and they have to follow strict guidelines. There was an experiment, "the flower-pot cat," where the cats were not allowed to sleep until they died (Dawson). Treating animals in such a way is an ethical reason, which emphasizes that animals should not be used. There are also many scientific reasons which are against the use of animals in psychological research.

They are of the view that humans are very different from animals and that animals behave differently,

so they are not a good model of human behaviour. They also argue that scientists can misinterpret the results as animals are unable to communicate and give answers. Suppose an animal is sad or depressed because of some other reason, but scientists can interpret that the animal is showing signs of depression because of their experiments. There are also cases where the drugs tested on animals showed harmful outcomes for humans. Along with these ethical and scientific reasons, scientists should consider the cost and benefits of the research conducted on animals and apply the outcomes to humans. I do not feel that there are any conditions where animals should be used as experimental items because they are also living creatures who can think and feel. However, such research can be conducted in which animals are in their natural setting, and no interference is made in their behaviour.

There is a common belief that our society has always been as aggressive as it was in the past, but we only hear more about it because of global technological connections. The two world wars and many other offensive wars all over the world in the past are proof of this. The warriors who have killed many others are always glorified in history. It shows that our society was always aggressive. However, I believe that this is not true, and technology is helping to make societies more aggressive. Boys from the age of 7 start playing violent video games whose only mission is to fight and kill others. Movies and television shows also promote violence and the killing of others. A character in a movie who kills his enemy without showing mercy is the hero, and a person who is against violence is always a side character.

It shows how our society is motivating violence. Violent movies, video games, and television shows aid in instilling a belief in the minds of the children that violence is not something wrong and a person is a coward who does not show violence. There are many cases in the world now that show the worst form of cruel behaviour. People are becoming more and more intolerant and showing high signs of aggression. Another factor contributing to increased violence and aggression in society is the alienation of the people from each other. In the past, people used to live in small cities and towns, and they all were either related to each other or had some affiliation. Still, now, people in big cities are alienated, and they usually commit acts of violence towards complete strangers.

Works Cited

Dawson, Angus. "Ethical Issues and Guidelines in Psychology." *Nurse Researcher*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2006, pp. 85-87.