


12

ANGRY MEN

is an American drama film directed by Sidney Lumet based on a screenplay of the same name by Reginald Rose. the movie was produced by Rose and Henry Fonda, one of the actors in the movie and was released in 1957.

This film tells the story of a jury of 12 men as they deliberate the guilt or acquital of a defendant on the basis of reasonable doubt. The verdict of the jury should be unanimous in criminal trials.



with LEE J. COBB • ED BEGLEY and E. G. MARSHALL • JACK WARDEN • Story and Screenplay by REGINALD ROSE
Directed by SIDNEY LUMET • Produced by HENRY FONDA and REGINALD ROSE • Associate Producer GEORGE JUSTIN
An ORION-NOVA Production • Released thru UNITED ARTISTS

Courtroom drama

American constitution Murder case

12 reasonable doubt

In form 12 angry men is a courtroom drama. It generally a journey into those alleys of the American constitution which promises the defendants a fair trial based on their proven innocence.

The first 3 minutes of the movie just shows the brief setup of the plot and a much briefer consequential epilogue of the story. The rest of the story happens in a small stuffy jury room in the court.



2ND FLOOR
COURT OF
GENERAL SESSION
SPECIAL TERM
PART IV 238
V 248
VIII 212
XI 208
XII 252



THE TRIAL

We get to see nothing of the trial, get nothing to hear from the prosecutor nor the defendant but only a perfunctory of the judge who hands over the charge to the jury, as if the verdict is some definite conclusion.

We get to know from the judge that the proceeding case is a first degree murder charge and the accused if proven guilty will be sent to the electric chair.



THE JURORS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

A small, petty man who is impressed with the authority he has and handles himself quite formally. Not overly bright but dogged.

A meek, hesitant man who finds it difficult to maintain any opinions of his own. Easily swayed and usually adopts the opinion of the last person to whom he has spoken.

A very strong, very forceful extremely opinionated man within whom can be detected a streak of sadism. He is a humorless man who is intolerant of opinions other than his own and accustomed to forcing his wishes and view on others.

Seems to be a man of wealth and position, a stock broker which he reveals later. He is a practiced speaker who presents himself well at all times. He seems to feel a little bit above the rest of the jurors. His only concern is with the facts in this case, and he is appalled at the behaviour of the others.

A naive, very frightened young man who takes his obligations in this case seriously but, who finds it difficult to speak up when his elders have the floor.

An honest but dull witted man who comes upon his decisions slowly and carefully. A man who finds it difficult to create positive opinions, but who must listen to and digest and accept those opinions offered by others which appeal to him most.

A loud, flashy-handed salesman type who has more important things to do than to sit on a jury. He is quick to show temper, quick to form opinions on things about which he knows nothing. Is a bully and, of course, a coward.

A quiet, thoughtful, gentle man. A man who sees all sides of every question and constantly seeks the truth. A man of strength tempered with compassion. Above all, he is a man who wants justice to be done and will fight to see that it is.

A mild gentle old man long since defeated by life and now merely waiting to die. A man who recognizes himself for what he is and mourns the days when it would have been possible to be courageous without shielding himself behind his many years.

An angry, bitter man. He is a man who antagonizes almost at sight. A bigot who places no values on any human life save his own, a man who has been nowhere and is going nowhere and knows it deep within him.

A refugee from Europe who has come to this country in 1941. A man who speaks with an accent and who is ashamed, humble, almost subservient to the people around him, but who will honestly seek justice because he has suffered through so much injustice.

A slick, bright advertising man who thinks of human beings in terms of percentages, graphs, and polls and has no real understanding of people. He is a superficial snob, but trying to be a good fellow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

The jury retires for discussion

Distributes papers to all to jot down stuff, co-ordinates the whole session

Talk it's an open and shut case which is taking a lot of time and how the kids of today who ought to be slapped every time.

Gets offended as he was a slum dweller once

Worried about the ball game.

Shows his racist attitude towards slum people

The voting happens for the 1st time

Talks about the old man as witness

Casts not guilty

Mentions the lady as the witness

Mentions about kids
these days and
a b o u t h i s
relationship with his
son.

Says there can't be coincidences or possibilities whether the boy is guilty or not.

Mentions the knife was a rare piece, one of its kind so a coincidence is not possible.

Explains the case and probable loopholes in it that justifies his cause. Asks to see the murder weapon, the knife.

Shows a look alike
of the boy's knife.

Calls for a second vote and claims that he will end the argument if anybody other than him vote not guilty.

2nd round of voting happens

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Abuses No. 5, for changing vote to not guilty for his fellow brethren.		Not guilty Gets offended with what No.3 says and argues back				Discloses that he changed the vote to not guilty and offers his reason.			
			Discusses with No. 11 regarding the knife and the evidence the old man downstairs presented.	Brings up a point that the old man couldn't possibly run up to the door as he had a faulty leg.		Wants to wrap up the session fast without much contributions.			Mentions the lady as the witness		
	Opposes the test No 8 and other people conduct to simulate the old man's scenario.							Simulates the situation how the old man could have interpreted the case.			
	Infuriated by this. He yells at No. 8 that he will kill him.					3rd round of voting happens					Not guilty
	Later talks to number 4 that No 8 said something very excitable.							Speaks to No.3 that in spite of seeing all the possibilities and denying them he is behaving like the executioner of the boy. He mentions that he must be a sadist.			
						4th round of voting happens					

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Votes not guilty.

Makes a point about the stab wound.

Enacts the use of a switchblade knife with No.8

Offers to give a demo how a switchblade knife is used

5th round of voting happens

Votes not guilty.

Votes not guilty.

Votes for not guilty. Couldn't justify why he voted.

Asks No.10 to keep his mouth shut and not talk again

Again draws back to racist remarks that people leave the table.

Brings up the issue of the woman's eyesight

Votes not guilty

Votes not guilty

Votes not guilty

6th round of voting happens

Argues with all that they can't prove anything, and stays stubborn. But finally relieved of a personal burden.

Votes not guilty

MEANS OF STORYTELLING

Although Reginald Rose wrote the original screenplay quite lucidly but presenting in a movie a full 92 minutes in a single room is a challenge in itself.




THE SETTING







CHARA
CTER
ASSOC





protago
n i s t
ANTAG







The
lens
plot













Takeaw ay

