## 12 ANGRY MEN: ANALYSIS

12 Angry Men has maintained significant popularity as political representation under the mundane courtroom potboiler for people learning about innocence and justice within legal premises. Directed by Sidney Lumet, who focused on controversial topics through his filmography, the movie stars Henry Fonda, Jack Klugman, Lee J. Cobb, and E.G. Marshall in lead roles. 12 Angry Men is no exception to Lumet’s idea of detailing courtroom drama while explicating the 1950’s America through social divisions (Ref-DJ49KL). The major setup of the movie is in the sweltering courtroom, where twelve men debate on an Italian defendant’s conviction of killing his father. The charm of the movie is the indirect dialogue and evidence, which are different from common courtroom movies that hang on to explaining the entire case through prologues, character stories, and juror debates. 12 Angry Men deviates from pulling the viewer in, as the debate and verdict are never directly explained to the person.

The political satire is in the major construction of the case: and antique switchable, which, under the US Constitution, cannot be justified for murder as it is circumstantial evidence (Ref-A1B2C3). The concept of innocence until proven guilty is used fervently in our legal system, and the movie uses it, as Juror no. 3 claims it to be an “open and shut” case; however, the movie’s gist is in the personal conflict and underlying motives. The defendant, the defendant, is shown once in the brief shot, and the conflict intertwines among the twelve jurors. The movie’s cinematography is a remarkable representation of stylized realism set in a claustrophobic room to develop a stark repertoire among the booming Technicolor movies of its time (Ref-D4E5F6). The debacle among the jurors is speckled with swears, smokes, and aggression, which jitters the viewer as a court attendee. The twelve jurors are introduced in quick prologues, while the film runs tirelessly through his smaller runtime of 95 minutes. Juror 8 (Henry Fonda) is the rational protagonist, who splits the hairs in the case, and runs a thorough argument to save the child, while major racial opposition is from Juror 10, who despises the boy for his social background. He exclaims, “You know how these people lie. It’s born in them.” The alienation and partiality are vocalized in the early American legal system; however, some jurors quickly turn their back from the unnecessary arguments on race (Ref-G7H8I9).

The racial argument is a powerful statement in the movie and Begley’s prejudice is shunned for an American culture that hangs on social disparities. Twelve Angry Men, an adaptation of Reginal Rose’s teleplay, is a weaving argument of social perceptions and how they can influence legal decisions under the social landscape. The movie starts with an 11 against 1 vote to sentence the boy to death and moves by criminalizing the 11 jurors for not investigating thoroughly. The movie heroifies Fonda as the rational juror who magnifies the intricacies in the case, yet some jurors (nos. 7 and 11) have fresh perspectives on the defendant’s life (Ref-A1B2C3). To increase the tension among the characters and story development, Lumet applied lens plot changes to make the room more claustrophobic. It also teaches the teamwork among the individuals and the strategies that need to be adopted by the leader to defuse any escalation. Moreover, the first half movie has a perspective from below, as the room appears more accommodating, and the jurors are put on a pedestal. However, after the two-thirds, the perspective changed from the ceiling to the characters (Ref-D4E5F6). The increasing tension in the movie is allocated from the ceiling closing in with the walls on the jurors as the viewer navigates the case with the jurors and manages to discern the story by the last wide concluding shot.

Twelve Angry Men was Lumet’s first venture on the large screen and has become the main directive for filmmakers to apply through gripping lens techniques (Ref-DJ49F2). Camera positions in the movies provide the sense of domination, while focus changes help in the mood and storytelling, and the end has the viewer hovering over the jury to provide the overwhelmed arguments touching the ceiling with the debate. The movie used classic storytelling with gripping drama to manage its way through discussions of race, power, and legalities, which prime it as a classic to this day.