

# ANALYSIS PAPER ON THE FILM “12 ANGRY MEN”

by Alibek Zhumagaliyev SE-1902.

“12 Angry Men” is an adaptation of the 1957 crime drama of the same name by Reginald Rose, who even helped Sidney Arthur Lumet (filmmaker) in writing and producing of the film. The film was critically acclaimed and receive numerous awards, such as “Best Motion Picture – Drama” at Golden Globe Awards and “Best Written Drama” for screenplay by Reginald Rose. The story revolves around trial process of teenager boy who is being suspected of killing of his own father. 12 jury must come to a unanimous opinion on this case, determine whether the boy is guilty or innocent, whether he will walk away free or receive a death sentence.

Most of the movie takes place in courtroom where all 12 of the jurors gathered to determine the guilt of the defendant. All the main characters, the 12 jurors, are different in their personalities and beliefs which even sparks the conflict to occur in the courtroom when they clash on this case. After the evidence and witness statements were presented almost instantly everyone was on the side of prosecution. The evidence was irrefutable, and both witnesses claimed it was boy who murdered the father, everyone thought he was already one leg on the electric chair, but one of the juries thought otherwise. Juror number 8, played by Henry Fonda, aka Mr. Davis found evidence unconvincing and was pleading others to have a through discussion before the making of decision. This is met with frustration and malice from some of the jurors, Juror number 7 bought tickets for a baseball game and Juror #8’s decision to unnecessarily prolonging closing of trial drew sharp criticism from him.

*“What's there to talk about? Eleven of us think he's guilty. No one had to think about it twice except you.” -Juror #7.*

Then Juror #8 present his vision of the case, pointing out the conflict in witnesses’ testimonies and cast shadow of the doubt on the presented evidence and its reliability. Yet none of the jurors are convinced and has changed their

mind about the decision. So, Juror #8 comes up with a brilliant idea, he suggests other 11 jurors partake in an anonymous ballot and finally decide the faith of the boy. And to everyone's surprise one of the votes wrote not guilty. Just like that, Juror #8 got what he wanted, an all-out discussion. Through the length of the film jury carry out heated debates on the topic, revealing their personal drama and coming together to recognize the boy on trial as innocent.

The moral of the story is to show that any conflict can be solved via communication, to always be open minded and respect other people and their opinions, be unassuming, calm, and optimistic. In the heat of the argument jurors yelled, humiliated, accused each other, but Juror #8 remained calm, humble, and polite the entire time, painting him as a man of great features and a good example and a role model for people to follow. He never backed down from his beliefs and stood his ground on boy's innocence even when everyone was against him.