

FILM STUDY GUIDE SERIES

12 ANGRY MEN

by

Sidney Lumet

TEACHER'S COMMENTARY

by

Seán Conlan M.A., H. Dip. Ed.

C&N media
PUBLICATIONS

12 Angry Men, 1957, US, (Approx. 92 minutes), directed by Sidney Lumet and produced by Henry Fonda and Reginald Rose is a United Artists production.

**Also available in this series and specially prepared for the
Leaving Certificate English Comparative Study**

<i>Billy Elliot</i>	Stephen Daldry
<i>Casablanca</i>	Michael Curtiz
<i>Inside I'm Dancing</i>	Damien O'Donnell
<i>The Truman Show</i>	Peter Weir
<i>Witness</i>	Peter Weir
<i>Cinema Paradiso</i>	Giuseppe Tornatore
<i>A Room With A View</i>	James Ivory
<i>Strictly Ballroom</i>	Baz Luhrmann
<i>My Left Foot</i>	Jim Sheridan

**Available as photocopiable resources comprising Student's Guide and Teacher's Commentary,
and suitable for study at
Junior Certificate, Transition Year, L.C.A. or VTOS levels**

<i>The Searchers</i>	John Ford
<i>The Birds</i>	Alfred Hitchcock
<i>The Field</i>	Jim Sheridan
<i>Into The West</i>	Mike Newell
<i>Shane</i>	George Stevens
<i>The Outsiders</i>	F.F. Coppola
<i>To Kill A Mockingbird</i>	Robert Mulligan

For further information contact

**C&N media,
26, Georgian Close,
Drogheda,
Co. Louth.
Phone 041-983 8767
Fax 041-984 5890
e-mail seanconlan@film-studies.net**

For samples of our products visit our web-site at

www.film-studies.net

These notes are available in hard copy free of charge with an order for a class set of the student study guides.

© Seán Conlan 2009 (Revised)

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is prepared for teachers using the Film Study Guide for the Comparative Study in the Leaving Certificate English course. It provides answers to the questions in those notes and raises other issues that the teacher may wish to explore with the class.

The methodology recommended is, firstly, to view the film in its entirety to let the students enjoy it. This viewing can be followed by a class discussion in which the teacher can get a feel for the impact the film has made on the students.

The film has been segmented into ten sequences for close analysis and discussion in class periods of 35 to 40 minutes. Each period should start with the students reading the questions in their notes for the sequence in hand. This will guide their viewing by focusing attention on certain aspects of the action, characterisation, social setting, and *mise en scène* (camerawork, setting, movement, etc.). The teacher may decide to limit the questions to one character or theme, as desired. The students then watch the sequence in a more critical way, and discussion will follow of the points raised in the questions. The class can finish with a re-viewing of the sequence in full or in part, as time permits.

Homework can be set on the sequence viewed in class. This may consist of writing out the answers, merely. The questions are grouped around definite topics, so the students will be developing the capacity to write in coherent paragraphs, if they do this exercise. Other assignments can be given in specific areas like characterisation, action, setting, patterns of imagery, or whatever. This will build into a personal response journal that will be of use when key moments in the film are re-visited with a specific mode in mind.

Following this method will mean that the film can be completed in two to three weeks.

Studying film is a very worthwhile and liberating experience for teachers and pupils. Teachers may find that the expertise of the students outpaces their own. In this case the learning experience is truly social and of benefit to all. Skills of facilitating the group will be developed in this environment. The discipline that the teachers bring from their previous training and experience will act as a scaffold to facilitate learning among the students, and the concepts that the students bring to the class will be strengthened.

SEQUENCE 1

Introducing the Jury

Let the film roll until Juror #6 helps the old juror to his seat

The film opens with a low angle shot of the exterior of a massive neo-classical building. The huge columns are made to appear even bigger by the camera angle. A flight of steps adds to the sense of grandeur. The camera slowly tilts upwards positioning us, the audience, to stand in awe of the structure. The sounds of everyday life in a city are heard on the soundtrack but this does not distract us from the contemplation of the grandeur of the building before us. We reach the entablature and read the motto in grand Roman lettering “DEMONSTRATION OF JUSTICE IS THE FIRMEST PILLAR OF GOOD”. Thus a central theme is introduced at the very start of the film. The reference to ‘pillar’ connects the literal columns of the porch and the metaphorical sense of justice properly supported out as a vital basis of society. The architecture harks back to ancient times and we think of the grandeur of Rome and the laws that have been passed down across time since the early days of Greek democracy.

We cut to the inside of the building and the massive scale of the interior matches that of the façade. As the camera tilts downwards we catch a glimpse of the words ‘Roman’ and ‘Byzantine’, ancient centres of civilisation that have the best of their heritage preserved and maintained in establishments such as this throughout Western society. There is a sense of the structure being the centre of interest as the camera tilts downwards and people appear. The people in the lobby are tiny and move about this way and that. There might be a suggestion that the structure is greater, more enduring, more important than the individuals.

Suddenly the camera follows an individual. There is a sense that any one of the people walking about the building could have been chosen. The random movement of the camera is again emphasised when a man comes out of an elevator and we begin to follow him only to lose interest as another man emerges from a phone booth smiling and obviously delighted with the news he has just received. His mood contrasts starkly with the of the first man who seemed preoccupied and troubled in himself. The group of people at the end of the corridor share noisily in the delight of the man with the news and they are reprimanded by the guard in uniform. The camera moves smoothly to the left pauses outside room 228. All of this has scene has been projected in one take, i.e. no other shots have been edited in to this camera set-up. The movement has been fluid and unbroken and sets the pattern for the rest of the film. There is a sense that the camera could have followed any individual in the building and this film would have become their story.

When we cut to the courtroom we hear the judge droning out his instructions to the jury in a voice that suggests he is totally tired of the proceedings. The juror dressed in white has his fingers to his mouth in a meditative pose. Another shifts uneasily and checks his watch. An older man holds a handkerchief to his nose. In general they are taking in what the judge has to say in a serious manner. He is instructing them in the letter of the law but his tone infers a detachment from the proceedings. This could be read as an anticlimax to the grandeur of the opening - outside the system looks solid but inside the people administering the system have not got the heart for the work. He tells them that they must bring in a unanimous verdict and the sentence of death will follow a guilty verdict without leave of appeal. Such a decision must be made on the basis that they are convinced of the guilt of the accused beyond a “reasonable doubt”.

As the camera tracks from right to left we hear this phrase three times. The juror in white shifts at the mention of “in good conscience”. He looks like a serious man who will take this to heart. Another juror looks compassionately out of frame (at the accused) at the word ‘mercy’.

As they prepare to leave the court some jurors head straight for the jury room and others linger a little and look back at the accused. A poignant musical theme strikes up on solo flute. This is a leitmotif, a melody that becomes associated with a certain place, idea or character, in this case the accused. We cut to a

reverse close-up shot of the accused. The camera invites us to pity him and his vulnerability. There is a slow dissolve as the interior of the jury room comes onto the screen. Slowly the transition is complete and the credits roll.

The camera is placed at a high angle and catches all the jurors as they enter the room to prepare for their deliberations. Many take out handkerchiefs and mop their brow. The atmosphere is obviously muggy. Some take off their jackets. An old man comes in and goes quickly out of the frame. We later learn that the men's room is located at this end of the room. The man dressed in white goes to the window and remains there in silent meditation as the others move about. Another man stands under the fan and wipes the sweat from his forehead. Then he goes to the end of the room and retrieves his hat. He will wear it in the room despite the humidity. He must see it as part of his 'look'. The man using the handkerchief takes the wastepaper bin from the corner and brings it to where he will sit at the table. He has a need for it and appropriates it accordingly with no regard for the needs of others. The man in the hat seems to be extrovert as he tries to get the fan going and then offers gum to the meditative man in white. He helps another juror to get the window open and proceeds to throw the wrapping paper of his gum out the window. He voices his disgruntlement at the heat and the lack of air conditioning. We learn that he has checked the weather forecast for the day.

The clerk is taking a roll of the members of the jury and tries to preserve their anonymity. This is part of the system of justice and will be referred to again later in the film.

The compassionate-looking man who responded to the word "mercy" is surprised that the door has been locked. The man with the cold, who seems to be a jovial type, reassures him that this is normal practice and goes on to joke about making a senator of the accused.

All of this action is taking place without any cuts. The camera is moving fluidly about the room in a shot that will last for six and a half minutes. The director has decided to rule out cutting from juror to juror. This is part of Lumet's style for this film. This is the longest of many such takes. The fluid camera gives a sense of intimacy and of the jurors getting to know each other as they talk about the details of the case for the first time. We track back with a heavy-set man who sits on a bench beside a small balding man with glasses. They swap ideas and it emerges that the novelty of the proceedings have been interesting for the man with the glasses. The other man has served on many juries and in a world-weary tone declares that the whole thing is a waste of time. This was an open and shut case in his opinion. Time and money could be saved by dealing with the likes of the accused before they get a chance to commit crimes. He comes across as bigoted.

The foreman tells the man with the paper that they will be seated according to their jury numbers. They have been issued with numbers to maintain their anonymity. Some jurors want to get things going but the foreman has noted that one juror has gone to the men's room and doesn't seem to be too rushed about starting. The man with the cigarette holder is asked to move so that the man with the paper can take his allotted seat. He goes to the window and chats with the man in the white suit. He has found the case interesting. He is glad they did not get a burglary. There were no low points in the case for him. He spots the roof of the Woolworth building and informs the man in the white suit that he has lived in the area all his life but has never been inside that building. From 1913 to 1930, when the Chrysler building was completed, this was the highest building in the world. It was dubbed "The Cathedral of Commerce". We have not been made aware of it yet, but this man in the white suit is an architect by profession. There will be many such moments of irony as the film progresses.

The camera tracks to allow us to follow the gaze of the man at the window. His attention has been drawn to the conversation of two of the jurors as they discuss aspects of the case. They sound biased. They have their minds made up. The man with the hat is cracking jokes and seems never to be stuck for a humorous phrase. He checks his watch and moves to the foreman. He wants to get things under way without any more delay.

The camera moves on giving us further details about the various jurors. We learn that the big man who was weary of all the talk during the trial is a self-made businessman. He runs a messaging company. He takes his business card from his wallet and displays it. He started with nothing and takes pride in the fact that he has thirty seven men working for him now. The seated gentleman is a stock broker and does not seem too interested in the details being supplied by the businessman. He wants to keep his distance. Perhaps he is thinking about the anonymity involved in being a juror and wants to maintain this secrecy in a discreet way. The need to tell people about how he has made it tells us that the other man lacks such discretion.

We learn that the extrovert wearing the hat has tickets for a baseball game later that evening. He supports the Yankees and can't wait to see their new man, Modjelewski, in action. The man with the glasses obviously hasn't a clue about the ins and outs of the game and the extrovert takes a sarcastic tone as he speaks to him. He is intolerant of people who do not profess an interest in sport. The foreman suggests that the jurors take their seats according to their jury numbers and the stock broker declares this proposal reasonable.

It is important at this stage to get the various individuals on the jury into some kind of perspective. In the next sequence we will suggest an exercise for the students to get familiar with the twelve men around the table. Let's take the following grid as model for the moment:

Juror #1	foreman	Juror #2	wearing glasses
Juror #3	self-made	Juror #4	stock broker
Juror #5	quiet	Juror #6	labourer
Juror #7	sports fan	Juror #8	white suit
Juror #9	old	Juror #10	handkerchief
Juror #11	European	Juror #12	advertising man

Juror #12 thought the performance of the prosecuting attorney was very impressive. He liked the way he presented things in a clear order. In spite of what we thought earlier, he must be a man who appreciates this kind of clear thinking. Juror #11 seems to speak in broken English. He gives the impression he is foreign. He thinks that the prosecutor did a good job. Juror #12 respected the fact that the prosecutor showed "real drive".

As the foreman calls for attention we have the first cut since the dissolve that brought us into the jury room. The scene has lasted six and a half minutes. The camera has glided around the room imperceptibly as it introduced us to the various members of the jury. Most have had a chance to speak and we have an initial impression of them all. Juror #8 has remained by the window in silent contemplation. He has stood apart from the others and the small talk that they have engaged in the opening sequence.

As he takes his place we hear Juror # 10 talking of his surprise at the accused killing his own father. Juror #12 declares that if Juror #10 checked the figures he would see that there was no need to be surprised. Juror #4, wanting to keep his distance, will have no part in a discussion like this and raises his newspaper as a barrier. Juror #10 turns down the corner of the paper asking "Know what I mean?". He fails to take the hint that is being dropped. Juror #6 tells the foreman that all are still not present. He goes to the men's room to fetch the old man. Juror #7 learns that Juror #5 supports a baseball team from Baltimore. He can't understand how anyone could be so foolish as to do such a thing. His tone is sarcastic, just as it was with Juror #2. He is a narrow-minded man who can't understand how anyone could support a team like that. "It's like being hit in the head with a crow-bar once a day!" he declares. Juror #5 seems a bit timid and doesn't try to justify his choice of team.

Juror #6 leads the old man to his seat and helps him to sit comfortably. He seems to be a gentlemanly kind of person, one who looks out for others and likes to see fair play done.

SEQUENCE 2

The Jurors Have Their Say I

Let the film roll until Juror #3 says “Well, let’s get going!”

The foreman seems to be a bit shaky as he gets proceedings under way. He is hesitant and deferential to the others. He seems to be anxious not to step on toes by asserting himself too strongly. He is dressed in a short-sleeved sports shirt with a couple of buttons at the neck. This is a casual shirt yet he wears a tie with it. In the same way as he is uncomfortable about his position as foreman he is uncomfortable with dressing formally. The loosely knotted tie is in deference to his position as a juror. He would be far more comfortable, one feels, out of this costume and out of this situation.

Juror #4 seems practical and to-the-point as he asserts that taking a preliminary vote is customary. Juror #7’s only thought is to get out as quickly as possible. As the foreman speaks he checks the time on his wristwatch. We know that he has tickets for the Yankees baseball game later in the day. The instructions of the judge regarding the mandatory death sentence for a guilty verdict and the need for a unanimous vote are reiterated by the foreman as he finishes. Juror #4 and Juror #10 are anxious to get proceedings under way.

As the count is taken all the jurors look at Juror #8 with varying degrees of surprise registered on their faces. It would be opportune to use this still to familiarise the class with the various members of the jury at this stage. One suggestion would be for them to make a list of the jurors numbered one to twelve and add a label to each along the lines of the one at the end of Sequence 1. A second exercise would be brainstorm in class on all they’ve learnt or guessed about each juror since the start of the film. A third exercise here would be to make a sketch plan of the table and number and label each juror’s place. A poster-size plan would be of use if it were placed on the classroom wall until they become familiar with the various members of the jury. The fact that the characters have not been given names is bound to make the early discussions problematic.

Juror #10 repeats “There’s always one!” His tone is sarcastic and disparaging. For him the decision is beyond discussion. Juror #8 just wants to talk about the case. He has doubts about the evidence. He is not able to convince himself fully of the guilt of the young boy. A decision taken after five minutes appals him. He suggests that they take an hour. With an ironic glance at Juror #7, he declares that the ballgame doesn’t start till eight o’clock. He has made his mind up very quickly about what is motivating Juror #7. He is a good judge of character. We have also noticed the impatience of Juror #7 and might question his commitment to giving the accused a fair hearing.

There are only five sets in this film: the street outside the courthouse, the lobby inside, the courtroom, the jury-room and the men’s room. So the director has to find ways to keep the interest of the audience alive as the film progresses. One of the main ways Lumet achieves this is by varying his use of the camera. Here the camera is at eye level as the jurors sit around the table. As one of them rises to make a point or to show frustration, the camera will shift upwards to keep at the eye level of the juror whose is the centre of interest. Lumet also varies the camera distance at crucial moments. The camera pulls in on the face of a character to increase his size on the screen. This focuses the attention of the audience on that character. Sometimes this is done by a movement or zoom in which can be fast or slow. The camera is fitted to a crane and mounted on a dolly. At others times the editing is by means of a cut. As a character moves about the room the camera may track along with him. This keeps our attention on him and his importance in our minds is not lessened by him, for instance, reducing in size as he walks away from the camera. So camerawork and editing will loom large in this film.

Juror #9 thinks that an hour is not too much to sacrifice for such an important decision as the one in hand. Juror #10 launches into a funny story. If he has to stay for an hour he will have some fun! Juror #8 is not impressed. Neither are we, the audience. We are being positioned by the director to take our moral cue from this character. Juror #10 becomes angry when his story is curtailed. Juror #8 has all the details of

the boy's life. He has the facts and he wants to try to understand the way such a boy might think. He is tempering his reason with emotion. There is more to this trial than the facts as presented in the courtroom, in his opinion. Juror #10 turns his opinions back on him by declaring that they owe the boy nothing more than a fair trial. That trial has cost the state a deal of money. Of course there is merit in what he is saying, but we are being positioned to see things from the point of view of Juror #8.

The camera cranes to the eye level of Juror #10 as he gets up and moves to the coat-rail. He discards his used tissue on the floor as he rails on about "them". He has heard the facts and is adamant that this is all he needs to consider at this point. His bigotry is showing itself and we do not find it attractive. Juror #9 rises indignantly to put a stop to this kind of ignorant talk. We hear Juror #7 saying there is no need for a sermon. He is quick to come up with a smart alec phrase that puts people down. We are getting a feeling for these characters in a gradual way as the film continues. Some characters are being presented to us in a sympathetic way and others less so.

We cut abruptly to a close-up of a sketch that Juror #12 has drawn. He is more interested in talking about himself and his career than he is in following the discussion. This is the man who declared that he found the case interesting, with "no dead spots"! He likes to doodle to keep himself thinking clearly. There may be a contradiction in terms here. Maybe he finds it hard to think clearly and consistently over a period of time on an issue. The foreman deals well with the situation. His tone is paternal as he tries to get things back on course and becomes patronising when he suggests that Juror #8 put his points to the assembly so that the error of his thinking can be pointed out to him. Juror #12 tries to redeem himself by suggesting that the eleven should try to convince Juror #8 of how they came to their conclusion. This seems like a sensible way to go. Despite his suave appearance, his cigarette holder earlier and his fashionable costume (suit, shirt with rounded collar, tie, cuff-links, pocket handkerchief, spectacles and hairstyle), he is diffident in his contribution. He inserts a preamble and breaks off before making his point fully. The foreman has to encourage him by saying they should, indeed, go once around the table.

The camera moves closer to Juror #2. He is hesitant and lacking in confidence as he begins to speak. Juror #8 points out the flaw in what he is saying. The onus of proof is on the prosecution. This point is enshrined in the constitution. Juror #2 is not a very forceful character and he simply re-states his first contention. Juror #3 is losing patience with him and takes over the foreman's role by dismissing him and getting on with his own presentation.

He declares that he has no personal feelings about the case. He just wants to talk about the facts. He takes out his wallet and consults his notes. He is thorough and has followed the details of the case well. He presents his points clearly and seems to have taken the job of juror seriously. His conclusion is logical and based on facts. In his opinion, there is no room for sentiment when the facts are this clear. Juror #7 declares his agreement with the conclusion.

Juror #4 uses no preamble. He gets straight into the evidence and the things that have become obvious to him as the case progressed. Like Juror #3, he presents his points well and argues reasonably. He has come to his conclusion by looking at the facts in a clinical and logical way.

Everything so far has revolved around the boy. Juror #10 backs up this argument by referring to the testimony of the woman across the street. This testimony is very convincing and Juror #11 avers that she actually saw the killing. The foreman tries to call things to order but he is disregarded by Juror #10. He rises and goes to the window for a breath of fresh air as he goes back over the testimony. This woman has known the boy all his life and she swore she saw him kill his father. In an over-the-shoulder shot we see Juror #8 as he tries to counter the argument by saying that what she saw was happening through the windows of a passing elevated train. It was proven in court that it was indeed possible to see through the windows of the train as the lights were out. In a cut to Juror #8 we find the camera framing him in close-up. We have grown used to the medium shots that predominated in the earlier part of the film so

this change to a close-up catches us by surprise and makes the ironic reference to “them” by Juror #8 all the more dramatic. The tension is added to by the cut to the close-up of Juror #10. This is a good example of how Lumet uses the camera and the editing to vary the impact of the unfolding story. Again we observe the annoyance of Juror #10 as he is crossed. He is intolerant of others. The camera holds on him as he walks around the table and takes his seat. Then it lowers to his eye level and we move on to the contribution of Juror #5.

This juror is very quiet and unsure of himself. He seemed worried about the locking of the door earlier and this sense of insecurity re-surfaces here. He asks to be passed over at this point.

Juror #6 has been looking for a motive. He regards this as very important in building up a case. He sounds like he may be used to watching detective programmes on TV. He found this motive in the testimony of the neighbours across the hall. Juror #8 does not think this evidence is very strong. Juror #7 checks his watch. He obviously is not amused by the nit-picking of Juror #8. Being hit was a regular feature of the life of the boy according to Juror #8. Juror #4 thinks that this might just have amounted to breaking-point for the boy. This is a good point and he makes it without fuss and effectively. Juror #8 is silenced. The effectiveness of the contribution of Juror #4 is emphasised by the close-up of Juror #8 in the reaction shot.

The turn of Juror #7 comes around. He wraps his used chewing gum in a piece of paper and leaves it on the table as he stands to speak. He is feeling the effects of the heat in the room and continually wipes the perspiration from himself. He has a good grasp of the details of the boy’s history. He enumerates a series of nasty incidents the boy has been involved in culminating in two arrests for the use of a knife. (It should be noted that this does not amount to evidence for the case in hand.) Juror #8 tries to make the excuse that violence was part of the boy’s milieu. His father used to beat him “with his fists”. Juror #7 says he too would strike “a kid like that” to put order on him.

This reference is a cue for Juror #3 to make a general point about the younger generation and its lack of respect. Again the camera cranes up to keep him at eye level. As a boy, he used to address his father as ‘Sir’. This is no longer the case with young people. Juror #8 thinks the fault might lie with the parents as they don’t seem to think that kind of thing is important anymore. Juror #3 takes out his wallet for the third time in the film. In the opening sequence we saw him take his business card from it. He stores things that are important to him here. He has kept notes of the evidence in the trial here. Now he takes out a photograph of his son and proceeds to give personal details of his life. As he begins to speak about his son he seems to be a normal parent who has tender feelings for his only son. Pretty soon we learn that there is trouble between them, though. His attempts to “make a man of him” did not produce the expected results. In an over-the-shoulder shot we see

Juror #8 turn his head away slightly as if in embarrassment. Juror #3 was very tough on his boy and drove him too sternly in a direction he thought was important. Now they are estranged. We learn that Juror #3 is head-strong and a bully. He has paid for this in his personal life. As he laments “Kids! You work your heart out ...” we cut to Juror #8 who makes eye contact with Juror #3 again and looks at him in a sympathetic way. He has just revealed a lot about himself in a gathering where anonymity is important. As with the business card earlier, this does not seem to bother him. He is full of self-righteousness and is so confident in his position that he fails to see that others might have a different way of looking at a situation to his. The camera has held on him uninterruptedly for almost fifty seconds as he sat there at the end of the table. We have been invited by the camera position and editing to see him from the perspective of Juror #8.

SEQUENCE 3

The Jurors Have Their Say II

Let the film roll until the foreman says “These side arguments are only slowing us up.”

Juror #4 thinks that the discussion is getting off the point. He is the voice of reason and wants to stick to the facts of the case. He presents his ideas in a clinical way and rationally concludes that ghettos produce a criminal element. He does not allow himself to be swayed by emotion. Ironically the camera does not frame him as he speaks but lingers on Juror #3 as he walks to the water-cooler, still looking at the photograph of his son. He is in sharp focus and the other jurors are out of focus. This invites us to question what is going on in the mind of Juror #3. There is an ironic counterpoint between the audio and the video tracks in this part of the scene. On the soundtrack the talk is of the product of ghettos but the visuals linger on Juror #3 and the product of what he saw as the right way to bring a son up. The rational presentation of the facts of how society works is not helped by the blatant bigotry articulated by Juror #10. Juror #4 averts his eyes from him, embarrassed by his opinions. Juror #5 is growing more uneasy as this continues. The camera moves in on him as he makes his confession about his slum background. This invites us to draw close to him and feel sympathy for him. His timid nature has been pointed at since he asked about the door being locked at the start the film. As his anger mounts he stands up and raises his voice. Juror #12 tries to advise him not to take the statement by Juror #10 personally. Juror #11 stands and moves from the table saying that he can understand such sensitivity. As this word sounds we cut back to Juror #3 who is still looking at the photograph of his son. Personal sensitivity is an issue for these three characters. This aspect of their personalities will play a part in the action as the film progresses.

Juror #8 did not expect to be called. The foreman has to be reminded of the procedure that was agreed. The camera photographs the action objectively from the neutrality of the corner of the jury room. This is a break from the point of view shots that are so frequent in the film and it serves to make such shots more effective when they are used. This static distant view of the jury contrasts with the camera movement in just a moment when another row breaks out. Juror #10 wants to hear what the man who is keeping them all there has to say. At the back of the room Juror #7 paces the floor in an agitated way and glances at his watch again as the foreman speaks. We get a glimpse of the head of Juror #11 as the foreman gets sensitive about the ‘kid’ remark of Juror #10.

As the camera abandons its neutral position in the corner to get closer to the two men arguing, the foreman offers to let Juror #10 take the chair. We are being drawn into the row between the men by the camera movement. The moment is a good example of how Lumet is varying his use of camera and editing.

Juror #12 remarks that “The whole thing’s unimportant”. Considering he works in advertising and uses language to make his living, this tactless attempt at defusing the row shows him up as inept. He recovers his ground by praising the foreman’s work. Juror #7 uses a sporting metaphor to encourage the foreman to carry on. The exasperation felt by the foreman is summed up by his sotto voce remark as Juror #8 starts to speak. He is finding the job a little beyond him. His initial unease, we now realise was well founded.

The trial has been going on for six days. Juror #8 feels that everybody is a little too positive for his liking. He would have liked to have a lot more questions asked. He questions the effectiveness of the defence counsel. If his life were in the balance he would expect his defence to tear the prosecution witnesses apart in cross-examination. In his opinion this did not happen. We have moved to a close-up of Juror #8 for his statement that there was one alleged eye witness to the killing and another “who heard the murder”. The whole case rested on the evidence of two witnesses. Juror #12 is photographed from a low angle in an over-the-shoulder shot as he intervenes. Juror #8 wants to know if those witnesses could be wrong. The fact that they gave their testimony under oath is enough to convince Juror #12 that they are right. Juror #8 wants to question the logic of that assumption. The tension of the exchange is accentuated by the close-ups of Juror #12 and Juror #8 as the former has to acknowledge that “This is not an exact science”.

Juror #3 wants to change tack and talk about the switch knife embedded in the old man's chest. He dismisses Juror #2, as he had done earlier. Again he is so filled with the sense of his own righteousness that he has no time for the opinions of others. He refers sarcastically to the accused as "this fine upright boy". Juror #8 asks for the knife in question to be brought into the jury room. When Juror #3 complains about sending for the knife, Juror #4 makes the point that such a request is within the rights of Juror #8. Again he is the voice of reason in this jury. When he makes a point he does so in a detached, logical way. He does not let his own feelings get in the way of clear thinking.

Juror #4 gets Juror #8 to agree that the knife and the way it was bought was "very strong evidence" and proceeds to go through the events detail by detail. He is doing his job as a juror in an exemplary way. He gets a little angry at the intervention of Juror #6 over the nicety of whether the boy was slapped or punched. He compromises with the term hit and proceeds until he comes to talking about the knife. He stumbles over the word and is helped by Juror #5 who has grown up and still lives in the same milieu as the accused. Juror #4 is unfamiliar with such things. His world is totally different from that of the boy and the slums that produced him. His use of the word tavern rather than bar might be another indication of this fact. As he gets to his fourth point the camera begins a slow move inwards and keeps the attention of the audience focused on his presentation of the facts. He treats the intervention of Juror #8 as irrelevant and carries on. It could be argued that the treatment of the boy by the police is a red herring. It could also be seen as another attempt by Juror #8 to let his emotions get involved in his treatment of deciding on the guilt or innocence of the accused. Based on the fact that nobody saw the boy leave the building, that nobody saw him at the picture house, and that he could not remember the names of the movies, Juror #4 concludes that he never went to the movies that night. What actually happened in his opinion is that the boy stayed at home, had another fight with his father and stabbed him to death.

The over-the-shoulder shot of Juror #8 as Juror #4 leans over the table gives us a sense of the powerful position Juror #4 feels he occupies based on the logic of his argument and his sense of the weakness of the arguments of Juror #8. The abrupt movement inwards of the camera as the knife is forced into the table adds to the tension and the drama as Juror #8 tries to maintain that his version of affairs is just possible. Close-up shots are edited in to increase the tension. The other jurors are astounded at the introduction of the second knife. Juror #4 declares that it is against the law to buy or sell switchblade knives. In an ironic twist it is now the turn of Juror #8 to disregard as irrelevant the intervention of Juror #4. A series of close-ups maintain the tension of the scene as various jurors try to play down the significance of the easy availability of the second knife. The scene culminates with Juror #4's definitive "But not very probable!" before the foreman calls for order. The editing signals an end to the tension by cutting from the close-ups to a general view of the room as the jurors move back to their places.

The unfortunate Juror #2 leaves himself open to the ire of Juror #3 by his inarticulacy. All he can say is that it is "interesting" that another similar knife should be found. The voice of Juror #3 is getting higher as he becomes more frustrated with the delay in coming to a verdict.

Juror #3 now puts it to Juror #8 that he is standing alone against the other eleven jurors. Off camera Juror #10 backs up this sentiment saying that if the jury is hung the boy will surely be found guilty by another one. This gives Juror #8 pause for thought. He moves again to the window. This is the position he took up pensively at the start of the film before he was called to the table by the foreman. As Juror #7 adds to the chorus of objections to this lone stand by saying they could be still there overnight, Juror #9 reminds them that a boy's life is at stake. Juror #7 responds in a sarcastic way by belittling the suggestion. We are used to this behaviour from him since he made fun of Juror #5 over his allegiance to Baltimore's baseball team. His ridicule rouses general laughter but Juror #2 objects quietly to the foreman who merely shrugs his shoulders. Juror #10 rises to emphasise the point that all the talk about the knife is unimportant as a witness has testified to seeing the boy kill his father. His patience is running out. He has "three garages going to pot" while they spend time arguing over this case. He dismisses the point made by Juror #11 about the importance of the knife to the prosecutor's case by saying that he was only a fifteenth assistant

with very little experience. Ironically this echoes the point made by Juror #8 at the start of the sequence when he questioned the commitment of the defence counsel to the case. The legal system does not come well out of this sequence.

SEQUENCE 4

Standing Alone

Let the film roll until Juror #6 says “really did knife his father.”

This sequence begins and ends with the only music on the soundtrack outside the opening and closing scenes. It starts when Juror #3 says “You’re the only one.” The musical theme is the one we heard in the courtroom scene. We associate it with the boy in the helpless isolation of the dock. It comes to stand for the boy and the position he finds himself in. It expands now to cover the isolation that Juror #8 feels in the jury room. It represents what is in his mind as he decides to make an offer to the rest of the jury. It seems a reasonable one. He has tried his best to convince his colleagues of the importance of sifting through the testimonies and the evidence presented in the case. Now he will gamble. He has decided that if not even one other juror has been won over by his arguments then he will change his verdict and agree with the others on a guilty vote. He has tried his best to be a good juror. The others respond to the call for a vote with enthusiasm, especially Jurors #7 and #10. As Juror #8 stands by the water-cooler the music builds to a crescendo. Juror #8 is in similar position to the boy at this point. He is isolated and at the mercy of the rest of the jury. He suffers the same torment as the boy. The musical theme unites them in their helpless isolation. The camera frames him in big close-up. This positions us to view him sympathetically and empathise with him. The term ‘leitmotif’ from Wagnerian opera is used to denote a piece of music like this that comes to be associated with a person, place or idea.

The foreman reads the guilty verdicts in a tone bordering on boredom. After opening the not guilty ballot, however, he pauses and then stands astonished to read out the result. The relief is visible on the face of Juror #8 and he turns to resume his seat at the table. The gamble has paid off. As noted earlier, we are being invited by the camerawork and the editing to identify with him, to feel his concerns as our concerns. Jurors #7 and #10 get to their feet in anger. We will see that Juror #3 has done the same when next he comes into the frame. These three have been the most vociferous in arguing against the stand of Juror #8. Juror #10 is reprimanded by Juror #11 when he demands to know the identity of the person who has changed his vote. Juror #3 raises his voice and flails about in anger and refers to Juror #8 as a “golden voiced preacher”. He shares with Juror #7 the characteristic of labelling pejoratively those with whom he is in disagreement in order to reduce their status. Shortly after this he extends the metaphor and suggests that Juror #5 put money in the preacher’s collection box. Juror #5 who began the film quiet and almost apologising for his presence speaks up for himself for the second time. He will take only so much abuse, as we saw in the last sequence. Juror #4, the embodiment of reasonableness, tells him not to mind Juror #3, that he is very excitable. The camera moves in on Juror #3 quickly as he grows even more furious. He is clearly an intolerant man who likes to get his own way. He has a capacity for logical thought, like Juror #4, but follows up any opposition to his way of seeing things with emotion bordering on hysteria, whereas the latter will persist with logical argument to get his point across. At the mention of “trying to put a guilty man in the chair where he belongs” he is in close-up and we cut to Juror #8. Once again he looks at Juror #3 trying to figure out what is motivating him, as he did after the confession about his relationship with his son.

As Juror #3 rounds on Juror #5 again the editor inserts a startlingly big close-up of Juror #9. This catches us unawares and we experience the same shock as the other jurors. In another close-up we see a sense of satisfaction on the face of Juror #8. Juror #7 checks his watch as Juror #9 offers to explain his reasons for changing his vote. He has only one thing on his mind and refuses to listen. Juror #6 defends the old man against the attack of Juror #10. He is the one in Sequence 1 who would not let things start until Juror #9 got back to his seat. He is looking out for him. Juror #7 then exits to the men’s room to the annoyance of

Juror #9 who has been addressing his remarks mainly at him as he tries to explain that he respects the stand made by Juror #8. He recognises the gamble that has been taken by him. Raising his voice he gets very upset and angry at the refusal of Juror #7 to listen to his point. Juror #8 gently advises him that Juror #7 will never accept what he is saying and suggests they resume their seats. The old man is very distraught and it takes him quite a while to regain his composure. Our admiration for and identification with Juror #8 is growing as the film progresses.

Juror #12 is surprised by the turn of events. He tries to come up with a solution by thinking of how the situation would be dealt with in his business, advertising. He is honestly trying to be a good juror. He compliments European watch-makers but the remark is hollow. He tells a funny incident about the agency he works for, but nobody manages to see the comical side if it although he himself thinks it hilarious. We are being positioned to view him as superficial. Everything about him is on the surface. The camera moves away from him almost as if anything else in the room would be of more interest to it.

We follow Juror #5 as he moves back to his place. Juror #3 tries to apologise. He is trying to be sincere but Juror #5 will have none of it. His remark about emotional appeals invites us to scorn him too. He is being presented to us in a way that makes us see him as unappealing. Juror #5, the camera and therefore the audience move on away from him and his meaningless apology.

The atmosphere in the room is getting hotter both literally and metaphorically. Juror #6 tries unsuccessfully to get the fan going to help the situation.

Inside in the men's room Juror #7 is admiring himself in the mirror oblivious to the hurt he has caused to Juror #9. He is perturbed by the hairs in his comb and wipes it clean. He is particular about his look. Wearing the hat in the stuffy jury room is part of this. We learn that Juror #8 is an architect. Juror #7 thought he might be involved in sales and marketing because he is good at convincing people and influencing their behaviour by methods of persuasion that are known in that business as "soft sell". Judging by his quick wit we can believe that he would do well as a salesman, even selling marmalade. Taking our cue from the stand-offishness of Juror #8 we conclude that he has not much time for Juror #7 and his fooling around. Juror #7 shows his bigotry when he refers to do-gooders and, again, a reference is made to making a contribution to a cause. This links him with Juror #3 whose said something similar earlier in the sequence. Juror #8 calmly lets the sarcasm pass him by and carries on with freshening up. Juror #7 stubs out his cigarette on the floor showing the same disregard for littering as he did in Sequence 1 when he disposed of the wrapper of his chewing gum by throwing it through the open window. Juror #8 makes his second ironic reference to the ballgame to end the conversation.

Juror #8 runs the tap over his cigarette butt and throws it in the bin as Juror #6 speaks about the jury and the case. He also feels the boy is guilty and thinks that the case should have been wrapped up by now. Unlike Juror #7, though, he is in no hurry - he is avoiding work by being on jury service and this suits him fine. He seems like a genuine sort of person who sees himself as having a certain place in society. He is happy with this role and lets others, his boss for instance, get on with the intellectual side of things. He suggests that Juror #8 could be wrong. Were he to persuade the rest of the jury of the boy's innocence he might be, in fact, letting a guilty party off the hook. The prosecution has come up with "strong evidence" and he is not one to question that. This fits with Juror #6's philosophy of letting others do the thinking for him. The camera moves in to a close-up of Juror #8 as the significance of what has been said to him sinks in. The theme music comes back on the soundtrack to emphasise his doubts and his feelings of isolation. It acts as a book-end, or bracket, to open and close the sequence. Juror #8 is not quite as isolated as he was in the beginning, but he is now aware of the huge significance of carrying on with his questioning of the evidence presented over the six days of the trial.

SEQUENCE 5

“I’m Gonna Kill You!” I

Let the film roll until Juror #7 says “Will you look at the time!”

Another example of the gaucherie of Juror #12 is presented to us in the guessing game which opens this sequence. After Juror #2 has failed to pick the correct hand he points to Juror #7’s left hand. “Where else?” asks Juror #7. The simplicity of this game of right or wrong is in stark contrast with the two-way choice that occupies the attention of Juror #8 in the men’s room. Juror #2 remarks that they will probably still be in session when it gets to dinner-time but he is totally disregarded by the others. This is a further example of how ineffectual a man he is.

Juror #3 opens proceedings by referring aggressively to Juror #8 as “You down there!” He shows little sign of respect. He wants to know what he makes of the testimony of the man downstairs who claimed he saw the boy running out of the house immediately after hearing a thud on the floor. The camera travels over the heads of the rest of the jury and closes in on Juror #8 as the questions are flung at him in rapid succession. He might cower under the onslaught, but that is not how he reacts. Juror #7, ever ready with the joky one-liner, says talking to him is like talking into a dead telephone. Juror #8 seems to get an idea as Juror #4 talks about the passing elevated train. However he stops in his tracks and walks to the end of the table to break up a game of xs and os between Juror #3 and Juror #12. Our impression of the latter as superficial is reinforced by this total lack of respect for a fellow juror and the importance of the legal process. This is not the first time he has put pen to paper to pass the time. In Sequence 1 he said that he doodled to keep himself thinking. He was bored then as he is now. Juror #3 is furious when the paper is snatched from in front of him. His reaction is as we would expect. Other jurors calm him down as Juror #8 crunches the paper in disgust and takes up his speech at exactly the point he left off. The camera holds on Juror #8 for one minute and forty eight seconds without a cut as he goes along the table trying to get an estimate of how long it would take a train to pass the open window. He emphasises the closeness of the train tracks to the apartment window, and the noise. Juror #6 has worked by the elevated tracks and can vouch for the noise of the passing trains. Juror #10 and Juror #3 heckle but at no point does the editor cut to the person interrupting. Juror #8 gets agreement on ten seconds and tries to think on his feet as he puts the two pieces of eye witness testimony together. The long take adds to the tension of the scene and the cut is edited in only when the conclusion has been reached. There is a discrepancy in the testimony of the old man. There would have to have been a ten second gap between the shout and the sound of the body hitting the floor. The old man testified there was only a split second between the two incidents. Juror #3, with whose shouting and bullying we are becoming familiar, stands to counter the conclusion drawn by Juror #8. He insists that it is impossible to be that accurate in giving testimony. By getting emotionally over-wrought and letting his mouth run away with him, as it were, he leaves himself open, not for the last time in the film, to correction by Juror #8.

Significantly the camera goes back not to Juror #3 but to a two-shot of Jurors #5 and #6. The former tends to agree with Juror #8 that the old man could not have heard the shout. The latter also has a doubt now about the evidence given by the old man. Juror #3 wants to know what the old man has to gain by lying in his testimony. Juror #9 suggests enigmatically that the old man might crave attention. Juror #3 raises his voice again to say sarcastically that the newspapers pay three dollars each for wise sayings like the ones he keeps coming out with. Juror #6 will not brook such treatment of an old man and warns Juror #3 to change his attitude. In Sequence 1 he had helped Juror #9 to his seat. Then in Sequence 4 he defended him against the jibes of Juror #10 when he declared that it was he who changed his vote and not Juror #5. Juror #3 backs away from the threatened confrontation. He does not mind talking abusively to an old man nor to a weak man like Juror #2, but Juror #6 is a different proposition. He is a bully. He pushes his weight around and domineers in situations where he is not opposed. He raises his voice to terrify those who disagree with him. There are situations in which this tactic does not work and he retreats from them. The camera reflects this failure on his part to face up to strong opposition by framing him facing us and away from Juror #6. The camera then moves along the table to frame Juror #6 sympathetically in close-up as he tells Juror #9 to go ahead and say anything he likes.

Juror #9 has paid more attention to the old man and his testimony than any of the other jurors, probably because he is of the same generation. He has even noticed that the seam of the old man's jacket was split under the sleeve. Such a man would have taken pride in his appearance and would have presented his best side, as it were, in so important a place as a court of law. This torn jacket is obviously the best that this poor man can do. This fact evokes the sympathy of Juror #9 and he tries to understand what motivates the old man. At the start of the film he was quite prepared to vote guilty on the evidence presented in court. Now that Juror #8 has asked for time to discuss the presentation of the case, he grasps the opportunity to go critically through the questions that are raised. The camera moves in slowly to a close-up as Juror #9 tells the others what he noticed. Traditionally a close-up invites us to get inside the mind of a character and see things from his point of view. Such is the case here. He says the old man walked slowly to the witness stand. The intervention of Juror #7 might have been edited in as a cut but that is not the case here. The camera holds on Juror #9 as he distinguishes between telling a lie and making oneself believe something. He tries to put himself in the old man's shoes. He knows that it is a very sad thing to be nothing after seventy five years. As he speaks we notice the intensity in his voice. Is he talking about himself as he speaks of being quoted and paid attention to? In just the same way as Juror #3 revealed a lot about himself as he spoke about his relationship with his son, even so is Juror #9 revealing his thoughts about growing old. In this trial he is being given a chance to be listened to and he will grasp the opportunity with both hands. In his dismissive, ignorant way Juror #10 asks what Juror #9 would know about what was motivating the old man but we sense that there is very little between the two of them. Juror #9 bows his head. He knows he has revealed quite a lot about himself in that speech.

The tension is relieved by Juror #2, who asks if anyone would like a cough drop. He seems delighted that he can oblige when Juror #8 says he would like one. He is a simple man. As Juror #8 tries to set up another point for discussion, Juror #10 cuts across him aggressively. Ironically the scenario that is being proposed by him is one in which the boy actually did say that he would kill his father. His point is that merely saying the words does not prove that he actually did the killing. Juror #3 goes into his shouting mode again and says, in a line that will take on its own irony in the next sequence, "Anybody says a thing like that, the way he said it, they mean it!" Juror #2 speaks up for himself by telling of an incident in which a colleague in the bank called him an idiot. He actually shouted back at him. Juror #3 pays no attention whatsoever to the contribution but proceeds to hector the others about the intentions of Juror #8. He is not making his case in a persuasive way. He is trying to bully the others into agreeing with him. Juror #8 makes the reasonable point that the boy is too bright to have shouted out a threat like that if he really intended to carry it out. The disdain in the voice of Juror #10 is palpable as he dismisses the notion that the boy is anything but "a common ignorant slob". Juror #11, who has been carefully making notes during all the talk, corrects the bad grammar while subtly drawing attention to the bigotry inherent in the tone of Juror #10.

We get a two shot of Jurors #5 and #6 again. The last time we had them in a shot like this was when they discussed the possibility that the old man could not have heard the shout in the way he said he did. Juror #5 decides to change his vote to not guilty. Juror #3 roars at him. We have become well used to him at this point. Juror #7 is exasperated at the way things are going. He suggests that Juror #8 is making up stories that should be printed in "some cookie detective magazine". He claims that the boy's own lawyer knew he was guilty. He is dismissive of the opinion of Juror #5 and refers to him sarcastically as "Baltimore". Certain members of the jury are emerging as not very nice human beings. The defence lawyer was court-appointed. Earlier in the film Juror #8 claimed that he was not vigorous enough in tackling the points made by the prosecution. Now he suggests that maybe as a young lawyer he resented having the case foisted on him when there was very little for him to gain from it.

All that is on the mind of Juror #7 is the time. The intricacies of the case are of less import to him than the possibility of missing the Yankees baseball game as the evening progresses. He seems to have no feeling for the responsibility that has been placed on him by his society.

SEQUENCE 6
“I’m Gonna Kill You!” II

Let the film roll until the jurors all laugh

In the bad-mannered way that we have come to expect from him, Juror #10 scoffs at the reference to his notes made by Juror #11. The latter has been treating the case very seriously and is trying to take the role of juror seriously. He wants to know why the boy would come back home three hours later if he really had killed his father. Juror #12, who has been blowing smoke rings and playing with his cigarette holder, fails to treat the matter with the same seriousness as Juror #11. Juror #7 does not fail to spot another opportunity to poke fun at those with whom he does not agree. Off camera we hear Juror #4 trying to bring a sense of responsibility back into the proceedings.

As he tries to give a logical explanation for the behaviour of the boy, the camera tracks in on Juror #4 slowly. He is framed in a two-shot with Juror #3. He presents his points in a calm and rational manner. This contrasts starkly with the performance of Juror #3 who seeks to bully and harry those who do not agree with him by shouting and gesticulating. Juror #4 reckons the boy fled in a certain amount of panic after killing his father. Juror #11 seems to be happy that this point has been made because he counters with the fact that the boy thought of removing his fingerprints from the knife, putting in question the notion that he was in a state of panic. He seems to know where he wants the thread of this argument to go. So he lets his arguments unfold gradually. He is making his case well. Juror #3 makes the totally illogical point that Juror #11 has voted guilty and is now changing sides. This is an indication of how simplistically he views the case. Juror #11 answers quite calmly that there is no question of loyalty to one side or another here. He adds that he is simply asking questions. In doing this he is taking the same approach as Juror #8. He is open-minded and wants to spend the time they have agreed on in examining the testimonies presented in court. This exchange has been filmed in a short series of close-up reverse shots. Juror #12, also in close-up, has become serious now and reckons that the boy might have felt that, because it was the middle of the night, he was in no danger of being seen as he came home after calming down. Juror #11 now gets to make the full point that he has been driving at, and says that the boy would have heard the scream of the woman across the tracks and therefore would not have returned. There is now a doubt in his mind.

Juror #4 begins his response by numbering his points. He has done this before. He is a stock broker and has a mind that likes to have things tidy and ordered. His points are perfectly reasonable. Juror #8 introduces the word “doubt” into his summary of the various possibilities about the activities of the accused on the night of the murder. The judge has instructed the jury that they must be convinced of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Juror #10 will not accept the possibility of doubt. The old man has testified categorically that he saw the boy run out of the house. In the mind of Juror #11 there is now a doubt hanging over this testimony. He now distinguishes between what the old man says he saw and what he may actually have seen. Juror #10 is angry as he storms out of his seat. The last person who got angry, Juror #7, also walked around the table in exasperation. Like him Juror #10 wants the affair finished up as soon as possible. He, too, is dismissive of the opinions of others, and he tries, like Juror #3, to shout down opposition. These are not features that would lead others to agree with the points he is making. He shouts at Juror #5 when he says that witnesses can make mistakes. He shouts at the foreman. His reference to “little details” is illogical and makes no sense. Juror #8 brings a halt to this rant by asking for another vote. He has spotted the selfishness and narrow-mindedness that underpins the thinking of Juror #10.

Juror #3 thinks the taking of another vote is a waste of time, but Juror #2 speaks up for himself and says it only takes a while. The camera tracks down to Juror #11 as the not guilty vote is taken. We note the hesitancy in his agitated manner. This scene could have been filmed in a neutral long shot, showing us the entire jury room and letting us make up our mind as to where the centre of interest lay for us. Lumet’s style is to let the camera control our response by restricting what we are shown. The camera and editing leave us in suspense. The aggravating voice of Juror #7 saying that they can “yackety-yak until next

Tuesday” sounds off-camera and acts as the catalyst to make Juror #11 “beg pardon” and change his vote to not guilty. This is greeted with widespread dismay. The voice of Juror #3 is most prominent as he says they are all going crazy. The camera cranes up with him as he leaves his seat and goes to the end of the table. He sarcastically asks if this is “Love Your Underprivileged Brother Week.” This tone and the pitch to which he raises his voice is not going to win others to his point of view. But he is beyond reason at this stage. We are all too familiar with this kind of behaviour from him. He is being driven by his emotions of bigotry and anger. Juror #11 speaks up for himself when challenged and uses the phrase “reasonable doubt”. Juror #3 shouts at Juror #11 as he holds the knife out to him and refers to him sarcastically as “Mr Reasonable Doubt”. He is so angry that he forgets for a moment that it was introduced by Juror #8 and is not the murder weapon. He is capable of being rational but is being blinded by his emotions. He moves to the water-cooler at the back of the room . The last time we saw him here was when he got all emotional and confessed about the rift between himself and his son.

The trinity of disgruntled jurors is completed now as Juror #7 gets to give out. They are united by their anger, their bad manners, and by their habit of getting up and circling the others at the table as the vent their pent-up emotions. Juror #7 is so frustrated at this stage that he is almost inarticulate as he talks about the persuasive powers of Juror #8. Using discourse derived from the world of sport, he says he would be capable of convincing the others that what they saw happening before their eyes in the boxing match between Dempsey and Firpo was in fact not the case. He goes back to the testimony of the old man and says he ran to the door fifteen seconds after hearing the body hit the floor and saw the boy. Juror #5 picks up on the word “ran”. Juror #7 refers to him disparagingly as “the Baltimore rooter”. Like Juror #3 he has a facility for putting pejorative labels on those who do not agree with him. Labelling people like this is a device that makes them appear inferior. Their opinions are thereby reduced in value and lose their threat. Juror #5 has more important things on his mind than his favourite baseball team and will not be distracted by the sarcasm of Juror #7. The use of the word “ran” has triggered something in his memory. He fails to see how the old man could have run to the door. Juror #10 does not fail to get in a sarcastic comment when Juror #8 asks where the bedroom was in the apartment. Something, another reasonable doubt, maybe, has been triggered in his mind too by Juror #7’s use of the word ran. He calls for the diagram of the apartment to be brought in. The usual three object vociferously to the move.

Juror #8 wants to see the plan of the apartment to see if the old man, who suffered from a stroke and drags one foot behind him as he walks, could have made it from his bed to the door in fifteen seconds. Juror #3 makes the valid point that it is very hard to work out how long an action like that would take. Instead of making the point coolly, though, he rants again. This tendency of his to resort to raising his voice is getting him nowhere in terms of persuading his fellow jurors to his point of view. On the contrary, it is leading him into situations where he says too much, situations in which his words, driven on by emotions, run ahead of his thoughts, driven on by reason. The camera moves in on him quickly as he angrily asserts the old man was confused. Ironically it is Juror #9 who is insisting that the old man said fifteen seconds. In big close-up we see the shame on his face when Juror #3 realises that he has gone too far in declaring that the witness was an old man who could not be positive about anything. The editing reinforces this with a reaction shot of the Jurors #4 and #8 by the window followed by another shot Juror #3 and a sustained silence. If the jury were to follow his logic they would have to conclude that the evidence of this witness was worthless. Juror #4 moves back to his seat and enquires where this line of thought is leading. Juror #7 comes in again with the sarcastic suggestion that Juror #8 should be at a hair-splitters convention in Atlantic City. Juror #6 has had enough of this and tells him to cut out the smart remarks. Never lost for words Juror #7 tells him that, to get his allowance of three dollars a day, he has to listen to everybody .

This scene is the one with the most action since the one in which the jurors entered the room. We can see the perspiration on their shirts as they move about. The room is getting hot and stuffy. The humidity of the day and the heat of the jury room become a metaphor for what is happening among the jurors. Tempers are fraying as things heat up between them. Juror #8 wants to establish how long it would have

taken the old man to limp forty five feet. The defence counsel should have gone over this in the course of the trial. This would have meant “badgering an old man”, and would have been counter-productive, according to Juror #8.

Juror #7 tries to turn the affair into a joke as he whistles a comic tune to accompany the re-enactment of the old man’s walk. Juror #2 tells him to cut it out. Juror #7 impersonates James Cagney and refers to him as “Killer”. Like Juror #3 he shows no respect for him. Juror #2 finds it hard to get people to take him seriously. He is a naïve man and is delighted to be of assistance when Juror #8 asks for someone to keep the time. We saw the same reaction when he was able to oblige with the cough-drops earlier. He records the time taken as forty one seconds.

All the jurors except Juror #3 gather round Juror #8 as he gives his version of what actually happened. The old man heard the fight between the old man and the boy earlier, heard the scream from across the tracks then got to the door and assumed it was the boy that he saw. Juror #6 agrees that such a course of events was possible. Juror #3 reacts to what he calls the dishonesty of what Juror #8 is doing. He uses the word “fairy-tale” to summarise the version of events propounded by him. His gorge is rising as he speaks of “bleeding hearts” and “old ladies”. Again this use of language driven by anger will not persuade his fellow jurors to his point of view. He rages and says “He’s got to burn!” His reference to letting the boy slip through their fingers is another example of his mouth running away with him and the editing reinforces this with a reaction shot of the group of jurors around Juror #8. This scene is shot in a series of medium distance shot/reverse-shots. The editing then moves to close-ups of Jurors #3 and #8 to increase the intensity of the exchange. The facts are not what interests Juror #3. He personally wants to see the boy go to the electric chair for his own sadistic pleasure. He loses control of himself completely at the mention of the word “sadist” and threatens to kill Juror #8. Once again his words have run away with him and he gives Juror #8 the chance to prove the point he made earlier in the Sequence 5 about the way people use the phrase “I’m gonna kill you!” without really meaning it. As he fidgets with his cuffs the camera tracks in on him to let us experience his embarrassment just as it did after the incident with Juror #9. The sense of his ostracism is rendered even more acute by the editing in of the shot of all the other jurors except the foreman after he asks “What are you looking at?”

Slowly the shocked jurors move to resume their seats. Juror #11 is a European émigré, but he is the one it falls to remind the others of the strength of the process of trial by jury in the democratic system. The jury system is anonymous and therefore fair. Its impersonal nature should be respected and maintained and things should not be brought to the personal level. He makes his point clearly and eloquently. He uses irony in his reply to Juror #10 but it is not the biting sarcasm of Jurors #7 and #3.

Juror #12 tries to get things moving again. He is being serious now and falls into the trap of using the discourse he has described earlier as being from the world of the advertising agency. His reference to throwing the idea onto the porch to see if the cat licks it up elicits laughter from the others. Ironically when he used such a phrase earlier those listening failed to see the funny side of it. Now that he is trying to be serious he evokes laughter. He is not presenting his ideas very effectively: in the ensuing laughter he never gets to make his point.

SEQUENCE 7 The Room Heats Up

Let the film roll until Juror #12 says "OK with me!"

This sequence starts and ends with Juror #7 talking about the weather. As he stands by the window to get some air, Juror #7 remarks on how dark the day is getting. He reckons a storm is coming. It strikes Juror #5 that his neighbour does not appear to be put out by the heat of the room. Physically he can keep cool in the muggy room and intellectually he can think clearly even though others around him are getting into heated discussion. Juror #6 calls for another vote. Juror #7 belittles the suggestion by saying they could follow it up with dancing and refreshments. The foreman is getting annoyed with the cigarette smoke of Juror #12. He is getting edgy and forgets for a moment that he is juror Juror #1. Juror #10 wants an open ballot to see where they all stand. Each juror is framed in close-up as he gives his vote.

The vote is even, and Juror #7 says sarcastically that they are now into extra innings, once again expressing himself in sporting terms. He glances at his watch and we know what is on his mind. Juror #10 cannot understand how the jury can be split six to six over "a kid like that". Juror #9 tells him the kind of boy the accused is has nothing to do with the case. It is the facts that are important. Juror #10 behaves like Juror #3 as he dismisses the facts by shouting at the top of his voice, and actually argues against his own case. Juror #9 gets very angry with him and wishes he were a few years younger. He is losing his composure too. He notes that the room is getting very hot. The deliberations are taking their toll on individuals as the room grows darker and hotter.

Juror #7 is very sweaty as he stands by the window to cool down. Juror #2 makes the very obvious point that rain is on the way before Juror #7 dismisses him using the ironic term "Killer" again. He changed his vote because there seemed to be room for doubt. Juror #10 says it is a bad thing to think too much about things. Thinking too much just gets people mixed up. He throws his paper cup on the floor as he says this. Earlier he threw his used tissue on the floor. He has no manners and little consideration for others. Juror #2 refers to him as "Loudmouth" after he has walked away. Here is another juror who is getting annoyed as the day progresses. In his own quiet way he might be starting to speak up for himself.

Some of the jurors lean across the table lethargically; two others fan themselves. The storm breaks and the rain catches Juror #7 at the window. The room grows very dark and the foreman goes to turn on the lights as Juror #8 goes to close the windows. As they stand by the window the foreman tells a story of the school football team he coaches. For the first time in the film he seems to be relaxed. We noted that he appeared out of his element in his sports shirt and a tie as he called the jury to order in Sequence 1. Juror #8 does not seem to have any knowledge of, or interest in, football but he is a courteous man and listens to the foreman civilly. He does not allow himself to be annoyed by the idle chatter.

Others have used the sheets of paper supplied to the jury constructively to tally the ballots or make notes. Juror #7 tries to relieve his boredom by playing with them. Juror #12 used the paper in Sequence 2 for a similar purpose although he insisted that doodling helped him to think. He is photographed from slightly below eye level. This camera angle will be quite common from this point onwards in the film. It accentuates the walls and ceiling and gives a feeling of the claustrophobia that has entered the film as the jurors become more oppressed by the heat and the actions and opinions of each other. Juror #7 is delighted when he switches on the fan and it works. Nobody responds to him when he says "Things are looking up here!" Perhaps they are all too annoyed with him, or too tired to be bothered. He then throws the crumpled up papers at the fan without consideration for others. He refers to Madison Square Garden and is thinking about the only thing that he seems to take seriously - sport. Juror #9 is not amused by the flying paper balls. This is another example of one juror getting annoyed with another.

Juror #3 is feeling uncomfortable about his outburst earlier and tries to explain it away as Juror #4 takes a drink of water. He claims that Juror #3 was trying to bait him using words like "sadist" and "public avenger". The answer is terse - "He did an excellent job!" He is another juror who has become annoyed

with what is happening in the room. The room is heating up indeed! Again the camera angle is slightly below eye level.

When he comes back out of the washroom Juror #10 calls for declaration of a hung jury. The sounds of the lashing rain and thunder can be heard on the soundtrack as he speaks. Juror #7 says the boy would be found guilty by another jury. Juror #8 does not believe that such a declaration would be accepted by the judge because they have not been out long enough. Now Juror #5 uses the term "reasonable doubt". The immigrant from Europe then annoys Juror #7 unwittingly by suggesting that he may not fully understand the term. This notion of a foreigner coming into his country and telling him how things should be run is more than he can bear. His ensuing rant against the arrogance of immigrants reveals his deep prejudice. He uses the word "they" in the same way as Juror #10 did earlier in Sequence 2. He is filmed from a low angle again as he talks down to Juror #11. This angle and the lens used draws the background more into the composition. Many of the shots from now on will have this accentuation of the heavy door frames and the ceiling, emphasising the way the room is closing in on the members of the jury. Another juror has been annoyed by a colleague. Juror #11 does not argue back. He seems to realise that he has not expressed himself diplomatically and decides to let things rest.

Juror #8 now wants to discuss another item in the boy's evidence - the fact that he could not recall the names of the films he had seen when questioned by the detectives who were waiting for him when he came home at three o'clock in the morning. The visit to the cinema was the only alibi he offered and he could find no witnesses to back it up. The camera is below eye level, looking up at Juror #8 as he is framed by the heavy wooden panels of the door frame. The exchange is filmed in shot/reverse-shot as the dialogue alternates between the two men. Juror #8 makes the point that the boy was under great emotional stress. He was being questioned by the detectives in the kitchen while the body of his father lay on the floor of his bedroom. There were two statements: one the boy made to the detectives at the scene of the crime and the one he made in court. Juror #4 is basing his conclusion on the first one because the defence counsel could have researched the titles of the films that played on the night of the murder in the three months that intervened between the event and the court case.

Juror #4 indicates that he does not mind the line of questioning being followed by Juror #8. He is quite confident in the way memory works in general and how his works in particular. We hear the smart alec comment about New Year's Eve 1954 from Juror #7. We are well used to his flippant attitude by now. At this point we have gone back as far as Monday night and the editing introduces a close-up of Juror #4. He hesitates for a moment as if rattled. The change in camera distance draws our attention to the pressure he is feeling for the first time. When we cut back to Juror #8 as he asks for the name of the second feature we note that he too is filmed in close-up. The growing tension being felt by Juror #4 is emphasised by the closing in of the camera and the use of a prop - he takes out another cigarette to help him to relax. The quiet Juror #2 recalls the correct name of the second feature. He is filmed in big close-up. This distance is also used for the following shots in the interrogation as the closeness of the camera becomes a metaphor for way the questioning is homing in its target. Juror #8 delivers the coup de grace with "And you weren't under an emotional stress, were you?" A bead of sweat trickles down the forehead of the man who has declared at the start of the sequence that he does not sweat. Juror #8 has handled the line of questioning very well. He did not rush or shout or gesticulate or storm around the table as others have done.

The camera is on the same level as the tabletop as Juror #9 declares the point made. Juror #10 dismisses all the talk as useless and demands a cough drop. This gives Juror #2 the chance to assert himself even more positively than he did earlier at the window and he rises to the occasion with the ironic "They're all gone, my friend!" In a liberal democracy, the type of system that is being championed by Juror #8, everyone gets a chance to have their say.

We cut to a shot of the members of the jury from the top of the table. The angle is still low but we get a

respite from the tight close-ups and medium shots that increased the tension of the last scene. Juror #12 remarks on the fact that the Yankee game will not go ahead now. Juror #7 still entertains a hope that this may not be the case because the in-field has a covering over it. As Juror #2 asks to see the knife there is talk of the time. It is five past six. Juror #5 suggests that they carry on until seven.

SEQUENCE 8 **Using the Knife**

Let the film roll until Juror #8 says "... unless it's sure."

Juror #2 has a question that has been bothering him about the way the stab wound was made. Again the camera is at a low angle and the panels of the wall are accentuated giving the effect of a closing down of space. Juror #3 objects to going over this detail again, but Juror #2 will not be bullied as easily at this point in the film. Juror #3 decides to give a practical demonstration of how the wound would have been made to get the point cleared up once and for all. Juror #8 gives a slightly startled look as he is picked out as the guinea pig for the demonstration. As Juror #3 holds the knife in the air the earlier row between the two men and the word "sadist" echoes in our minds. He holds the blade aloft for a long time. It is hard to tell what he might be thinking but he seems to snap himself out of a reverie before performing the pretend stabbing motion. His extension of time is a feature of cinema and is used to increase tension. Members of the jury jump to their feet in horror when he eventually carries out the downward strike. The thought has crossed their minds that he might just have meant the line "I'm gonna kill you!" Juror #8 himself never flinches. He is a man of some courage.

We know from Sequence 1 that Juror #5 has a slum background. He is the only one in the room with firsthand experience of a knife-fight. Back in Sequence 3 he came to the assistance of Juror #4 when he stumbled over the word "switch-knife". We notice Juror #7 checking his watch again. This is all a waste of time as far as he is concerned. Juror #5 says he has tried to forget the experiences of growing up in a poor neighbourhood where knife-fights on his back porch were common. He wants to draw attention to the fact that somebody who was used to using a knife like this one would never stab downwards. He makes his point clearly and demonstrates what he means so that all can understand what he is saying. Before starting on the demonstration he had asked if anyone in the room had seen a knife-fight, so he knows that he must show clearly what he is talking about. Juror #3 illogically dismisses the demonstration by asking if Juror #5 was in the room when the murder took place leaving himself open to that very same question, thereby invalidating his earlier demonstration. Juror #4 says that the demonstration has no bearing on the way the boy might have stabbed his father.

Juror #8 asks Jurors #12 and #7 what they think of the stabbing. The camera follows him along the table and moves in to the latter quickly as he declares that he is tired "of all the yakety-yakkin' back and forth" and wants to change his vote. The movement of the camera accentuates the unexpectedness of this turn of events. As he replies to Juror #3 he checks his watch revealing what is really on his mind. Juror #11 is appalled at his callousness. He refers to the baseball tickets but cannot bring himself to believe that the prospect of missing a game would influence a person who was on jury service. He rises and comes towards Juror #7. He is filmed from a low angle in close-up as he tries to get him to articulate the reason for his change of mind. This angle emphasises the moral high ground he holds in this argument. The editing increases this authority as he declares "I can talk like that to you" by cutting to a big close-up. Of course Juror #7 is not in a position to give the true reason for his thinking. He may not even be aware of the depth of his selfishness and lack of civic commitment. Juror #11 goes back to his place in desperation. Juror #8 calls for another vote and a show of hands is called for. Juror #12 and the foreman now change their vote to not guilty giving a count of nine to three.

Three jurors now remain who contend that the boy is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The short-tempered and bad mannered Juror #10 stands to vent his exasperation in a long take. His speech lasts for

three minutes and seventeen seconds. As he gets into full bigoted flight the camera tracks back from him. It is positioning us to do the same. Apart from the first few minutes of the film when he appeared to be a jolly kind of person as he made the wisecrack about making the accused a senator, this man has not been presented to us in a favourable light. Now we are distancing ourselves from the sentiments he is expressing about “them”. He has exhibited this prejudice from the start. Ironically we did not understand the true feelings behind the senator joke in Sequence 1. Since then we have begun to realise that he harbours deep prejudices. As the camera draws back from him the jurors begin to distance themselves too, and walk away from the table in disgust at the racism he shows. The first to walk away from the table is Juror #5. We know how sensitive he is to prejudice against the poor who live in the slums. Juror #10 lists the faults of “these people” - dishonesty, drunkenness, violence, murder, lack of respect for human life. He admits that they are not all like this, though. He has known “a couple” who had redeeming qualities. After the foreman gets up from his seat it seems to be dawning on him that, far from persuading the others to his way of thinking, he has actually alienated the entire group. When Juror #12 gets up we become aware of the drone of the fan. Juror #4 is appalled but calm and tells him to sit down and be quiet. Juror #10 seems to be in a state of shock as he walks from the main table and takes his seat in the corner of the room. He fidgets with his paper tissue and looks blankly ahead of him. He has caused his own ostracism. Perhaps he was not aware of the depth of his bigotry in the same way that Juror #7 is unaware of his selfishness. In his exasperation at the drawn out discussions of a case that he thought was open and shut he has given voice to the deep-seated hatred he has for slum-dwellers. As he sits there in dejection at the small table in the corner, we ask ourselves whether he has learnt anything. Will this make him change his way of thinking or will he persist in his irrational prejudice? Juror #5 has learned to assert himself in the course of the afternoon. He is the first to resume his seat after Juror #10 trudges away into self-imposed exile.

This scene is another of the long takes in the film in which Lumet relies on the camerawork to maintain the interest of the audience. Critics have expressed different opinions about this scene. Some feel it fails as a piece of cinema because it is far too ‘stagy’.

When Juror #8 gets to his seat the camera tracks back to the table. We have been positioned through the film to accept him as the hero of the piece, our moral benchmark. He speaks for all of us when he says that prejudice always obscures the truth. He goes on to say that no one in the room is certain of what happened on the night of the murder. We remember how Juror #6 put the supposition of letting a guilty person go free to him at the end of Sequence 4. The nine have a reasonable doubt and they are taking a gamble that the boy is not guilty. This concept is very important to the system of justice they live under. The camera has tracked in to a close-up of him as he asks the other three to explain why they are so sure of the boy’s guilt.

SEQUENCE 9

A Reasonable Man’s Doubt

Let the film roll until Juror #2 says “You said we could throw out all the other evidence.”

Juror #4 starts by admitting that some very good points have been made in the boy’s defence. He has a good grasp of the facts of the case and is able to put his ideas before the others in a calm and rational way. He genuinely feels that the boy has been proven guilty. He goes through the eye-witness account of the woman who lived across the street detail by detail. The interruptions of Juror #3 irritate him. He feels well capable of making his case himself. The woman testified that she saw the boy clearly through the windows of the passing elevated train stabbing his father with a downward thrust. Her testimony constitutes unshakeable proof as far as he is concerned. Juror #8 finds it hard to argue against the case he has made.

This scene is filmed in medium shot with the camera again at the level of the table. Juror #4 turns to Juror #12 and asks how he can possibly change his vote. This is uncharacteristic of him. He has tried all along

to keep things on an impersonal level. He seems to have reached a point of exasperation. The latter stated in Sequence 1 that he found the case had no low points. Through the afternoon we have seen him doodling and telling yarns. He seemed to relish the challenge of the murder case and to enjoy the attention of the other jurors as he spoke of his job in the advertising agency. Now he puts his glasses on almost as a defensive mask and talks about the difficulty of sifting through all the evidence. He finds it hard to accept the badgering of Juror #3 who thinks all the other evidence apart from that of the woman is relatively unimportant. Now Juror #12 is put on the spot and finds it hard to put words on his thoughts about the case. One would have thought that somebody working in an advertising agency would have been more adept at using language and articulating his feelings and thoughts. He vacillates and changes his vote back to guilty.

Juror #3 rises and he is filmed from a low angle. He does not even bother to answer Juror #11 when he asks why this one vote is such a “personal triumph” for him. Juror #11 knows intuitively that Juror #3 has an agenda. We cut to a close-up as Juror #3 suggests they go for a declaration of being a hung jury. In Sequence 7 Juror #7 said that the boy would definitely be found guilty by another jury. Juror #3 has decided that this is the best way for him to achieve his aim. He refers in a sarcastic tone to Juror #8 as “the leader of the cause”. He is getting into one of his rages and refers disparagingly to Juror #12 as “the kid in the grey flannel suit”. Juror #4 realises that he is losing the run of himself again and warns him not to be nasty. He says that he is turning the case into a competition. Juror #8 wants to go over details again. Juror #4 suggests they set some kind of a time limit. Juror #7 comes out with his usual sporting discourse and checks his watch.

As Juror #4 checks the clock he takes off his glasses and rubs his eye sockets. He is not amused by the way Juror #9 interrupts him as he tries “to settle something”. But Juror #9 himself has a point to make and insists on making it. He gives short shrift to Juror #3 and raises his voice to him. He, unlike Juror #12, has gone beyond the point at which he will be bullied. He takes his time getting his point across. He seems to know that what he has to say is of importance. He wants to talk about eye-glasses. He has twenty-twenty vision and seems very pleased about that. After the bad-mannered intervention of Juror #7 the editing changes the camera distance to big close-up. The pattern established in the film is that when this happens we are coming to an important revelation. We get a reverse shot of Juror #4 as the others react to the mention of the fact that the woman had marks like his. Juror #5 vouches for the fact that this is indeed the case. Juror #9 is a close observer of people. He noticed things about the old man that the others did not. Now he goes back over what he noticed about the woman and gives a psychological profile of her. She is forty five years old and trying to look thirty five. She has had her hair dyed and has bought new clothes. She is heavily made up for her “first public appearance” and is not wearing glasses. As he continues with his observations on the understandable vanity of the woman, Juror #4, doubt growing in his mind, puts his glasses back on. Juror #5 answers the objections of Jurors #3 and Juror #6 threatens him again. In all the shots in this scene the sense of the room closing in is caught as the camera shows so much of the background. As Juror #3 shouts looking for an answer Juror #9 gets to the point “Can those marks be made by anything other than eye-glasses?” He has presented his thoughts well and effectively. Each cut back to Juror #4 in this scene has shown him framed in the exact same way as the implications of what is being said sink in. Juror #8 taps Juror #9 on the arm in encouragement. He is the only one in the courtroom who has noticed these details. Juror #3 fights all the way, resisting the truth that has dawned on the others. He concedes that the woman might not have wanted to wear glasses in public. But the fact is she was in the privacy of her own home when she saw the boy stabbing his father. Juror #4 has to admit that no one wears glasses to bed and that it is logical to assume that this was the case with the witness in question. A series of big close-ups rounds off the scene as Juror #11 articulates the implications of what has been revealed. Juror #2 makes his strongest contribution of the afternoon when he says that they cannot send the boy to his death on this testimony. The implication is irrefutable: there is a doubt over her testimony.

Relief from the claustrophobic close-ups and the effect of the longer lens that brings the background into

the composition is provided by the editing when Juror #8 stands up. He asks Juror #12 what he thinks now. He is a kind man and accosts Juror #10 gently showing consideration for the fragility his emotional state. He gets Juror #4 to articulate the implications of what they have concluded about the woman. Juror #4 reiterates the point about reasonable doubt made by Juror #8 at the start of the sequence. As Juror #3 shouts in his frustration about all the other evidence he is reminded ironically by Juror #2 that he has already said that all of that can be left out. Juror #2 has learned to stand up for himself in the course of this afternoon. The democratic system allows people to voice their opinions.

SEQUENCE 10 **“Rotten Kids”**

Let the film roll until the end

The camera tracks in to a close-up of Juror #8. The situation has inverted itself ironically from Sequence 1 when it was he who stood alone. When Juror #3 declares peevishly “It’s my right!” the camera films Juror #8 from the level of the table-top. He looms over Juror #3 occupying the higher moral ground, as it were. The lens used accentuates the background. The sound of the rain and the fan add to the oppressive atmosphere. Medium shots of members of the jury are edited in to increase the sense of things closing in on Juror #3.

Juror #3 is filmed from a low angle as he takes up his position by the window. Far from granting him a lofty moral status, this angle in his case only serves to present him to the audience as a towering bully. Like Juror #4, he has the facts of the case at his fingertips. Unlike him, though, he cannot keep his mind clear of prejudice and emotion, so his presentation of those facts fails him time and again. As he gesticulates and shouts he addresses most of his remarks to Juror #8. A major flaw in his speech is the emphasis on the word prove. Juror #8 has already made the point in Sequence 2 that the constitution puts the burden of proof on the prosecution. This has been the recurring theme throughout the afternoon - the prosecution must prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Juror #3 takes out his wallet in a desperate attempt to show that he has all the evidence he needs. In a touch of dramatic irony the audience’s attention is drawn by the editing to the photograph of himself and his estranged son. The dramatic irony continues with his next line: “That’s it. That’s the whole case!” It is the failed relationship with his son, not the facts of the case, that has been propelling him towards demanding a guilty verdict for the boy! The audience is made aware of this but he is ironically left in the dark. The editing emphasises the length to which he has distanced himself from the other jurors by cutting to them in big close-up. He resorts to name calling. “Bleeding hearts” is his preferred term for this occasion. He has resorted to this kind of abuse at various stages in the story. His use of the word intimidate is totally out of place - he is the one who has been doing the bullying. As he says he is entitled to his opinion, his eye is drawn to the photograph and the truth of the situation dawns on him. In trying to get even with his son he is blaming all young people. Like Juror #10 he has talked himself through his neurosis, through his irrational feelings for the accused, and he breaks down as he realises what has been motivating him. This man who has towered over his fellow jurors since the start of the film now sinks to his knees as he leans weeping over the table and the torn up photograph of his estranged son.

The music, a feature of cinema that has been notably absent from this film, strikes up now. The theme has been associated with isolation: that of the boy in Sequence and of Juror #8 in Sequence 4. It plays as the jurors get their coats and hats and leave the room to deliver their unanimous verdict. We had the jurors introduced to a camera placed above the fan at the start of the film. Now we have a shot of the room from the clothes closet. It is a neutral shot of the room like the first one. The oppressive crowding achieved by the long lens and close-ups of the last three sequences is relieved. As the foreman tells the guard that they are ready to deliver their verdict, Juror #7 gives one last glance at his watch. We ask ourselves if he has learnt anything or been changed in any way by the events of the afternoon. As the coats are taken from the hangers we get an increasingly clearer view of the room. This shot might act as a metaphor for what

has happened in the story. People have come into this room and have been stripped of their prejudices, preconceptions and bigotry so that they can see more clearly. Juror #8 has put on his white coat and now carries the black jacket to the man who has been his opposite in so many ways in the course of the film. To the end he is decent and fair. We have been positioned to view him in this way from the very start of the film, from the initial shots of the jury in the courtroom. Juror #8 picks up his wallet and the pieces of the photograph of his son. We are left with the question of whether he will be able to put the pieces of his life back together.

The camera tracks along the table showing the paraphernalia of the jury process. It dissolves into a shot of the jurors leaving the courthouse. In Sequence 1 the editing similarly dissolved the shot of the courtroom with a shot of the interior of the jury room.

We cut to an exterior shot of the colonnaded porch of the courthouse. The film has consisted of a Prologue (the exterior and interior of the courthouse and the courtroom), followed by the action in the jury room, and it now ends with an Epilogue (the exterior of the courthouse). In the porch the camera is positioned at the base of a pillar in such a way as to emphasize the hugeness and solidity of the columns that support the building. The jurors emerge from the courthouse. They are tiny in this setting. These are the anonymous pillars, some solid, some frail and all too human, that support the jury system of democratic society. Juror #7 checks his watch. Juror #9, McArdle, asks Juror #8, Davis, his name. They shake hands in a formal introduction. He seems mighty pleased with his day's work. He is glad to have had this opportunity of making a contribution to his society. He has had a chance to be quoted, a chance to have his opinions heard. Attention has been paid to him. He must also admire the uprightness of Davis who facilitated this by asking for time to talk. Their introduction is ironically their valediction.

For the closing shot of the film the camera is positioned high up beside one of the courthouse pillars. The film opened with an exterior shot of the courthouse and we read the motto above the entablature. We have witnessed how justice is demonstrated in the heat of the jury room and now we are in the open again. Despite the flaws and weaknesses of individual human beings, justice has been seen to be done. This is any courthouse, anywhere in democratic society.

The camera position and the wide angle lens emphasise the relief of the jurors now that they are out in the open again. Some may have learnt from the experience. Some have not. Juror #7 runs down the steps. There is one thing on his mind. Juror #3 walks slowly using the hand-rail for support. They all go their separate ways. They came together because they were "notified", as Juror #11 said in Sequence 6. They have discussed the case in the sweltering cock-pit that was the jury room. Most have done their best to be a fair jury. "This is what makes us strong."