

# Thelma and Louise term paper examples

[Law](#), [Evidence](#)



The movie *Thelma and Louise* revolves around two women and tackles feminist issues. The set-up rotates within a couple of themes and characterizations. It opens up with two middle-aged ladies who are best friends; Thelma (Geena Davis) and her best friend, Louise (Susan Sarandon), start the movie with a plan to go away for the weekend and have fun. Louise works as a waitress, while Thelma, who is a housewife married to an abusive husband, is a carpet-seller. Both Thelma and Louise have problems in their marriages, and this happens to be the reason why they both want to take a break.

The major effect of the trip (foreshadow) occurs when Thelma packs the revolver in her purse. Although their main plan is to go for the holiday at a cabin belonging to Louise's manager, Thelma requests that they make a stopover on the way, just for fun, since the trip was one in million. She insists that they have a stopover at a club called "Silver Bullet" for a few drinks. Thelma orders a drink, while Louise does not want to take part in drinking. Inside the bar, they meet Harlan, who gets attracted to Thelma. However, there is a conflict between the two because Louise does not like Harlan. Louise seems to be hostile to Harlan, while Thelma acts welcoming towards the new man. They share some drinks; later, they have a dance. Harlan tries to make Thelma drunk and dizzy. Later, they move out to an empty parking lot. The events that ensue mark the start of the crime scene.

At the parking lot, Harlan makes some advances to Thelma but she refuses. Harlan then slaps her as he pulls the dress up, probably intending to rape her. Thelma is then seen begging him to stop as she slaps him. This is followed by a blow from Harlan, which makes Thelma's nose bleed. As Harlan

unbuckles his belt, Louise shows up with the revolver pointed at Harlan's neck. On seeing the gun, Harlan lets Thelma go. As the two women walk away, Harlan yells the phrase "suck my dick." These words offend Louise, prompting her to shoot him.

The event makes Louise a murderer and Thelma an accomplice. As Thelma insists to report the matter to the police, Louise explains to her how that could put both of them in trouble. The reason for Louise's standpoint is in the fact that people had seen them dancing in the club; thus, they would not believe them that easy. Since no one saw them actually committing the murder, they resolve to run away and continue with their journey. However, their freedom is short-lived, since Hal Slocumb (a detective played by Harvey Keitel) begins to investigate the murder.

The detective starts his investigation at the "Silver Bullet" - the bar in which Thelma and Louise had stopped over for a drink. However, after a talk with his supervisor, the detective makes some adjustments to the investigation, since the murderers have left the state and the FBI is aware of the matter. Meanwhile, Thelma and Louise are completely unaware of the situation they are in and they keep on moving.

After a while, the ladies need the money for food and gas, as well as accommodation. This prompts Louise to call her boyfriend Jimmy and, fortunately, he answers the call. Louise borrows some cash from Jimmy, and he agrees to wire the cash to Oklahoma City. On the other hand, Thelma also tries calling her husband Darryl; unfortunately, she is not that lucky, as the husband ends up insulting her (as expected). This gives an indication of a break-up between Thelma and her husband. As Thelma walks conveniently

from a telephone booth, she comes across a young handsome man by the name JD who, after a short conversation, offers her a ride to Oklahoma. From that link on, JD becomes a major figure in the film and the main figure in the escape as the bond with Thelma.

On a rainy night, Louise and Jimmy share the bed, as Thelma spends the night with JD. In the morning, Jimmy bids farewell to Louise as JD steals the \$750 left under Thelma's supervision by Jimmy. The girls are left penniless, and the problem initiates a moment of crisis and propels Thelma in making an rash decision: she robs a store using a technique taught to her by JD before he left.

Thelma robbed a store because her boyfriend JD stole their money. In addition to creating a problem, JD also provided Thelma with a solution, although not a very productive one. This shows us that JD is an important joke-maker in the plot. Moreover, JD is also a tell-tale, because he reveals to the authorities the girls' destination (which was Mexico). The police sets a pursuit after them as they head to a Mexican city. Their destination and whereabouts are revealed as the detective talks to Darryl, Thelma's husband, who discloses their whereabouts. Slocomb, the investigator, later talks to Louise as she tries to contact Darryl; this enables the police to trace them. At the Grand Canyon, the FBI and the police corner them and they are left with no choice. They can either surrender or keep going and jump the cliff. Louise stomps on the pedal and they drive off the cliff. The journey is brought to a dead-end.

The movie revolves around a set of crimes which should be investigated properly before taking the matter to the court for judgment. Therefore, there

are many types of the crimes committed. First, there are the agents of the crime- the situations which instigate the problem and cannot be eliminated in the investigation. Thelma's husband proves to be a brutal one. The relationship seems to be on the rocks and this leads to a situation that would later make Thelma decide to take the trip. Louise also has a problem with the husband and also works as a waitress. These are some agents that need to be investigated as the case is being taken to the judge. Another agent is the presence of a revolver in the house. Investigators should look at the authorization of the revolver, the license and the genuineness. Ballistic tests should be carried out on the bullets, to show whether the gun was really the one used to commit the crime or it had been used for other criminal activities in the past. Another body that should be investigated is the club where the two ladies had a drink. The owner should be questioned about his connections to Harlan, Harlan's conduct and the normal routine within the area. This should be done in order to take a closer look at his intentions and see whether his behaviour in the club was normal. The investigators should check whether there has been any other case of the same sort within the area. They should also get to the root of it all, as the criminal act was clearly not done intentionally. It was done in defense, as Harlan wanted to force Thelma and take advantage of her. while she was intoxicated. The crime in question is rape. Another fact that should be investigated is the existence of JD in the story. The investigation department should note the obvious naivety of Thelma and Louise since from the moment of getting the money to the moment of losing it through theft. Again, JD had taught them how to steal and shoplift, which clearly shows that the ladies knew nothing about

criminal activities.

First and foremost, it would be professional from a judge to deal with the possession of a firearm. This should be with reference to Gun control Act 1968, that prohibits certain or specific type of people from the possession of firearms. This act is under the United States Firearm Control board. Certain people, who are prohibited, should not- at any point- be found with a firearm, since it would be considered a felony. This includes passing the firearm to those people as well. In our case, the prohibition would be possession of a firearm by someone proved to have been engaged in domestic violence. The sentence to this sort of offense should be one year in prison. The conflict would, however, be between the owner of a firearm and the person who committed a crime. In act one, Thelma is seen packing the revolver in her purse, although she is not the one who committed the crime. Louise committed the crime; therefore, the sentence should be severe. That is because she is not the owner of the revolver, Thelma is. Therefore, Louise should be charged on two counts: 1) the use of a firearm not belonging to her and 2) manslaughter, since the gun was used in a criminal act.

Thelma, as an accomplice, should be charged with allowing her gun to go to someone else in committing the crime. Ballistic reports should show involvement of the gun in committing the crime. Thus, the investigators would link the crime with the owner of the gun and the charges would be laid against her under the Gun Control Act 1968. The combination of all these crimes would send the two ladies in jail for at least 3 years in prison, under maximum security.

Another act of crime that should be taken into consideration is the murder of

Harlan. This should be approached in several different views; first of all, there is the question about the very nature of the act- was it intentional or it happened accidentally? The court would want the accused to understand the terminology in question: "homicide" consists of both murder and manslaughter. Manslaughter can be committed through malice aforethought as well as in self-defense. It can also be defined as negligent conduct which can lead to death of the other party. On the hand, murder is classified as a crime of killing that occurs when the culprit is completely sane and of sound mind. It could also be classified as unlawful killing.

In the film "Thelma and Louise", Harlan instigated his murder after the attempted rape of Thelma. This homicide can be termed as murder, since it was taken with a clear mind (sanely). It could not be said that they were acting in self-defense, because Harlan had already let go of Thelma. In situations like these, where, for instance, a defendant gets accused of an offence (assault related to the victim whose injuries later prove serious and the defendant gets charged with murder), the prosecutors must consider section 74(3) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. In this section, earlier convictions are allowed. For example, for an attacker to include admissible evidence, it proves that the defendant should be guilty of attacking the victim and also guilty of murder (as the laws of a state instruct).

While the previous conviction is still in court, the case would be open for the defendant to balance through probabilities in showing that she is not guilty or that she never committed the crime for which she had been convicted earlier. In addition to that, section 78 of Police And Criminal Evidence could

be used to remove the earlier accusations; the verdict would not be based on nebulous or unfair facts; but the evidence should specifically be related to certain circumstances that directly refer to the case in court.

Offences such as murder are particularly sensitive and, therefore, in order to approach the subject consistency, collective cases related to homicide should be reviewed in places where death happens three years after the first assault injury got sustained, or after a previous conviction of those offences committed under the circumstances related to death, requiring the Director of Public Prosecutions' Principal Legal Advisor to approve, prior to the moving the case to the Attorney General's verdict for further approval. These cases are for serious offences, under which the teams of investigators are in turmoil. Therefore, on account of the committed murder, the case may be taken to the chief prosecutor for further clarification of the matter. If the case is forwarded for approval, it should be handled through by Chief Crown Prosecutors or the attorney general's office. An evidence transcript on the verdict should be expected on hearing of the conviction, and the transcript should be written in any papers that are sent to the chief persecutor, since they contain comment related to the issues on double jeopardy.

If the conviction has to be handled under British courts, the subject should be tried for murder or manslaughter in Wales and England even if the offence has been committed outside their jurisdiction. The victim's nationality would be immaterial and dealt with under section 9 Offences, which are filed against the Person Act 1861. Therefore, the prosecution should always indicate the link between the act and the omission of the cause of death. The omission or act should prove to be a clear cause of



death, although it should not necessarily be the main (or sole) cause of murder. Under the same doctrines, it would not matter whether the act or the omission by the person in defense merely "fastened" the death of a victim. However, in case of illegibility in omission of a substantial cause of murder, causation would be particularly hard. It would be important to show (in accordance to criminal standards) that the deceased should not have died in the act. Therefore, to stop the chain related to the cause of death an intervention act should be in such a way that it proves the particular cause of the death of the victim in response to relieving the liability of the defendant. For instance, the intervening acts are: the third party interventions in the case: such an act would never break the chains unless it is a freed, informed, deliberate voluntary act, which would not be reasonable.

In conclusion, the "Thelma and Louise" is a film set under different themes which revolve around specific issues. It comprises of three acts: the start of the trip- which comprises of a crime committed by Louise when she shoots Harlan; the intervention or confrontation (as the two ladies try to escape the crime committed); and the escape (as they end up rolling on a cliff). The murder of Harlan ends their journey as the police come in pursuit of them. The crime should be termed murder, since Louise shoot Harlan with intent. According to the laws of United States, this can be classified as homicide. Moreover, the possession of a firearm is yet another case that should be prosecuted. Therefore, Louise is guilty of murder, while Thelma is an accomplice. To rub salt into the wound, the two ladies try to resist arrest as they engage the police in a full-scale pursuit, since there is no question of

surrendering to the police. Another crime committed in the film the money stolen by Thelma (through the tactic learnt from JD). That adds to the crime record the investigators compile. Whilst the conviction is laid before the judge, some point should also not be neglected. For instance, Harlan tried to rape Thelma as evident through the assaults at the parking yard. Police investigators should examine the injuries on her cheek. Therefore, before any judgment is brought, that should be taken into consideration, as the murder could have been done in self-defense (in case of the lack of strong-enough evidence material). Another important offence is the possession and use of a firearm under the influence of alcohol (while Louise was intoxicated). This is termed as an offence by the criminal department of the United States.

Thus, the verdict should put the two ladies on trial, as they need to defend themselves from all the charges. The expected sentence for this should be a 5-year imprisonment.

## **References**

Neroni, Hilary. *The Violent Woman: Femininity, Narrative, and Violence in Contemporary American*. New York : SUNY Press,, 2005.

Horder, Jeremy. *Homicide and the Politics of Law Reform*. London: Oxford University Press, 2012.