

12 angry men: the story of a murder trial

[Law](#), [Court](#)



This film is about a murder trial. A boy that could be looked on as guilty for sure is put up to the jury to decide his destiny. The boy has a background of violence and crime and has been brought up in a slum. The jury is confident of the boy's guilt. The whole jury votes guilty but one, Henry Fonda, or juror eight, and so the jury is forced to talk it out and make a decision. The other eleven jurors aren't caring enough to sit out and talk it out, Henry Fonda tries to get as much evidence as he can to persuade the jurors that there is a possibility that the boy is guilty. Slowly he convinces them, one by one. While we are unsure whether he is right or wrong, 8th Juror is one of the only jurors who is unaffected by any kind of negative bigotries. He respects the system and the value of life, causing him to want to consider the case more carefully than others. Juror number eight only tries to convince the other jurors to talk it out and think about the possibility that the boy might be not guilty. He is motivated simply by the idea of persisting justice and no other personal gain or affirmation comes into play. One of the first things the jurors commented on is the jury room's temperature, which was oppressively hot. Its purpose was to emphasize the heated discussions going on inside the room and to increase the tension and pressure. Also, these men were driven to madness rapidly by the heat. The heat was one of the key elements the director used. It showed how strong the tension was in there and how hard it was for juror number eight having to persuade the other jurors, even when they only wanted to leave. Personal prejudice was found numerous times in this film. The tenth juror is the most obvious example. Immediately against the defendant just because he was "one of them." He hated the criminal defendant because he was raised in a slum. Similarly, the third juror is

biased against the criminal defendant because he reminds him of his own son, which ran away from him and gave him a hard life. On some opinions, juror number eight was also biased toward the young criminal defendant because he was a poor boy with a hard upbringing. Although the system has its imperfections, justice can still be achieved. We breathe a sigh of relief when we see that one man is eager to confront what eleven other jurors have thought as established at the start. We see that the system works and think justice is achieved when this man's doubt and judicious doubt gradually but surely become every man's uncertainty and reasonable doubt. In the final analysis, we all pull for that one courageous man who activates the doubt in the room and opens the eyes of the blind to the truth.