

Article by Anica Boulanger-Mashberg

TWELVE ANGRY MEN

By Reginald Rose

INTRODUCTION

Twelve Angry Men is a legal drama written first for television and then adapted for both screen and stage. Reginald Rose wrote the play after having been a jury member himself; while the play explores a completely fictional legal case, it is likely that the jury's deliberations, challenges and conflicts in *Twelve Angry Men* reflect Rose's own experience as a juror.

Rose co-produced a 1957 film version with actor Henry Fonda, and is also credited as the writer for the 1997 telemovie version. The 1957 film, directed by Sydney Lumet, was nominated for several Academy Awards. The stage play has been adapted (for example, for female or mixed-gender casts) and translated into various languages, and in addition to the 1957 and 1997 versions there have been film and television remakes in other languages, including an Indian 'Bollywood' remake.

BRIEF SYNOPSIS

Twelve Angry Men is set in 1957 in the jury-room of a New York court. The play takes place in real time (the action is continuous) over two single-scene acts, while the twelve jury members of a murder trial attempt to reach a verdict. The verdict must be unanimous, and a 'guilty' verdict will sentence the defendant to death by electric chair. At the opening of the play the jurors, who are only ever identified by number, agree to a preliminary vote which reveals that eleven of the twelve are convinced of the defendant's guilt, while only one – 8th Juror – votes 'not guilty'. Importantly, he does not argue that the defendant is actually innocent, but rather that he has a *reasonable doubt* regarding the boy's guilt.

As the play progresses, 8th Juror challenges the other jurors' certainty about the defendant's guilt, and gradually manages to change their minds. He puts forward various arguments which include questioning witness testimonies and setting up physical demonstrations to test the possibility that written statements could be inaccurate. Throughout the play regular votes indicate that the jury is slowly shifting its opinion away from a guilty verdict and instead towards reasonable doubt about the defendant's guilt. However, several jurors (4th, 10th and particularly 3rd) hold firm to their 'guilty' vote until the final moments.

The jury-room is a site of tension and conflict with various jurors taking arguments personally as they fight for their opinion about the case. The central relationship is between 8th, a calm and rational man, and 3rd, an impatient and aggressive man who is the final juror to change his vote to 'not guilty'. The conflicts between these two are both verbal and physical, and serve to represent the larger conflicts of the case.

BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

Historical Context

Twelve Angry Men is set against a social backdrop of America in the mid-1950s. America was in a strong position after World War II, and the Great Depression of the late 1920s and 1930s was no longer dominating international and domestic economies. America was negotiating its place in a global political environment, and a part of this was the ongoing conflict with the Soviet Union which included the Cold War: a struggle between two powerful nations for political and economic dominance. At the same time, the nation was entering into an internal struggle – the Civil Rights Movement – which was concerned with ending racial discrimination, and with issues of freedom, respect and equality. In *Twelve Angry Men*, these broader conflicts are rarely alluded to, but form the historical context for the legal and personal conflicts which take place in the jury-room. The conflicts between jurors are sometimes personal, but often represent larger cultural conflicts over belief systems and social constructs such as class. Rose

had a particular interest in social justice, and *Twelve Angry Men* is an example of how he explored these concerns in his work. The issue of prejudice, for example, is central to the play, and is at the heart of many of the conflicts between characters as well as forming a basis for many of the characters' world views. A strong example is 10th, whose prejudices about the lower socio-economic classes underlie his belief in the defendant's guilt.

Legal context

Twelve Angry Men is a narrative which takes place within the twentieth-century American judicial system, and it does require an understanding of basic legal terms and concepts – such as the fact that a jury must reach a unanimous verdict, and the fact that if they have any 'reasonable doubt' about the defendant's guilt, as argued by the prosecution, then they have no choice but to deliver a verdict of 'not guilty'. However, a sophisticated understanding of the law is not necessary to appreciate the play: while *Twelve Angry Men* examines philosophical implications of a Western legal system, it does so from a very individual and human perspective. The central characters in the play are not lawyers with a complex understanding of the law, but jurors who are ordinary people, just like members of the audience. This allows us to form a strong connection with the characters and their concerns.

There are a number of legal terms used regularly in the play – including 'defendant', 'prosecution', 'evidence', 'witness testimony' and 'reasonable doubt'. Many of these will be familiar for audiences (especially contemporary audiences, who are likely to have had exposure to detailed representations of the American legal system in popular culture, such as in a multitude of films and television series with legal settings). Those terms which are less familiar, or of great importance to the text (especially 'reasonable doubt') are introduced and discussed on stage so that audiences are not alienated by their extensive use.

STRUCTURE, LANGUAGE & STYLE

Structure

Twelve Angry Men follows a two-act structure, with the action running continuously, rather than being broken into scenes. Although there would usually be an interval in the performance, the second act takes up exactly where the first left off – there is no change in chronology. With no scene divisions, the progress of the play can be measured by the votes which take place, functioning as a kind of pulse, reminding the audience where the jury's opinion stands on the defendant's conviction. Some votes are formal, with secret ballots or a show of hands, and others are less formal and consist of jurors' announcements of a change of opinion. These moments serve as markers for the audience in the journey through the play, helping to structure the action.

The play follows the three classical unities – rules of drama derived from basic principles explored by Aristotle. *Twelve Angry Men* obeys the **unity of time**: there are no shifts or disjunctions of chronology, and the action takes place over a confined and continuous period of time. Similarly the **unity of place** is fulfilled, as the entire play occurs in a single location. Finally the **unity of action** dictates that there should be a single central plot around which the play revolves. *Twelve Angry Men* satisfies this condition: the central issue of the play is the jury's decision-making process in reaching a verdict. The relationships between characters, and details of their personal lives, always serve this central plot rather than forming separate sub-plots.

Language

Rose's characters use naturalistic, everyday language appropriate to the social and historical setting. They rarely employ heightened poetic or symbolic language, instead speaking in concrete terms about the details of the case at hand. Most characters are of a similar social and cultural background, so the vocabulary is fairly similar for each. They are generally differentiated by the content of their speech rather than style. Differences between characters are

established only through subtle variations in speech patterns – for example, 8th sometimes pauses while he speaks, demonstrating his calm, reasoned nature as well as the fact that he is uncertain about the case. Conversely, 3rd's speeches are often punctuated with exclamation marks and he frequently interrupts other characters, demonstrating his impatience and hotheadedness.

Rose uses legal terminology to situate us in a legal context. As his characters are having their discussions at the conclusion of a court case, they are all familiar with the legal terms necessary to discuss the case.

Style

Twelve Angry Men is a mainstream drama, and like much of the work appearing on the American stage of its time, is realist and concrete. Rose's works for television were part of a realist or naturalist style known as 'slice of life', and this play is an example of a theatrical equivalent to that style; it presents a gritty, real-life look at a realistic situation, with the writing and staging rarely relying on metaphor, symbolism or spectacle.

CHARACTERS & RELATIONSHIPS

8th Juror

8th Juror can be considered the main character: when actor Henry Fonda co-produced the 1957 film version with Reginald Rose, it was 8th Juror that he was passionate about playing. In terms of narrative, 8th Juror is central because in the first moments of the play he is the only character to vote 'not guilty' (p.7), thus initiating the central conflict. He also drives the action of the play, regularly introducing new information to the audience (such as the victim's background, p.23, or detailed information about witness testimonies e.g. pp.24–26). He is frequently active in stimulating conversations about the case, in challenging other jurors' perspectives or opinions and in enacting demonstrations of various testimonies in order to test their likelihood of being accurate.

In terms of personality, 8th Juror tends towards compassion and patience: while he is not convinced of the defendant's innocence when he votes 'not guilty', he is concerned with ensuring the defendant has a fair trial and the jury consider carefully the details of the case. He is comfortable with his uncertainties and does not present himself as an authority – he says 'I haven't got anything brilliant' (p.13). He does not mind that reaching a verdict will take time, and is willing to stay in the jury room for as long as it takes. This contrasts with many other jurors including, in particular, 3rd, 7th and 10th, who are impatient and keen to have the job over and done with.

8th's 'not guilty' position in both the first and final votes tells us many things about his character. From the first vote, it is clear that he is willing to question the authority of the prosecution, and to keep an open mind about some of the apparently damning evidence and 'facts' from the case. He says he was concerned, during the case, that the 'defence counsel wasn't doing his job' (p.13). He is also unafraid to publicly vote against the eleven other jurymen, even when it is clear that they will not be tolerant of his decision. For example, 3rd has stated that the case, and therefore the verdict, is an 'obvious ... one' (p.3) and 7th thinks the trial has been a 'goddamn waste of time' (p.4). But 8th still stands up for his belief that they should investigate the case carefully. He holds this belief consistently, as evidenced by the fact that his vote is the same at the final count: he is the only one of the twelve men never to change his vote.

Although 8th is portrayed as an admirable character (for his ability to calmly, respectfully and patiently stand up for his beliefs and for the defendant's rights), it is important to note that he is not without flaws – for example, he openly admits to having broken the law in order to obtain a switch-knife just like the one in evidence (p.17). While he did this in service of showing reasonable doubt about the defendant's guilt, it was still an illegal and therefore morally questionable act.

The most important relationship for 8th is with 3rd Juror: a character as different from 8th as any in the play. Several key moments illustrate the nature of their relationship: one is when 3rd demonstrates the downward stabbing motion on 8th

– who does not move away – stopping just short of actually making contact (p.48), and the other is at the end of the play when 8th helps 3rd with his jacket (p.59). These moments characterise the two personalities as well as their interactions: 3rd is generally more aggressive both physically and emotionally, while 8th stands firm in his beliefs and opinions, displaying tolerance and compassion towards others.

- How does Rose encourage us to align our own opinions and moral positions with those of 8th Juror?
- Identify several key lines for 8th, and explain what they tell us about his character.

3rd Juror

After 8th, 3rd is the most important character in *Twelve Angry Men*. One of the most passionate ‘guilty’ voters throughout, he is the last to change his vote to ‘not guilty’. 3rd Juror runs a messenger service and is married with a twenty-year-old son, with whom he has an uneasy relationship. He describes some of their past conflicts early in the play – he struggles with what he sees as a lack of respect from his son and speaks scornfully of an episode when the boy ‘ran away from a fight’ (p.12). This speech reveals 3rd’s belief in the importance of physical strength and violence. It also foreshadows the way 3rd conflates his disappointment in his own son with his feelings about the defendant. At the end of the play 8th has to remind 3rd: ‘It’s not your boy. He’s somebody else’ (p.59).

3rd is a foil to 8th, providing contrasts to various qualities of the main protagonist. For example, where 8th is patient (‘we’re talking about somebody’s life here ... we can’t decide in five minutes’, p.7) 3rd is unwilling to take time with the discussions. He is convinced that the case is ‘one of those open and shut things’ (p.7), and when 8th requests a re-viewing of a piece of evidence from the case, 3rd would rather they ‘stop wasting time’ (p.33). Yet 3rd, as the last to change his vote, is actually the character who draws out the proceedings the most. This illustrates an internal conflict he must reconcile: he is impatient to end the

discussion and yet (just like 8th) he is passionately committed to his opinion. Perhaps this internal struggle is one of the factors contributing to 3rd's fury and verbal and physical aggression.

A prime example of 3rd's anger and aggression occurs at the end of the first act and is a climax for both the play and 3rd's character. His frustration with 8th's calm, persistent arguments finally peaks when he lunges at 8th, saying 'I'll kill him! I'll kill him!' (p.37). This moment reveals the extent of 3rd's anger and aggression: 5th and 6th have to restrain him to protect 8th (who calmly '*holds his ground*', p.37). It also powerfully undermines 3rd's own earlier argument against the defendant, when he claimed that anyone who 'says a thing like that' – as a witness claims the boy did – really means it (p.28). Clearly 3rd, although angry, does not actually intend to kill 8th, and he clarifies this later: 'that business before ... that guy was baiting me. I mean, that doesn't prove anything' (p.42). His actions, then, weaken his own argument and effectively strengthen 8th's position.

Another key moment for 3rd is when, in the closing moments of the play, he finally changes his vote. Right up to this point, 3rd is committed to his 'guilty' vote – only a page earlier he says he can 'sit in this goddamn room for a year' and not change his mind (p.58). When he at last changes his vote it is quite sudden (p.59), and a significant moment after such passionate resistance against 8th and others' arguments.

- Why does 3rd eventually change his vote?
- 3rd provides a foil for 8th, with many contrasting traits. What are some similarities of character between 3rd and 8th?

Other jurors

Each of the other jurors makes his own journey from a belief in the defendant's guilt to a 'not guilty' vote based on reasonable doubt. Only one juror – 12th – changes his vote more than once. The jurors are not named; identified instead only by their jury numbers. This encourages us to focus on their role in the case at hand and to analyse them as members of this group. What is important about

their individual qualities and characteristics is how these details lead the jurors to act and vote in the jury-room.

For example, 5th Juror, like the defendant, was raised in a slum environment, but feels he has made something of his life rather than fulfilling stereotyped expectations about individuals from poor socio-economic backgrounds. Even though at first he votes 'guilty', 5th quickly displays sympathy towards the defendant, perhaps partly because he feels attacked by the other jurors' opinions about the defendant: he notes that 'there is something personal' (p.12). He seems to find it easier than many others to accept the position of reasonable doubt about the defendant's guilt, as evidenced by the fact that he is the second juror to change his vote.

- Which jurors other than 3rd and 8th are central to the narrative in *Twelve Angry Men*, and why?
- Choose two jurors and discuss, using direct evidence from the text, how their own backgrounds and past experiences influence their votes.

THEMES, IDEAS & VALUES

Uncertainty and fact

Twelve Angry Men explores the idea that we can rarely be absolutely certain of 'facts'. At the beginning of the play, it seems that all the details presented in the courtroom regarding this case were solid 'fact', but 8th proceeds to demonstrate (to jurors and audience alike) how facts 'may be coloured by the personalities of the people who present them' (11th Juror, p.27) and things may not be as they first seem. An example is the accepted 'fact', presented by the prosecution, that the switch-knife used to stab the victim was so unusual as to be unique. When 8th produces an identical knife (p.16), jurors are forced to reconsider the 'facts', and come to terms with uncertainty in the face of this new information.

This is one example of many – at the play’s core is the jury’s journey from almost unanimous certainty about the defendant’s guilt to a reasonable doubt which ultimately changes their verdict to ‘not guilty’. 8th, with the support of other jurors as they change their minds, demonstrates that deeper investigation, new information or different perspectives can change how ‘facts’ appear. Indeed, 8th shows that even eyewitness testimony may at times be less than reliable, thanks to interfering factors such as human error or misunderstanding. For example, while 4th finds the woman across the road’s statement to be ‘unshakeable testimony’ (p.54), 8th argues that because her eyesight is in question, ‘maybe she honestly thought she saw the boy kill his father. I say that she only saw a blur’ (p.57).

Another way in which the play encourages us to question what constitutes ‘fact’ is the frequency with which the term is used. 10th, for example, who regularly displays prejudiced attitudes (judging others by stereotypes and ungrounded generalisation), says of people from the lower socio-economic backgrounds: ‘let’s talk facts. These people are born to lie ... They think different. They act different ... they don’t need any big excuse to kill someone ... Well, that’s true. Everybody knows it’. (p.51). Obviously, these statements are not actually ‘facts’ but opinions expressed without any supporting evidence. This reminds us that when people use the word ‘fact’, it does not necessarily describe an objective truth.

Generally, *Twelve Angry Men* suggests that uncertainty is the most reasonable course of action or belief, although Rose also acknowledges the problems and possible implications. For example, in a key stage direction we are informed that while 8th stands firm in his ‘not guilty’ vote, he is fully aware that in giving the defendant the benefit of the (reasonable) doubt, he and the jury could be returning ‘a guilty man to the community’ (p.53). 6th asks: ‘Suppose you talk us all outa this and the kid really did knife his father?’ (p.22). 8th has no reply, but the stage direction gives an important insight into his character, as well as into the risks of uncertainty: ‘*we know that this is the problem which has been tormenting him. He does not know, and never will*’ (p.22).

As 8th challenges the 'facts' and witness testimonies, we come to realise that there are very few details of which the characters can be certain. However, Rose does not suggest that this is always a problem. Rather, he reminds us that many things in life are uncertain and we should remain aware of this, keeping a healthy attitude of 'reasonable doubt' instead of jumping to conclusions and making decisions which impact – sometimes fatally – on others' lives.

8th praises the American justice system within which they are working, recognising that the clause of reasonable doubt 'is a safeguard which has enormous value in our system. No jury can declare a man guilty unless it's sure' (p.53). Note that neither 8th nor Rose endorse an extreme view that certainty is impossible, but rather a belief that absolute certainty is rare.

- Why do you think characters other than 8th are reluctant, at first, to admit reasonable doubt?

Prejudice

Twelve Angry Men shows that prejudice can be a dangerous thing. When they first enter the jury-room, many jurors are ready to convict the defendant, not just on the evidence and arguments presented by the prosecution but, frighteningly, because the boy is a member of a social group for whom the jury hold no respect, for whom the stereotypes are of hopeless lives and criminal behaviours. As 4th puts it, 'slums are breeding grounds for criminals' (p.12) and 10th adds, 'the kids who crawl outa those places are real trash' (p.12).

While there may be statistical or subjective justifications for some of these opinions, there is little evidence to show that the opinions explain this particular murder. Certainly the defendant grew up in underprivileged conditions and 7th does give us details of the boy's criminal history (p.11), but this background is not sufficient proof that he committed the murder. 11th puts forward a strong argument supporting this point when the debate turns to psychiatric evidence stating that 'the boy had strong homicidal tendencies' (p.46). 11th responds: 'we should remember that many of us are capable of committing murder. But few of

us do' (p.47). As with the class stereotypes, it is important to remember that a particular tendency does not equate to evidence of any particular behaviour.

Rose's theme here is that keeping an open mind, instead of holding firm to pre-formed and often generalised opinions, is important. *Twelve Angry Men* shows that we all have our own particular biases, and that they can be dangerous: as 8th says, 'no matter where you run into it, prejudice obscures the truth' (p.53). The play suggests that it is important to be aware of such obstacles to truth, to try to avoid them where possible and at the very least acknowledge them.

By aligning the most prejudiced attitudes with the less sympathetic characters in the play (including 10th and 3rd) and by making sure that 8th – a character with whom we are encouraged to empathise – tries to avoid prejudice, Rose endorses the notion that prejudice is not a desirable or useful trait.

- Apart from socio-economic status, on the basis of what other variables do jurors stereotype people?

Subjectivity of the justice system

Twelve Angry Men reminds us that the justice system is not an anonymous social apparatus of laws, convictions and punishments, but instead a system dependent on and shaped by the people operating within it. (In the case of the play, this perspective specifically refers to the American context, but similarities in other western courts – like the Australian system – justify readings of this text outside its original social and geographical context.)

By focussing on the discussions of the jurors and never showing us the lawyers or other more authoritative formal figures involved with the case, the play reminds us that in such situations it is *people* who make decisions, not courts or lawyers. These people are human, just like us, and the play encourages us to put ourselves in the jurors' positions and imagine how we might act under similar circumstances.

Subjectivity is a part of the court process at every level, from witnesses to jurors. 8th Juror notes that 'witnesses are only people. People make mistakes' (p.14)

and later reiterates ‘witnesses can make mistakes’ (p.31). He does not say this as a way of accusing the case witnesses of any intentional deception or error. Rather, he wants to remind the other jurors that while witness testimony can be very convincing, it is not necessarily immune to inaccuracy and therefore should not be used to decide a case like this one.

While Rose articulates these arguments explicitly through his characters (especially 8th), the jurors’ discussions also serve as more subtle illustrations of his theme: that people are not perfect. Each of the jurors brings his own baggage to the case, such as 3rd’s relationship with his son or 5th’s background. We see how these factors colour jurors’ decisions, and therefore how the justice system is subjective, and highly susceptible to the influence of its individual members.

- Does *Twelve Angry Men* suggest that this subjectivity in the legal system is of benefit or detriment to society?

DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS

There are many ways to interpret any given text. As long as it is supported with evidence from the text, an interpretation can be valid even when it is very different to other possible interpretations. Supporting your interpretation with the text includes using direct quotations and constructing arguments which refer to relevant events, dialogue, incidents or relationships in the text. Below are two contrasting interpretations of *Twelve Angry Men*, with some examples of how the text might support these interpretations.

***Twelve Angry Men* condemns stubbornness.**

‘Stubbornness’ here refers to inflexibility of opinion and attitude. The play presents stubbornness as a trait which is neither useful nor admirable. For example:

- the most ‘stubborn’ characters in the play are those who refuse to acknowledge others’ perspectives, including 3rd and 10th, and these characters are never rewarded for their attitudes

- many of the stubbornly held opinions about the case and the defendant's guilt are shown to be unfounded – for example, the reliability of the witness testimonies
- 3rd's refusal to acknowledge changing times, complaining that his son will not call him 'Sir' as he did for his own father (p.12), leaving him disappointed and angry
- on the other hand, 8th notes that this is no longer the way things are, and even fathers 'don't seem to think it's important any more' (p.12); as a result his relationship with his own children seems much easier than 3rd's
- despite stubbornly sticking to their guilty votes, even 3rd and 10th eventually change their minds – this shows that stubbornness does not guarantee success, stability or happiness.

Twelve Angry Men celebrates persistence.

8th juror is the only one not to change his vote and the play centres on his persistence in convincing each of the other jurors to vote 'not guilty'. His character provides the strongest support for this interpretation:

- 8th's persistence is rewarded, as all eleven other jurors eventually support his vote
- 8th's persistence is differentiated from other characters' inflexible obstinacy, because he is able to sustain his opinion and shift others', while still remaining open to different viewpoints – for example, when only three 'guilty' votes remain, he is open to their justifications and even asks 'maybe you can tell us' (p.53)
- although we never know whether or not the defendant committed the crime, 8th's persistence has saved his life; and as 8th notes, 'it's happened before that someone's been convicted of murder and executed, and years later someone else has confessed to the crime' (p.29) – 8th's persistence has prevented such a tragedy

- each time 8th persists with a demonstration or argument discrediting the prosecution's case, he is rewarded with other jurors' support, as one by one they begin to agree with his vote
- the play in its entirety charts a seemingly unachievable feat: one man changes the firm opinions of eleven others. This in itself is a celebration of persistence.

ESSAY TOPICS

1. '*Twelve Angry Men* shows that prejudice is a factor in every conflict.' Discuss.
2. The judge instructs the jury 'to deliberate honestly and thoughtfully'. How closely is this instruction followed?
3. '8th Juror is able to change the minds of the eleven other jurors not because he is right but because he is persuasive.' Discuss.
4. Choose one of the jurors other than 8th. What evidence in the text would suggest that he might behave differently in a similar situation, having had this experience?
5. 'The lack of character names helps make *Twelve Angry Men* and its themes more universal.' Discuss.
6. '*Twelve Angry Men* illustrates the dangers of a justice system that relies on twelve individuals reaching a life-or-death decision.' Discuss.
7. 'In *Twelve Angry Men*, Rose shows that doubt is an easier state of mind than certainty.' Discuss.
8. 8th Juror says, 'I'm not asking anyone to accept it. I'm just saying that it's possible'. How does the text differentiate between possible and probable?
9. '3rd Juror has integrity because he stands by his opinion longer than all the others (except 8th).' Discuss.

10. 'Sometimes the facts that are staring you in the face are wrong!' (8th Juror, p.29). How does *Twelve Angry Men* show us that 'facts' can be unreliable?

ANALYSING A SAMPLE QUESTION

'In *Twelve Angry Men*, Rose shows that doubt is an easier state of mind than certainty.' Discuss.

When answering any essay question, always identify key terms. In this question, 'doubt' and 'certainty' are the two central concepts. 'Easier' is also significant, as it tells you what kind of essay question this is and how to go about answering it: you will need to *compare* these two concepts and (using evidence from the text) form a main contention about which is 'easier'.

You will first need to define the two central terms within this specific context, using evidence from the text. For example,

- 8th's state of mind for most of the play is *doubt*: at the beginning he says 'I don't know whether I believe it or not. Maybe I don't' (p.7) and at the end: 'I don't really know what the truth is ... no-one can really know' (p.53)
- for most of the play 10th Juror provides examples of certainty, such as when he says 'a kid kills his father. Bing! Just like that' (p.5) or 'you can talk till your tongue is draggin' on the floor. The boy is guilty. Period' (p.46).

Form a main contention or argument: you can agree, disagree or partly agree with the question. (Often disagreeing or partially agreeing can be more interesting, but more challenging and risky, too!) In this case, your contention might be 'by the end of the play, not one juror has been able to maintain his certainty and therefore doubt is an easier state of mind'. You will need to support this central argument with other arguments and examples from the text. These might include:

- showing how a position of doubt is actually strong: 8th need not 'prove' anything, just introduce reasonable possibilities
- demonstrating how doubt erodes certainty and therefore it is harder to maintain certainty
- comparing characters' states of mind: for example 3rd, 4th and 10th are the most 'certain' jurors (about the defendant's guilt and also about some of their personal beliefs and biases), yet they are the most frustrated, angry and volatile. 8th, on the other hand, remains uncertain about many things, but is calmer and less defensive, suggesting that doubt is an easier state of mind.

Remember to support all your arguments with examples and quotes from the text and to plan your essay first.

THE TEXT

Rose, Reginald 1977, *Twelve Angry Men*, Samuel French, London.

FURTHER READING

Twelve Angry Men 1957, dir. Sydney Lumet, Orion-Nova. Starring Henry Fonda and Lee J. Cobb.

Twelve Angry Men 1997, dir. William Friedkin, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Starring Jack Lemmon and George C. Scott.

Duhaime, Lloyd 2010, *Duhaime.org*, <http://www.duhaime.org/>

A site with accessible dictionaries of legal terminology.

IMDb.com 2010, *The Internet Movie Database*, <http://www.imdb.com/>

Marks, Peter 2006, 'Twelve Angry Men returns with conviction', *Washington Post*, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/05/AR2006100501855.html>

Museum of Broadcast Communications 2010, *Reginald Rose*, <http://www.museum.tv/eotvsection.php?entrycode=rosereginal>

Pinter, Harold 2003 'Directing: *Twelve Angry Men*', http://www.haroldpinter.org/directing/directing_angry.shtml

Harold Pinter website containing extracts from reviews of his 1996 production.

Thomas, Tony 1983, *The Complete Films of Henry Fonda*, Citadel Press, NJ.