

10m19-21:53

Extract 2: technical elements you could have used to comment this scene:

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

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.

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 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 uninterrupted 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.