<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Twelve Angry Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Sidney Lumet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Truth/knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plot Summary</strong></td>
<td>Henry Fonda plays juror #8, the architect, the only person on a jury holding out for a not guilty verdict for a young man accused of murder. Through argument he gradually brings the others around to his point of view. The other jurors bring various perspectives to bear on the issue, for example juror #10, the bigot, whose whole assessment of the case is coloured by his view that ‘these people’ are just born bad, and juror #3, the angry man whose views are affected by his estrangement from his own son. This film might be seen as illustrating the way people’s beliefs and interests colour their attempts to reconstruct events from a mass of testimony, and thus implying that how we understand the world is always coloured by our beliefs and interests. However, the film is probably more accurately seen as one man’s heroic stand for the truth in the face of others whose views are distorted by interest and prejudice. Through his conscientious devotion to the truth and rational argument, Fonda is able to see past the prejudices of others and identify the clues that make it impossible for the young man to be convicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Scenes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant Text</strong></td>
<td>I. C. Jarvie, Philosophy of the Film: Epistemology, Ontology, Aesthetics, 1987, 302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>