*Twelve Angry Men* Act III Reading Guide Notes

1. How do the jurors vote at the beginning of Act III? It is six voting guilty and six voting not guilty.
2. Why do the jurors decide to reenact the stabbing? Juror #2 thinks there is something strange about the knife wound.
3. What contradictions does juror #5 see regarding the knife? An experienced knife fighter would not use a switchblade overhanded.
4. After they discuss the contradictions, how do the jurors vote? They vote 3 guilty and 9 not guilty.
5. Who is still voting guilty? Based on their characteristics, are their votes surprising? No, Juror #3 is a sadist, Juror #4 is only concerned with the facts in the case and still believes the woman across the tracks, and Juror #10 is a bigot.
6. What is the gist of juror #10’s long speech? What does it show? He groups all people of color together and says “they” don’t value human life as much as white people. He is racist because he is basing his decision on the young man’s race, not the facts.
7. What is wrong with the testimony given by the woman across the street? She has bad vision and needs to wear glasses. She testified that she saw the murder as she was tossing and turning in bed. No one wears glasses to bed, so how could she tell it was the young man?
8. Who is holding out in changing his vote to not guilty? Why do you think he refuses to change? Juror #3 refuses to change because he is stubborn and associates the young man with his own son whom he feels is rotten.
9. How is the conflict resolved? How does the play end? Juror #3 stands alone and finally agrees to enter a not guilty vote. The young man is found not guilty by all the jurors.
10. Do you feel justice has been served? Why or why not?