

Member and guest feedback for *The Goldman Case*

I thought this film was good and Arieh Worthalter portrayed Pierre Goldman convincingly. He was a totally unsympathetic character. I was amazed by the chaotic proceedings in the court and the fact that everyone seemed to be talking when the judge gave his verdict, showing no respect for his authority. I cannot imagine this happening in an English courtroom! Like *Anatomy of a Fall*, I was not sure at the end of the trial whether he was actually innocent or guilty! I enjoyed Jon Davies' useful introduction.

An interesting film with a very powerful performance from the actor playing Pierre Goldman. The noisy and chaotic courtroom scenes were a surprise, as was the shock ending revealing that Goldman had subsequently been assassinated. Jon's introduction was very good and helpful. Also, just the right length.

A very well-crafted film with a compelling performance from the lead. An excellent introduction from Jon Davies, who managed to pass on some very interesting information and observations in under 10 minutes.

Compelling. Well-acted apart from the crowd scenes in the court public gallery. Refreshingly close to the 100 minute mark. Beneficial not to know much about the case beforehand.

I enjoyed the introduction.

Engaging - I'm sure the distinguished director took a few liberties with representing the French justice system however it was a drama not a documentary exploring the mixing of prejudice, preference and perception in a politically charged situation. The director examining the key participants involved in the process, outcome and interpretation of evidence presented in the Goldman case. It reminded me of the revolutionary history and truculence of France, less deferential to authority and the forces of the state. It was rich in acting and discourse. In fact, such a wordy intellectual film that an edit for length would not have gone amiss either. That Goldman was assassinated only intensified the politics at stake in this case. Good choice and I enjoyed the crisp interesting introduction too from John Davies. Thank you.

Thanks for the informative introduction to the film. An interesting snapshot of French 'justice' of the time. Left me wondering how much has changed.

Great to have another courtroom drama following on from *Anatomy of a Fall* and *Collini Case*. A genre I love. John's introduction was most welcome and provided some valuable insights I missed on my previous viewing.

Fascinating and compelling, with a great principal character and supporting cast, it fell a little short, as courtroom drama, in my view, of *The Anatomy of a Fall*.

I found the movie very engaging and an excellent portrayal by the lead of a 'colourful' character which was complemented by the other misfit characters who were equally unusual and compelling. I also found the depiction of life in the 70s very realistic even though it was an unfamiliar city for me. For what it's worth, I think he did it.

A gripping tale which I preferred to the at times ponderous *Anatomy of a Fall*. Only in France would an intellectualising philosophical approach to racism, integration and on the other side of the spectrum the maintenance of and adherence to French societal authority come under the

radar though this story was very much a product of its time. I could not believe how naive the two defence pleas were at the end of the trial when for me it was far more clear cut. Did the jury believe the (no doubt fabricated) police evidence or not? Like most faux revolutionaries (for that read small time gangster) Goldman was a self-obsessed narcissist who wanted to be a macher (a big shot) instead of a low-life. Another excellent choice.

Very interesting and well-acted. Enjoyed the film and it was enlightening to see the biases in the system exposed.

An interesting film that, for the most part, was engaging. Strong performance from the lead actor. It was at points disjointed but a fascinating insight into the fractured politics of the 70s.

Very brave to produce a movie with little but the inside of a French courtroom. Could have been boring but wasn't, it was revealing on many levels but poor Bechdel Test.

Skilfully constructed and very well acted but all a bit too intense and claustrophobic for me.

Some great acting and a fascinating case but unfortunately the film didn't live up to expectations and dragged on.

Really engaging film. A lot of legal trickery, deception, intimidation and sleight of hand going on to convince the jury. It was filmed as a dramatic helter skelter in a way we would not recognise in an English court. Great choice of film, thank you.

Brilliantly acted portrayal of a bonkers judicial process, although the confines of the courtroom made it a suffocating watch. A couple of things really jarred. Was the rambunctious courtroom free-for-all, where anyone could shout anything to anyone at any time, for real? Ditto, the trial's focus on nit-picking unreliable eye-witness testimony over ballistics evidence that could have matched the fatal bullets to one of Goldman's many firearms. Turns out both were pretty accurate depictions. A trying experience.

The first time that I have given a Dreadful and the first time that I have walked out of a film! Really dull, speech so fast that the subtitles zoomed off the page before you could catch up with them. Because it was so dull I drifted off occasionally and missed chunks of the rapid-fire dialogue. Not for me!!

I found the court case interesting and the pacing kept me engaged. It reminded me of my own jury experience where witnesses "make mistakes" and nothing is totally clear - but you have to make some sense of what you have been presented with. I agreed with the outcome!

I usually like the films you choose but I really disliked this film. I felt no empathy for the key characters at all.

An interesting insight into the conduct of such a type of case in the French courts and an interesting subject. The audible gasp of the audience on discovering that the accused was assassinated three years after his release emphasised that this was a real-life event.

On second viewing I understood the range of issues raised in this film much more. It made important points and was well-acted. It was naturally limited by the single courtroom location. On both occasions when I watched it, I would have been very interested to hear some

discussion by the jury rather than a written description of the judgements. However, I was still very interested to see the film for a second time.

Gripping and intense. Very evocative of the 1970s. We couldn't believe how chaotic the courtroom was and that the Judge allowed the protesters to stay.

A deliberately claustrophobic and static film but one I felt was hampered in its impact by the constraints the director had chosen to impose on himself - linear chronology and setting the entire film in the courtroom.

I can never resist a courtroom drama and this was a gripping example. Powerful performance by the Aries Worthalter in the title role.

The antics in a French court are similar to PM's Wednesday afternoon question time in the Houses of Parliament. Interesting to see how the French judicial system works.

Good subject matter for a film but I found the style rather monotonous.

A truly dramatic French court experience! So many, still current, issues aired and several unanswered questions. Great viewing.

It was very well done and well-acted but I found the format was a bit boring, like sitting in a real trial.

A riveting film, with a very authentic 1970s feel. There is something particularly fascinating about a courtroom drama based on a real case and the whole thing is very tightly structured. In this case the story also has inescapable and thought-provoking, echoes of the Dreyfus case and the longer history of French antisemitism. Another great pick!

An interesting, worthy film rather than entertaining or enjoyable- the only light relief being the wonderful overblown reactions of the members of the public and the various lawyers. It certainly covered every possible variation of prejudice. The ending was suitably enigmatic regarding the sentencing.

I'd give it a Good but bordering on an OK not an Excellent. It was well acted and it was very interesting to get a glimpse of a very different legal system but overall I felt it would have been more successful as a play than a film.

Gripping, the central performance by Arie Worthalter as Goodman is mesmerising.

I thought the production values of the film were excellent - editing, framing etc. It was clearly intended for a French audience, who still hark back to the Dreyfus Affair and who will recall the reports of the Goldman trial. But I personally could not engage in the objectivity of the narrative - perhaps I am too used to a more dramatic emotional style, to explain to me the motivations fuelling the story.

I loved it!

An intense experience and a compelling watch. Strong performances. It's just that we were in the court, nearly all the time. It laboured on grindingly at times. Still, this was a story among many stories of misfortune; was it so different that it warranted a film? A revelation was the

freedom of interjection and speech permitted in the French court room - we liked that participants had their voices heard along the way! Our question: is it really possible in real life?

Well, you wouldn't get this sort of thing in an English court. The French have an "Inquisitorial" system (as opposed to an "Adversarial" system) which I have never rated as a means of getting at the truth although miscarriages of justice can occur in either system of course. What a shambles! However, the performances were excellent especially Ariele Worthalter as Pierre Goldman.