

Hands up Hamlet!

Members of the jury, we are not here to decide whether or not Hamlet is guilty of murder but to decide if Hamlet 's action is justified or not. Hamlet is mentally incapacitated and you can clearly see it from the fact that, for example, our defendant has been experiencing varied family issues and harassments: as soon as his father died, his mother immediately remarried, making Hamlet's uncle King of Denmark. Are we going to ignore this fact claiming that 'it's how the monarchy system works'? That event probably affected the prince's psyche irremediably. Let's analyze the concept carefully: a man died, and no one seems to care at all. This man was not only the defendant's father, but also the King! Now, unless everybody in Elsinore is characterized by an insane pessimism, the Queen's statement "all that lives must die" sounds like a defence of what she has just done. Everyone except Hamlet seems to accept what is going on and start a new life with a new King: think about how hurting it had to be to feel all that pain alone. Secondly, the prosecutor does not consider that no one managed to really understand the prince and, in the end, left, due to Hamlet's purpose to revenge his father's death led him to isolate himself. All the court, furthermore, betrayed him in a different way, making him doubt of everyone, even of himself, since he starts to think about suicide and who has the right to live in this world. His presumed lover decided to turn her back on him, his dearest friends work for the new king and he is endlessly surveilled by Polonius. Even the strongest mind would have felt uncomfortable, unwanted and annoyed, and these feelings have obviously turned into anger, which finally led Hamlet to that despicable murder. We can assume that Polonius' death was the peak of all those unspoken and misunderstood emotions Hamlet felt. So, members of the jury, having specified that we're here to prove the prince's mental instability, do you still think he has the faculty to account of his actions? Do you really want to sentence him after all he has witnessed? "Denmark's a prison" he said, and I proved it is actually like this. If I am not mistaken, King Claudius described Hamlet's liberty as "full of threats to all"; now, how could you still consider the possibility of acknowledging the Prince as accusable? We're talking about a man who's seriously hurt, damaged, abandoned and misunderstood, a man whose liberty has been reduced and feared, a man who only desires to find the truth, but ended up losing his mind and doing things he wouldn't have done if he was sane.