

# Conflicting perspectives



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT ??? THAT THE EXISTENCE OF CONFLICTING PERSPECTIVES CAN ONLY BE ENRICHING??

™ The term, ??? only???, as used in the statement, contradicts the intrinsic quality of conflicting perspectives, being perceived differently and having dissimilar effects with accordance to differing responders or characters. So, what one responder or character may value and believe to be enriching, another may not.

To prove my thesis, the existence of conflicting perspectives is usually enriching for one person but not for the other, I will critically analyse its affect on personalities and situations in two texts. ??? Julius Caesar???, my prescribed text, a play fashioned by Shakespeare and ??? To kill a mockingbird???, my chosen text, a novel composed by Harper Lee. Julius Caesar is a play in which conflicting perspectives are represented. It represents dominance declining to manipulation; the death of an emperor, Julius Caesar, by the manipulation of the, as Antony says, ??? noble Brutus???, by an animus, envious character, Cassius. It also represents power play on various levels, and groups and individuals struggling for predominance, honour, freedom and idealism. We are presented with many moral dilemmas such as the issue of governance and the admissibility of applying ones personal values and ethical and moral beliefs to justify and cover an act that seems unforgivable to others, which I believe is represented most profoundly. Close reference will be on Brutus and Cassius and the method and purpose of representation of personalities and events by Shakespeare??™s. Shakespeare represents this dilemma through what Brutus and Cassius reveal to the responder.

We are enticed to question whether or not it is justifiable to murder an emperor, in the belief that he is ??? ambitious??? and that he ??? may??? transform into a tyrant. Brutus is represented by Shakespeare as a man who shows integrity is highly acknowledged by the plebeians as a ??? noble man??? and values freedom, equality and democracy, exactly what he believes Caesar ??? may??? pose a threat to, and is further manipulated to believe Caesar ??? would??? pose a threat to. However, ultimately, Brutus??™ idealistic compassion towards his values and the independence of the Roman republic, ???.. not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more???, outweigh his love for Caesar and seems to him a reasonable ??? sacrifice???, and a true purpose to join the conspiracy. ??? I do fear the people choose Caesar for their king???. Prior to Brutus??™ soliloquy, he sits at his desk, in the dark. ??? I cannot by the progress of the stars??|.

. how near to day.??? ??? Get me a taper???. This is an effective dramatic staging technique that Shakespeare implemented in order to reflect Brutus??™ thoughts towards Caesar, being uncertain, lost in the dark.

Brutus??™ soliloquy instantly informs the responder that instability, in regards to his perspective of Julius Caesars??™ intentions and the evil conspiracy is concerning him. The portrayal of high and low modalities, as represented by Brutus through his soliloquy, reveals a major conflict against the statement, that the existence of conflicting perspectives can only be enriching. ??? And therefore??|would as his kind grow mischievous??|kill him in his shell.??? This quote reveals that Brutus is confident that Caesar will become a mischief to the Roman republic and that he must die before he, climbs the ladder.

Also, the use of the word 'would' furthermore shows that he is being confident and decisive as it is an opinionated term. That at his will he may do danger with. Now a weak and irresolute attitude is portrayed and conflicts with his more confident approach to the situation. 'may' is a term used mainly where one is uncertain. This clarifies his alteration in modalities, because when contrasted with 'would', it proves that Brutus has discontinuous perspectives and is at war with himself. Cassius perceives Brutus' weak attitude and takes advantage of it. This reveals that Shakespeare has attempted to represent Cassius as a manipulative, conniving character. He manipulates his thoughts in order to evoke his concerns towards the threats that Caesar will impose on his values of equality, democracy and freedom,.

.. we petty men walk under his huge legs.

. This ultimately leads to Brutus joining the conspiracy and executing the murder. Was this enriching for Brutus I think not, because the blood stained reputation, lose of objective and eventually suicide, is definitely not an enriching conclusion. Cassius on the other hand would perceive Brutus' self at war, 'might' 'may' 'would', as being enriching. There are multiple reasons why Cassius would perceive this. One reason would be because he can manipulate Brutus' thoughts to make him believe that Caesar would pose a threat to the Roman republic if he is not killed. Another significant reason would be because Brutus is highly regarded by the plebeians as a noble man and is known to love Caesar, whereas Cassius is inherently known to hate Caesar.

Thus, Brutus's involvement in the plan would supplement Cassius's conniving reputation and lessen the plebeians' accusations and anger. The reason for killing Caesar would be more acceptable to the plebeians because the noble Brutus was part of the assassination. This, in turn, reveals that Shakespeare is attempting to represent Cassius's reputation as being minor and also reveals Brutus as a highly regarded man. It essentially conveys the abuse of superiority, a power play twist, and the manipulation of Brutus, the patriot. By revealing that Brutus himself at war was enriching for Cassius but not for himself, effectively and dramatically reinforces my thesis, the statement that the existence of conflicting perspectives can only be enriching is incorrect, as there are usually two perspectives to a situation and will be enriching for one person but not for the other.

This is increasingly reinforced by the comparison of another text, *To Kill a Mockingbird*. *To Kill a Mockingbird*, by Harper Lee, represents a corrupt, discriminative society and the destruction of innocence by evil. We view this story from a six year old girl's perspective, Jeane Louise Finch, Scout, which makes the reader question the credibility of the situations. Symbolism and representation floods the novel in a dramatic form. Being set in Southern USA in the 19th Century, when segregation due to being unlike others or brown coloured, was common, a dilemma currently valid was risen. Harper Lee's intention on applying such a relevant dilemma was to assist the reader in feeling connected with the issue and characters, reinforce the motif of the novel and encourage them to contemplate whether it is, justifiable to segregate and make unfair assumptions due to someone's differing views, culture and or colour. The court case between Tom Robinson and

Mayella Ewell highlights the underlying motif of this novel, which is evil destroying innocence.

It represents the bigoted perspectives of Tom by Mayella and her father, Bob and the sympathetic perspective of Tom by Atticus Finch, the ??? wise man???. Atticus became less popular once he took the role of defending Tom by many ??? negro??? haters of the time. The conflict in perspectives is represented simply through the intrinsic nature of the court case, there being two sides to a story. By evaluating the staging, rhetoric and differing perspectives, we may notice the prejudice attitudes of the time and it will allow my thesis, that the existence of conflicting perspectives can only be enriching??™ is incorrect, as there are usually two perspectives to a situation and will be enriching for one person but not for the other, to be further reinforced. The conflict in perspectives within the case was, Tom Robinson raped Mayella. Tom Robinson didn??™t rape Mayella. Shakespeare imposed an intense court room to the reader by various techniques. Some include the seating arrangements which reinforce the conflict between brown and white people being segregated to one another and the very fact that a white man was defending a black man from a white woman.

However, even though it was intense, to Atticus the case was already lost. Atticus knew that no matter how well he could prove his case, the dogmatic attitudes of the judge would override. This reinforced the inequalities of the time and strengthened the motif of the novel.

My thesis will be strengthened when both sides of the case are considered and Shakespeares??™ representation are exposed.???. I said, Miss Mayella,

let me outta here, an??™ I tried to run.???. This is how Tom attempts to prove himself innocent.

He tried to show the judge that he was the one who was being abused, ??? let me outta here???. ???.. an??™ I tried to run???. On the other hand, Mayella says, ??? That nigger yonder took advantage of me??!???. This proves that Mayella is attempting to manipulate or further degrade the perspective of the judge and the ??? white???. community towards Tom by appealing to their hatred against brown coloured people. This is a clever representation of Harper Lee. It reveals that she is attempting to stress the motif of the novel, evil destroying innocence, and reflect the scale of bigoted attitudes in the Southern USA in the 19th century. Ultimately, as Atticus expected, the dogmatic attitudes towards brown men at the time override how ever strong the case they presented was, and Tom was sent to jail. He later attempted to escape and was shot.

This reveals that his experience from a conflict in perspective was not enriching as it led to him being sent to jail and being shot. On the other hand, Mayella??™s experience from this conflict in perspectives was enriching as it lessened the corruption of her reputation and the abuse she would have gotten from her father if the ??? truth??™ was revealed. This reinforces my thesis, that the existence of conflicting perspectives can only be enriching??™ is incorrect, as there are usually two perspectives to a situation and will be enriching for one person but not for the other. We, as responder may never genuinely understand what happened and who abused who, however by what we are presented with, the inconsistency of proof, Atticus proving that Tom could not have hit Mayella as he is Left handed and <https://assignbuster.com/conflicting-perspectives-3/>

the bruise was on the right arm, leads us to believe that she has been caught by her father kissing a ??? negro??? and her father coerced her to go to court and accuse Tom of abusing her so their reputation doesn't become contaminated. In conclusion, the statement that the existence of conflicting perspectives can only be enriching is incorrect, as there are usually two perspectives to a situation and will be enriching for one person but not for the other.

Both of my texts, when evaluated and compared, proved to comply with my thesis. A composer's aim is to create a story that encourages the responder to contemplate, meaning they will attempt to obscure it or make it comprehensive. Thus conflicting perspectives aren't usually presented wholly and clear to the responder but it will be presented, by the use of techniques and representations, multifaceted and abstrusely, to the extent the composer feels is necessary to allow the responder to reflect and consider. Therefore, the existence of conflicting perspectives is enriching to the responder as we are usually, but not always, given a two sided and comprehensive perception of situations and personalities, however only to the extent and approach the composer desires.

The comparison and synthesis of Julius Caesar, a play directed by Shakespeare and To Kill A Mocking bird, a novel composed by Harper Lee is imperative for the understanding of the composers aim in representing conflicting perspective and will reinforce my statement that, the existence of conflicting perspectives is enriching to the responder as we are usually given a two sided and comprehensive perception of situations and personalities, however only to the extent and approach the composer desires. In Julius



Caesar, we are presented with the notion that people are fickle in regards to responsibilities and governance and easily manipulated, which represents the human nature at the plays present era and currently today. By making such a concept an integral part of the play, Shakespeare allows the audience to reflect due to the relevance it would have with us.

This implementation raises a dilemma that occurs in the play and we as responders may also relate to. How the fickleness is presented and why it??  
™s apparent is the choice of the composer, mainly through the use of rhetoric, staging and foreshadowing, similar as to how the discriminative and manipulated attitudes to brown people are portrayed by Harper Lee in To kill a mockingbird. Both texts are similar in the way that the conflicting perspectives both conform to my statement, the existence of conflicting perspectives is enriching to the responder as we are usually given a comprehensive perception of situations and personalities, however only to the extent and approach the composer desires. They both hold conflicting perspectives that prove to be enriching to the reader. The existence of conflicting perspectives is enriching to the responder as we are usually, given a comprehensive perception of situations and personalities, however only to the extent and approach the composer desires. Both texts prove that conflicting perspective in some way enhanced the perception of the responder by broadening their thoughts and views on a situation or personality.