*Compare how the texts you have studied emphasise the complexities evident in the nature of conflicting perspectives – HSC 2008*

The nature of conflicting perspectives arises from the composer’s ability to form divergent views consequently to explore complexities to enhance the understanding of idealisms of the text. Such complexities are discoursed through the representation of personalities, events and situations which allows the composer to influence and contort audience’s opinions. Julius Caesar composed in the 1599 by Julius Caesar draws from the complexities in the perceptions of Caesar’s personality and image while pursuing the implications of the assassination of Caesar via leadership roles. Similarly the consideration of political agendas particularly terrorism accentuate aspects of differing judgements of the terrorist’s image in Media Watch’s ‘Promoting Propaganda v Public Interest’ (2013). Ultimately the appropriation of complexities as a medium demonstrates the representation of notable qualities present in the texts resulting in the formation of conflicting perspectives.

The significance of leadership roles evident in Act 3 Sc 2 shapes the audience’s interpretation of situations and events to highlight conflicting perspectives. Contrasting rhetoric of both Brutus and Antony highlights the varied opinion of Caesar while considering the leadership to rise from the events. Brutus’s initial address of plebeians gives prominence towards his formal and commanding tone ‘Romans, lover, countrymen… be silent that you may hear’. In addition, Brutus stands in the pulpit to further highlight his commanding stance combined with the use of ‘lovers’ creates a cumulative effect of his leadership with respect to the situation of Caesar’s assassination. Following his address, Brutus emphasises the notion of leadership via appealing to the audience’s logic in the form of ‘not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more…Had you rather Caesar was living and die all slaves?’ By suggesting his love for Rome overpowering his lover for Caesar and rhetorical questions, the image of Caesar’ as a dictator who intended to oppress Rome is conveyed. In contrast, Antony draws out his leadership by appealing to the plebeians with a more emotional response ‘Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ear.’ The accumulation of types of people facilitates a welcoming feeling allowing Antony to personalise himself with the audience. To further impact his influence of towards the audience in his favour he uses Caesar’s body as a prop while walking down to the citizen’s level. The combination of the prop and stage direction that is descending the steps enhances Antony’s personal relationship with the citizen’s remorse. Overall, the influence of ‘complexities’ assist in contorting the our views to strengthen our understanding of the text

Similarly, the audience’s views are influenced by the notions of power and corruption, allowing Shakespeare to illustrate conflicting perspective of Caesar’s personality in Act 2 Sc 1. Power and corruption as concepts have two sides of a coin both positive and negative shown through Brutus’s soliloquy of Caesar. Brutus expresses his initial thoughts of Caesar though ‘I have no personal cause to spurn at him’ and ‘I have not known when his affection swayed’. The use of emotive language highlights two perspectives of Caesar with respective to corruption and conveys Brutus’s indecisiveness. In contrast, Brutus presents his view with the consideration of Caesar’s hubris ‘he then unto the ladder turns his back… scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend. The metaphor establishes the inevitable nature of too much power which will lead to Caesar’s corruption such that he will dishonour all those helped him. Brutus conveys the symbol of a serpent egg in two phases; current state, potential state. An initial harmless of the egg asserts a lack of danger, but infers possible dangers should the egg be allows to develop which further establishes Caesar’s corruption. As a result, Shakespeare reflects his own contextual ideas to enhance the audience understanding of the text through the notion of power and corruption. Thus is able to convey the nature of conflicting perspectives.

‘Promoting Propaganda v Public Interest’ expresses the problem of media is virally exposing information to incite terrorism particularly events and personalities surrounding the text. The political agendas regarding propaganda and public interest inform public audience evoking a sense of conflicting perspectives by misinformation of messages to contort opinions. The title grabs the attention of the general audience while preserving the subject at hand. Consequently it gives rise to conflict to the context of the murder of a young soldier’s in suburban London. From this, the host, Holmes presents a newspaper extract ‘yes… pictures and film clips were across media within minutes’ and colloquially states ‘Well no. It wasn’t in public domains until two mainstream outlets put it there’. The colloquialism accentuates the form of a television show to express his thoughts and providing a political perspective on the issue. Furthermore media watch presents a statement from Faulks regarding the agenda ‘on a public interest basis as the material is integral to understanding the horrific incident that took place’ and juxtaposes it with ‘Well was it? It was definitely what the killer hoped for’. By utilising rhetorical questions, Holmes is able to dissuade the audience from thinking it was public interest and effectively highlights the conflict between propaganda with the hint of a colloquial tone. Consequently, Holmes is able to effectively portray effectively in a final line ‘But why give the killer a megaphone to inspire fear, and broadcast hate?’ through a rhetoric to establish his viewpoint while considering other perspective towards propaganda. In essence, the text expresses the issues with media exposing information by labelling it as public interest in the need for views. Complexities in the text provide the vehicle for representation which allows the formation of the audience’s views.