

“ Dialogue is a weapon ”

By Joanne Lee May Teng



# CRITICAL WRITING

Dialogue is a weapon for making war or peace. It is like a coin which has two faces either positive or negative. Conversation between two or more people is connoted by the word Dialogue. Dialogue is a powerful pen to scrap or to trap anything. It is increasable. Words used by one person can stimulate the incident as though it never occurred or develop them as an unimaginable story too.

People who are illiterate and who reside in rural areas connate terms that are acceptable to use before elders, youngsters and they have their own unwritten set of rules to maintain their words before people depending upon their age and respect. But comparatively, educated people who live in urban mostly have to improve these types of verbal etiquettes always. And this happens vice versa too.

Both educated and uneducated forget the mannerism and used the dialogue abruptly (Nightingale, 2000). Dialogues are important, it just starts as 'just like that' and it grows as an argument either for reasonable purpose which has to be established for a social cause or issues who struggle for their rights or for hurting others which has to be analysed in the beginning stage and has to be avoided.

A dialogue can make or break things as two too. Most of the unbreakable historical novels were written only through dialogue mode instead of a story phased. The most understandable and lively way of expressing things had been handled by historical writers to convey things very likely for the readers of those novels like "The Scarlet Pimpernel" and all the novels of Mr. Shakespeare. The words and wordings enhance and correlate even with modern age (Jokinen et al, 2010).

A dialogue is a continuous thing that lives along with us in each every communication that we make with someone else who is either near or far, it matters a lot or less. Conversation that we make from our childhood with our school friends, college mates, colleagues and especially with our parents, siblings make us to react for those things rapidly but when it comes to a person who is unknown and when we have a conversation with them for a while, we remember how to talk to them and get the response positively (Nightingale, 2000).

When we analyze, we forget the basic way that these things could be even followed with all the people whom we are talking daily. If we are always with sweet words with people who are close, we might get hurt. So at times it is better enough to show a harsh face in the conversation too as it is quite natural. And if the person who likes us will understand and reply even for that like how our mother does daily.

Script writers who are writing a variety of scripts for movies, short movies and for stage shows have gathered huge lot of experiences out of their life and by observing things around them and by watching many movies or by reading many dialogue oriented novels would have gathered information from them. It might be easy to read and see a movie but the hard work for imagining a conversation and for writing a set of dialogue by thinking how a character will think and react about this dialogue and how he/she responds back would be much difficult.

Dialogues in live or in screen have much difficulty and the words are much powerful either it is joke or it is an advice or it is an information everything matters through our single response. Making our words pleasant always and not showing our anger then and there and showing it in a right place is utmost way of conveying our thoughts and deeds.

## **References**

Nightingale, AW 2000, *Genres in dialogue: Plato and the construct of philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, UK.

Jokinen, K, and McTear, M 2010, *Spoken dialogue systems*, Morgan & Claypool publishers, Toronto.