

Text Comparison

Ashley Ehrlick

Section 3

September 29, 2022

We live in a time when the public's trust in law enforcement and the justice system has fallen significantly. People from all walks of life have asked the same question whether cameras should be put in all Canadian courtrooms to provide a greater and much-needed level of transparency to the system. However, both sides offer convincing arguments, whether for or against cameras, but one side does a better job of convincing the reader what position to take on the subject.

Taylor C. Noakes, a public historian, argues that cameras should be added to all Canadian courtrooms. He stated that since people began recording audio and video of police brutality, we now have a large supply of evidence. Noakes believes that in order to make the justice system more transparent and accountable, the next step would be to install cameras in courtrooms.

On the other side of the debate, Pam Hrick and Rosel Kim, from the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund, start their argument strong by referring to the defamation trial of Johnny Depp and Amber Heard earlier this spring. They say the trial was mocked worldwide, as clips of testimony were taken and spread across social

media for entertainment, rather than being treated as a serious trial. They predict that the addition of cameras to courtrooms would lead to harassment, judgement and disempowerment of victims and witnesses.

Both arguments present a number of compelling points, but I find that one is much more successful than the other in convincing the audience of their opinion, based on the effectiveness of the writing. Noakes authored his article with a more emotional style, while Pam Hrick and Rosel Kim use emotion-based opinions carefully layered with proof to convey their point of view. Emotion is present in both articles, but Hrick and Kim have a strong point-proof system, while Noakes' article is full of opinions and no facts to support it. In Noakes' article, for example, he refers to a case involving Charles Smith to prove that televising trials would lead to less prejudice and fewer wrongful convictions. I found this example unavailing unless the reader had previous knowledge of Charles Smith. Without context, it sounded more like name-dropping to give the illusion of strong proof, rather than actual evidence to support his view. On the contrary, Hrick and Kim mention two different examples of past cases, as well as reference to Canada's Courts of Justice Act.

Hrick and Kim wrote powerfully and thoughtfully, using opinions, emotions, and examples to convey their views. What stuck to me when I compared these two articles, as I tried to decide whose side I agreed with more, was the evidence behind their opinions and how effectively they related to their statements. Noakes used an example

that was not explained beyond a simple mention of the name, while Kim and Hrick delved further into their evidence by using numbers and trending hashtags to provide background information that strengthened their evidence.

Word Count - 493