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Abortion

 Going on *Twitter*, you will see many spectacles. There is the meme: funny, pointing to something in pop culture and generally making fun of it. There is the *Twitter* beef: a beautiful argument over the most vacuous of subjects. Then, there is the politics. Oh, how the politics in *Twitter* get spread around the place. *Twitter* is a place, in the end, for people to speak their mind. It is also a place for people to get offended by these said political tweets. Abortion is one of the most dividing issues in our nation. It is an issue with valid points being made by both sides. It is a tweet which will get the *Twitter* user massive backlash, as well as massive support-depending on which side is taken. There is the pro-choice side, classified as “baby-killers.” Then, there is the pro-life side, classified as “sexist, conservatives.” So, let us get one thing straight. This is a sensitive issue. There are countless tweets about abortion that people get offended by. I am an 18-year-old man. I will never have a direct problem with abortion, and so I was very confused about this topic. I needed to find people who were knowledgeable about this issue and would give me viewpoints to understand. I kept all this in mind while researching this rather controversial topic, and I came to use three mediums: *YouTube* videos, scholarly articles, and, of course, tweets. There are benefits and drawbacks to using each three of these different mediums, and I came to a greater understanding of this topic by using these mediums.

*YouTube* videos are the new-age magazine. If you want to find out about anything, you can easily search on *YouTube* and find an answer. For my search, I decided to use *The Ben Shapiro Show*.In one of his videos, Ben Shapiro talks about abortion. His video, perfectly titled “Ben Shapiro DESTROYS the Abortion Argument,” nailed what was shown in the next eight minutes. In a beautifully conservative video perfectly encapsulating the argument against abortion, Shapiro leaves all viewers with a different view on abortion. As Shapiro puts it, if someone does not want a born child, they cannot just kill it. These are all basic principles, Shapiro says. Murder is wrong. Yet, an unborn child, having the same features a born child has, is killed with no consequences. People do not get to choose another human beings death, and no one should be able to “crush the skull” or “drain the brain (Shapiro)” of a living, human being. So why do it to what will one day be living? Shapiro asks the question of how selfish one must be to only think of them. Shapiro said all this while driving his purpose of his whole argument. His whole rant, his beautiful-articulate rant, draws upon powerful logic and ethos to get his purpose across: abortion is really just a euphemism for killing.

The medium here is obviously a video, and when using this medium there were some key strengths. I was able to hear a political expert give his view on abortion easily. This is the beauty of *YouTube*. Also, because *YouTube* videos are tailored to a wide audience, they are made easier to watch. Shapiro’s video is no different. With strengths there are also drawbacks, though. The drawbacks are the lack of neutrality that will be present in the video. *YouTube* videos on politics generally take a strong stance. There will also be a lack of formality in this video, because since it is tailored to a wide audience, it has to be simplified. The formality goes out the window with this happening, and therefore might not be as credible a source to follow as a scholarly article.

I needed credibility and a new perspective on abortion. With these two things in mind I went looking for a scholarly article. I found one written by Jeanne Marecek, Catriona Macelod, and Lesley Hoggart in *Feminism & Psychology* called “Abortion in Legal, Social, and Healthcare Contexts.” In the scholarly article collaborated by Jeanne Marecek et al, the factors of what makes abortion appropriate versus inappropriate was examined. The five factors mainly looked at are the legal contexts of where the abortion patients are living, social and cultural issues, contexts of abortion, biotechnical advances, and healthcare systems. With these five factors Maracek and the others go into great detail and analyze what each factors consequence is. While doing this, the authors kept a professional, unbiased tone in their text. Yet, it can be concluded in their scholarly dissertation since all three authors are women, they are most likely pro-abortion. And, in fact, when reading it, the authors do sound pro-abortion. In rather small ways, they manage to showcase their viewpoint, such as describing at the beginning how this is going to be a “feminist scholarship” (Marecek, et al 1), through their respectful and unbiased tone.

This medium was a written essay, and the genre was a scholarly article. The effectiveness of using a scholarly article is it will generally be unbiased. As I touched on earlier in my summary and review of Marecek and others scholarly article, while they did show their bias, it was in a non-bias way. In fact, by introducing it at the beginning of their scholarly article, it made it more of a disclaimer: saying how they will try their best to not sound biased. Scholarly articles are also well-researched. Throwing out statistics left and right, Marecek and others have done their work. Now, the pitfalls of using a scholarly article are the difficulty of reading it. This article was turned in to a college professor expecting big words, so these scholars kept their end of the bargain. There are numerous words which made me pause, double check, then finally go on google to figure out what it meant. This is the downfall of using a scholarly article. It is not meant for the mass media, and because of its “high Lexile score,” it makes it hard to read. In fact, it took me so long to read it I probably could have found 10 non-scholarly articles about the same substance in the time it took me to read the scholarly article.

I touched on in the beginning how tweets are a great way to get information out there. I even foreshadowed the information you can find on abortion. Really, when on *Twitter*, there are two main people who will talk about abortion. There are the feminist, liberal people, and the conservative, sexist people. So, when analyzing what was needed I decided to go for another pro-life “extremist.” I chose Devin Sena, who’s *Twitter* account*,* @DevinSenaUI, specializes in this subject. Devin Sena, the disciple of Christ, conservative, and journalist. Like all anti-abortion and pro-life people, Sena is, of course, a disciple of Christ and a conservative. And like Sena, his *Twitter* is out of this world. Through five simple tweets, Sena paints a strong argument against the “life haters.” In his five tweets, Sena manages to elicit great emotion and logic out of his audience. His audience is anyone interested in abortion, and Sena nails his tweets in response to his audience. His tweets such as “In 2016, 1 million miscarriages. 2 million couples hoping to adopt. Yet, 1 million abortions. If you don’t want your child, trust me, someone else does. #Defund PP” (Sena), or “Life begins at conception” (Sena), are two prime examples of this. The first one shows Sena using logic through statistical analysis. While his second one shows a rather emotional claim, speaking about how, unlike what everyone thinks, life starts at conception.

The tweets Sena used are a great way to get the message across. The benefits when using a medium such as social media with a tweet is the message must be clear and concise. In *Twitter*, a tweet is allowed a maximum of 140 characters. This leads to tweets such as the “Life begins at conception” (Sena). In fact, it can be argued all of Sena’s tweets, which took up to three minutes to read, were just as powerful as the 10-minute clip of good old Ben Shapiro DESTROYING the Abortion Argument (this was his title). There are drawbacks, though. Like using *YouTube* or social media, the air of credibility will be doubted along. Also, there is no chance of impartiality. *Twitter* users take a definite stance, clouding their judgement with an observational bias.

Abortion is something happening in both politics and in pop culture. Through *YouTube* videos and tweets, I was able to take the pop culture’s side on the abortion argument. The scholarly article gave me the credibility needed, by looking not only at the pro-choice side, but also looking at sources with valid credibility. There were drawbacks and benefits to using each three mediums. *YouTube* videos again, were easy to watch as they were tailored to a wide audience, and easy to find. The drawbacks included not being as widely regarded a source, and a lack of partial judgement. Then, there was the scholarly articles. Scholarly articles are great because they instill credibility into the abortion argument. The fact these people were not biased helped me understand without any observational bias involved. The drawbacks included how hard it was reading the material. This one made me dislike scholarly articles altogether. Whatever is being said takes about fifteen minutes to read, whereas I could have found another *YouTube* video explaining, with bias although, the same material I read in only five minutes. Then, there were tweets. *Twitter* is a huge social media platform with more than a million daily active users. With that large a population comes differing beliefs. *Twitter* was a great way to stay connected to popular culture, and find valid points that had no fluff involved. Everything in *Twitter* has to be concise because of the 140-character limit. This leads to a “short and sweet”source giving all the information in less than ten to fifteen seconds. Drawbacks though, include again no credibility, and heavily biased arguments.

Understanding all this, I realized tweets were the way to go when research a subject such as abortion. Through tweets, I was able to understand as much as the Ben Shapiro’s *YouTube* video. A masterpiece argument, Shapiro’s video is out-done by the length of it. His video is ten-minutes. I was able to understand much from it. Yet, I was able to understand just as much through five simple tweets which took less than three minutes to read. Tweets also are the most modern way to express oneself. In an age where people are consistently growing more jittery, tweets are there to tell the facts point-blank. No fluff, no cloud of bias, tweets just put it all out there and would tailor to the most diverse of audiences.
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