John Doe

English 102

Essay 2 Rough Draft

December 9, 2013

Healthy and Rich: Is it Possible?

In "We Can Be Healthy and Rich", published in the *New York Times*, Ezekiel Emanuel urges Americans to support the control of health care costs through the Affordable Care Act. He postulates that controlling health care costs will boost the economy as well as provide more money to families and businesses.

The article begins with athe statement, that "just about everyone agrees that health care is too expensive... except for one group: hospitals and the unions representing hospital workers."

(para 1) Emanuel poses that the reason there is opposition to health care control is that some believe, "controlling health care costs will hurt the economy and increase unemployment", and that hospitals are among the largest employers and, unlike other employers, hospitals are adding jobs at a good clip. (Para 2) However, Emanuel remarks, bending the health care cost curve will spur the economy forward and then goes on to quote from the "Council of Economic Advisers" that the reduction of health care costs will raise G.D.P by 2030. He then ends this argument by pointing out that the raise in G.D.P would mean an extra \$600 billion in the economy and an extra \$7,000 for the average family. The article then settles into a predictable pattern, arguments posed by those against the control of health care and then swift rebukes to disprove those remarks while allowing Emanuel to further expound on his views and opinions.

The second debate suggests that competition in insurance exchanges and other changes influenced by the Affordable Care Act would result in lower premiums, therefore causing

Comment [J1]: You do not need to give paragraph numbers or page numbers.

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/74

Comment [J2]: Is this also quoted?

Comment [J3]: Why is this quoted?

Comment [J4]: Transition needed.

Comment [J5]: I'm confused. What is the second debate?

insurance companies to stress hospitals to reduce their rates. The argument continues by pointing out that sixty percent of average hospital costs are labor, and with reduced rates would come lay lay-offs and wage cuts for hospital employees. Emanuel makes the case that hospital support jobs pay ten percent more and often come with more generous benefits than comparable jobs in other industries and that is why health care employees are so-against the reform. He continues by stating, "cost control is not the same as cost reduction." (para 5)-The goal is not to cut spending but to stem the growth of health care spending. In addition, Emanuel notes that any decline in hospital workers due to a restructure of hospital operations would probably mean in increase in other health-related jobs.

Emanuel remarks that opponents of cost control really-went wrong with macroeconomics, which puts their argument that layoffs would increase unemployment and lower wages, and thereby hurting the economy to an abrupt rest. He claims that "both liberal and conservative economists agree that ever rising health care spending is a huge drag on the economy" and continues with a quote from a "Heritage Foundation's fellow", "If Americans could attain the current level of health for a lower total cost...U.S. economic well-being would undoubtedly improve." (para 7) Emanuel sustains his argument by comparing the change in health care to agriculture in the 1920's. By pointing out that the introduction to tractors caused unemployment but also increased productivity and made food cheaper. This allowed families to retain more money that could then be spent on other rewarding items. Emanuel figures that health care will follow a similar path by providing more savings to families that will not just disappear but will instead go into other purchases like education and computers.

The final dispute, which is put down promptly, is over the claim that more money spent on health care means a healthier person. The opponents argue that they would pay more for

Comment [J6]: Transition needed.

Comment [J7]: Why is this quoted?

Comment [J8]: Transition needed.

health care if it meant being healthier. Emanuel asserts that there is no connection between being healthy and the amount of money being spent on health care. Adding to this he reports, "Many other countries...spend less but perform better on many health care measures". (para 10)

Emanuel concludes by re-asserting that there is no connection between being healthy and the amount of money being spent on health care. At the end of the article Emanuel emphasizes, "Health care is about keeping people healthy or fixing them up when they get sick. It is not a jobs program."

I am, in the end, on Emanuel's side regarding his argument to get American's to support the Affordable Care Act. America needs to control health care before costs become too outrageous that only the rich will be able to afford care. However, this article did not guide or bolster my opinion on this matter. At first, the article seems to be very well written and balanced. It provided statistics and quotes to support its claims and acknowledged the opposition's opinions on the matter. But, upon further scrutiny and after analyzing the article based on its rhetorical appeals and tone, this supposed well-well-balanced and thoughtful article crumbles, and flaws start shining through.

Emanuel's distinction as a columnist specializing in health policies and other topics boosts his credibility to readers and gives the notion that the reader can depend on his views on health care policies. His recognition of his opponent's views also spurs the reader to think that Emanuel is not ignoring them, but is instead exploring both sides and presenting his objective insight on the subject. All this makes Emanuel further his credibility through the use of ethos.

Nonetheless, his use of logos decimates his credibility and comprehension of the subject.

His arguments seem believable and realistic but there is no evidence to support any of his claims.

Bandwagon and Straw Man fallacy is being used to convince the readers. Using mass

Comment [J9]: This sentence is not complete. "At first" is a sequential transition that leads to another event, "and then", "afterwards"... etc.

Comment [J10]: Where and how?

agreements, like what is found in the first paragraph one, and not providing any actual quotations can lead the reader to believe that the arguments are just Emanuel's personal opinions and projections and not factual information. This lack of proper evidence and testimonials reduces the overall effectiveness of the article.

Emanuel does not use pathos in his attempt to sway his readers. Instead he uses his tone to influence the readers. Initially his tone when acknowledging his opponents is sympathetic, "it's easy to sympathize with the hospital's worries" (para 3) but it rapidly changes to frustration, "but this line of reasoning is wrong" (para 4), and finally to anger, "where the opponents of cost control really go wrong is on the macroeconomics" (para 6), "but this, too, is wrong".

Emanuel's use of these tone change is in an effort to make the reader follow the same emotional

path as him and then, towards the end of the article, to completely disregard the oppositions arguments. By starting out sympathetic and then slowing gradually transitioning to anger, the reader does not see the anger as much and can be more_easily swayed into following Emanuel's decision.

The tone, however, does have downsides. It is a good tone to take if someone is quickly reading through the article, but if read twice, Emanuel can come across to be angry and emotionally driven in his article. His final statement at the end of the article is meant to give the reader something to chew on, but when coupled with the anger it can further add to the reader's opinion that Emanuel is just angry about health care and does not want to provide the facts in an unbiased fashion.

Ultimately, one wonders if this article is written by someone who is angry for paying , in their opinion, too much for health care, instead of someone trying to make a difference and

Comment [J11]: This can be one sentence.

improve Americans? lives. Emanuel's anger coupled with his inability to provide substantial evidence and support for his cause ended this article with more questions than answers.

Works Cited

< http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/02/we-can-be-healthy-and-rich/ >.

Comment [J12]: MLA no longer requires the use of URLs in MLA citations.

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/74

Dear Joe,

I've enjoyed reading your essay, but there were some parts in your essay that boggled my mind:

- I wasn't sure if I was reading actual quotes from Emanuel or if it was your
 paraphrasing. So try to make sure that it is clear who is speaking in the essay.
- The summary needs to be condensed. Try to use the main points from his article. And try to keep quotes minimal you are summarizing it after all. What I've done for the summary portion of my essay is:
 - o Read and reread the article.
 - Write one sentence per paragraph from his article. Each sentence should summarize the main point of the paragraph. Sometimes writers split up their main points into several paragraphs, so try to take note of that.
 - o Then throw all the sentences together. All the sentences should be sequential.
- Why are the names of organizations in quotes?

- When reading your essay, it seemed like I was jumping from topic to topic. The use
 of transitions will make the essay flow nicely and make it easy for the reader to read.
- And lastly, I was hoping that I can see more explanations of the fallacies that were used in the article. Using, "Bandwagon and Straw Man fallacy is being used to convince the readers" is not enough. Remember, you are trying to convince readers that Emanuel is not a very effective writer.

Well, that's all! I hope this helps you out. ☺

Sincerely,

Jane