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Obamacare Perspective Analysis

On October 1,2013 Americans that were previously uninsured had the first opportunity to purchase insurance that would be available to them on January 1,2014. The reason behind this is the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as Obamacare. Originally passed in March of 2010, the Affordable Care Act has been the victim of massive criticism during the past three years. Recently the United States government was shut down due to Republicans not agreeing with the Affordable Care Act, and the fear of adding to the debt ceiling. The Republicans view of the Affordable Care Act is very doubtful and critical, since it will supposedly raise the debt ceiling a good three trillion dollars. For this paper, I will analyze two cartoons that address each party. In order to focus this analysis I will be using the Rhetorical Situation critical lens.

The critical lens I will be using to look at these cartoons will be the Grant-Davie Rhetorical Situation. With that said, I will be looking at the audience, rhetor, exigence, and constraints, as well as the overall discourse. This lens will open up a way to get deeper into an analysis of the evidence. To give an idea of what I will be looking for, I will explain these four different constituents of the Rhetorical Situation defined in Grant-Davie(104). Rhetor is defined as "Those people, real or imagined, responsible for the discourse and its authorial voice"( 108). Audience is defined as "Those people, real or imagined, with whom rhetors negotiate through discourse to achieve the rhetorical objectives"(109). Exigence is defined as "The matter and motivation of the discourse"(106). Constraints is defined as "Factors in the situation's context that may affect the achievement of the rhtetorical objectives"(105). With the terms that will be used now explained, I will proceed to the cartoons and summarize their content.

During my research on perspectives of Obamacare, I came across a supporter for the reform form of a cartoon. I came to this cartoon with a Google search with the words "Pro Obamacare Cartoons". This cartoon was at the top of my search. This cartoon is a six sequence cartoon, with a man and a woman speaking to each other. The man is against Obamacare, while the woman is not necessarily for, but is speaking positively for it. The man starts by showing his dislike of the Obamacare reform, while the woman starts to ask questions to figure out why he disagrees with Obamacare. She starts stating all the good Obamacare will do, such as ensuring children aren't denied care due to a pre-existing condition. The man agrees with all of her questions. The man then in the last slide, states "It's the other part I can't stand." The woman replies "Which one?" The man states "The Obama part." It is then followed by an angry look from the woman, almost a defensive tone to her look.

What is the main argument of this text? To find out we need to have a look at when the author of this cartoon made this. I found that the author made this just before the signing of the Obamacare in 2010. This allows me to think that this cartoon would've been used to delegate ,from maybe a pro Obamacare perspective, how the Obamacare gets criticized on a day to day basis. The people that are for Obamacare might all agree this cartoon is accurate and true.

What are the problems with this? Well a huge problem, is that we are only limited to bubbles used to communicate in the cartoon. This is most likely not a proper representation of a typical Obamacare debate. There is most likely a lot missing from what goes out through the mouths of the typical American trying to figure out what is best for the country. We are also limited to the positive perspective of Obamacare and not the cons it brings along with it.

I also have found another cartoon representing an anti Obamacare perspective. This cartoon has two figures, an elephant representing a doctor. And a Frankenstein representing a dead patient. They are in a hospital room, with the Frankenstein laying down in a bed, and the elephant looking over him grabbing his hand. The Frankenstein has a blanket or cover that says "Status Quo" and the doctor has a clipboard stating "Health Care Reform". The doctor in a bubbled speech, says "I'm sorry...we did everything we could to save you..."

This cartoon is very aggressive, stating in a picture "The health care reform is trying to save something that is already dead". It might be a bit of a confusing cartoon, but it's quite simple once you figure it out. At first look, we see the Frankenstein in the hospital room. We all know that Frankenstein is dead, so we can conclude the patient is dead. The doctor is next to the Frankenstein with a clipboard, giving a clue of evaluation of the Frankenstein. On a doctors clipboard, typically the doctor keeps notes per patient. The notes written down are "Health Care Reform", leading us to conclude that he is evaluating the Frankenstein who is suffering from "Health Care Reform." This so called disease in the cartoon is untreatable, so it leads us to assume that the Frankenstein was hopeless in the first place.

The author most likely made this cartoon for people to view it that are affected by Obamacare, or to just spread an opinion on Obamacare. Also we are clouded from the reasoning of why this picture was where it was. It was found on a Swedish website, so I couldn't understand anything. This limits us to understanding why it was there in the first place. We are limited to only the picture, and that is it. Why would this picture be on a Swedish website when the Obamacare only has effect to those in America? It can also be appropriate to ponder why the author of the cartoon made the setting a hospital, and not a court room or a like minded place for politics. This could also affect people with relatives or friends in hospitals, and these people could be an unintentional but still an active audience. There is still more to the audience, such as those who read this for rhetorical papers, as well as those who will read this in the future to look back at how the course of the world took place.

What does this limit us to? First of all, we are immediately locked in a medical diagnosis to a dead healthcare. It keeps us in only one position with no chance of hope or life again. Well, we are limited to an idea of Obamacare being dead, and not giving any citizens hope. And to think abstractly, this could be looked at as one doctors diagnosis. Doctors tend to have incorrect diagnosis, and since we have no knowledge of how the Obamacare will play out until it actually does, this could be an incorrect diagnosis.

Out of the many discourse communities present in the debate of Obamacare, there is two present within these cartoons. One supporting Obamacare, and one opposing Obamacare. There can be a lot of debate over which political standing supporters and opponents take based off how they view Obamacare. I cannot conclude that people that agree or disagree with either of the cartoons belong to a political party since there isn't any evidence supporting this claim. But I can conclude that there is evidence to differentiate between two different communities within the debate of Obamacare.

In Conclusion, I have presented two texts with the reference of Obamacare. These texts both present different evidence that is part of the entire debate of the health care of the United States. The texts are aimed at the current debate in today's health care world, Obamacare. The two texts provide evidence to ideas that are used today in the debate of the Obamacare as a whole. The cartoons provide evidence to both the pros and the cons of Obamacare. But do the pros outweigh the cons? Or are the cons too little to worry about? These questions will hopefully be answered in time.
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