

Literature– Unit 7 Lesson 7

Do Now

Directions: Read the article taken DoctorsonHealthcare and respond to the questions that follow:

Healthcare for All by Patrick Whelan, M.D, Ph.D

How can there be a debate over whether universal health care is itself a desirable goal? A 2002 Institutes of Medicine study concluded that more than 18,000 Americans die every year because they're uninsured. This means that some kind of health coverage for every citizen would mean fewer child deaths from asthma, fewer cancer deaths in minority communities and fewer veterans who depend on emergency rooms for their primary care.

The real questions are how universal care would be paid for. The first myth concerns what universal health care is: a broad term that could mean anything from government paying for healthcare to raising taxes so that everyone can enter a form of the private health-insurance system, as Mitt Romney did in the state of Massachusetts.

Health insurance companies spend a lot of money to spread a term called “socialized medicine,” recognizing that if we pass a universal healthcare law, they would likely lose an enormous amount of money. But no major organizations or national political figures have advocated creating a system like Great Britain’s, where the government owns all the facilities and employs all the doctors and nurses.

Two other myths about universal care are that doctors oppose it and that the quality of healthcare would suffer. A large number of doctors support national health insurance. There is now strong evidence that, even in developed countries with addiction problems like ours, universal coverage is associated with improved quality of health for all classes of people—from the poor to the wealthy.

1. The author believes that American Universal Healthcare will be
 - a. Similar to Great Britain’s
 - b. Supported by Health Insurance company
 - c. Only beneficial to the poor
 - d. Affordable if done correctly

2. With which one of the following statements would the author MOST likely agree
 - a. Health insurance companies only care about helping people
 - b. Health insurance companies make up terms to protect people’s health
 - c. Health insurance companies believe Universal Healthcare will harm their business
 - d. Health insurance companies in America are better than those in Great Britain

Name: _____

7th Grade Literature

February 13, 2013

SWBAT compare authors arguments by analyzing how authors interpret or omit related evidence to support opposing claims

REVIEW: KEY QUESTIONS & KEY TERMS

Analysis: _____

Model

Healthcare for All by Patrick Whelan, M.D, Ph.D

How can there be a debate over whether universal health care is itself a desirable goal? A 2002 Institutes of Medicine study concluded that more than 18,000 Americans die every year because they're uninsured. Some kind of health coverage for every citizen would mean fewer child deaths from asthma, fewer cancer deaths in minority communities and fewer veterans who depend on emergency rooms for their primary care.

The real questions are how universal care would be paid for. The first myth concerns what universal health care is: a broad term that could mean anything from government paying for healthcare to raising taxes so that everyone can enter a form of the private health-insurance system, as Mitt Romney did in the state of Massachusetts.

Health insurance companies spend a lot of money to spread a term called "socialized medicine," recognizing that if we pass a universal healthcare law, they would likely lose an enormous amount of money. But no major organizations or national political figures have advocated creating a system like Great Britain's, where the government owns all the facilities and employs all the doctors and nurses.

Two other myths about universal care are that doctors oppose it and that the quality of healthcare would suffer. A large number of doctors support national health insurance. There is now strong evidence that, even in developed countries with addiction problems like ours, universal coverage is associated with improved quality of health for all classes of people—from the poor to the wealthy.

America Should Reject Universal Healthcare

By John S. O'Shea,

America is often criticized for its lack of a universal health-care system [equal] to the Europeans and Canadians, even though Germany, the United Kingdom and even Canada are increasingly turning to the private doctors in order to relieve the financial burden on government and solve serious problems about the quality of healthcare, most notably the extremely long wait times for many services, including cancer treatment and cardiac surgery.

Compared to the private sector, government programs are inefficient, and the higher costs have to be paid for with higher taxes or spending cuts in other areas such as defense, education, or even medical research and development. This is a tradeoff that most Americans would not be willing to make.

What mistake did Ms. _____ make?

What questions did she ask herself?

Practice**The Pro-Bullying Lobby: Conservative Leader Explains Why He Is Mobilizing Against Anti-Bullying Measures**

By Lee Fang on Mar 15, 2011 at 3:45 pm

Last October, ThinkProgress' Tanya Somanader pointed out that despite a growing number of LGBT suicides, [conservatives](#) are claiming "that anti-bullying measures are nothing more than insidious tools of the 'homosexual agenda.'" Several anti-gay Republican candidates in the election last year even made opposition to anti-bullying measures key components of their campaign.

But the fight against anti-bullying laws simply exposes the true power of the organized anti-gay lobby in America. At the Tea Party Policy Summit in Arizona last month, we spoke to American Principles Project executive director [Andy Blom](#). Blom, a veteran organizer for conservative causes, has mobilized Tea Party activists to rally against gay marriage. Recently, he has taken up the charge of stopping bullying laws on both the state and national level. According to Blom, children are rarely bullied on gender issues, and anti-bullying laws are really a sly way to force teaching homosexuality in schools"

Blom stated, "The core of the anti-bullying agenda is all gender-based and this is a really serious mistake for a lot of reasons. Bullying is not good, okay. The reasons people are bullied are size, clothing, economic circumstance, race, it's like anything having to do with gender falls down on number five or number six. But all the curriculum on bullying is about homosexuality [...] All of it is being used as an opportunity to force homosexual teaching into the schools...it's frightening what people want to teach under the name of bullying. And because being in favor of bullying is like hating apple pie, it's being very effective at [sneaking this agenda] into curriculum. In truth, the whole homosexual agenda gets filtered into the schools through anti-bullying.

Michigan anti-bullying law protects religious bullies

Nov 07, 2011 12:58 AM EST

By [Brad Hirschfield](#)

After long debates and tortuous negotiations, the state of Michigan passed anti-bullying legislation, which on the face of it, should be a good thing. Unfortunately, Michigan has managed to pass a law which may actually provide legal coverage to the worst of the bullies.

The law, Matt's Safe School Law, was named in memory of Matt Epling, who committed suicide in the wake of relentless anti-gay bullying. This offers a loophole to those who want to bully gay students or anyone else they don't like. All they need to do, according to the newly passed legislation, is claim that their bullying was based on "a sincerely held religious belief or moral conviction."

Although not mentioned specifically, those who bully gay people may avoid prosecution¹ under the new law by quoting Leviticus 20:13, a passage that condemns homosexuality. Alternatively, one who bullies Jews might escape accountability under "Matt's Law" by simply invoking the words of another Matthew -- the Gospel author.

Of course, one might argue that the passage of any legislation which addresses the growing problem of bullying in American schools is a victory, if only partial, and therefore worthy of celebration. They would be wrong.

In fact, the passage of this legislation may well set back the cause of protecting kids from their tormentors by moving the focus of attention from the damage bullies do. Now is the time to insist that the serious problems which it may create for the victims it aims to protect be addressed. Ignoring these challenges may put the blood of the next generation of victims on those who fail to do so. How ironic. How tragic.

¹ Being taken to court for the crime

Name: _____

7th Grade Literature

February 13, 2013

SWBAT compare authors arguments by analyzing how authors interpret or omit related evidence to support opposing claims

Both authors use related evidence to support their claims about Anti-Bullying Legislation. Andy Blom includes this evidence to support his claim that Michigan’s Anti-Bullying Legislation was justified by

.By contrast, Bill Hirshfield believes this legislation supports his claim by explaining that

_____. [Concluding Sentence]

Reading

Pro Gun Rights Turn Fear into Confidence by Gerald Valentino

When the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Second Amendment does confirm an individual right to bear arms, the anti-gun lobby immediately pointed out that it doesn't mean gun rights are absolute, and they are right. To determine how rights are regulated, however, requires some type of credible threat to public safety, or requires proof that exercising a right in a particular manner damages society as a whole.

A fact not in dispute is that over the last thirty years, while gun ownership goes up and more people are carrying guns than ever before, gun crime and gun accidents continue to drop.

In Ohio, since the concealed carry law was enacted, the crime rate has never risen. And after the Washington D. C. gun ban was overturned the murder rate dropped to a forty-year low. Such a series of events forces us to ask what threat to public safety justifies strict regulation of gun rights.

Everyone knows that falsely shouting "fire" in a theater is not an acceptable way to exercise First Amendment rights, and that a reporter will be charged for lying about a case. Both cases are clear examples of how fundamental rights should have some minor regulation. Now that the Supreme Court ruled the Second Amendment is an individual right, Buckeye Firearms Attorney Ken Hanson points out that our new battle is over what the courts will consider acceptable limits on that right.

The good news is we have mountains of evidence to prove that a gun in the hand, or holster, of a law-abiding citizen isn't a threat to public safety. There are two key points we can rely on in the court of public opinion. First, we know that cities with strict gun control laws have sky-high murder rates. Both Chicago and Washington D.C. fall into that category. Second, we know that in places where guns are legal there isn't an increase in gun crime and gun accident rates

Only by letting emotion cloud logic and by exploiting tragedy can the anti-gun agenda stay relevant in America today. But the enemies of liberty are more than willing to use emotion and exploitation as the key points in their strategy to destroy the right to bear arms. By sticking to honesty and a fact-based debate, we not only raise the level of discourse in America, but we bring to the table the added benefit of being right. Our dirty little secret however, is that even if the anti-gun leadership is successful in making the debate about fear and emotion, we still win.

Name: _____

7th Grade Literature

February 13, 2013

SWBAT compare authors arguments by analyzing how authors interpret or omit related evidence to support opposing claims

When Will America Wake Up to Gun Violence?

Last night's shooting rampage at a movie theater in Aurora, Colorado, was a nightmare. Twelve people have been killed, with many more injured. According to law enforcement officials, the weapons were purchased legally by the suspect in the last six months.

Even when legislation passed during the Clinton years in the form of the Brady bill, requiring background checks at the time of gun purchases, or the assault weapons ban, the NRA succeeded in injecting gaping loopholes into the laws. Who needs to go through a background check at Walmart when you can get your gun without one at the local gun show or from some shady figure on a street corner? The NRA then asks how "gun control" doesn't work. But it can.

Consider what happened in Australia after a crazed gunman killed 35 people in Port Arthur, Tasmania, in 1996. The Australian federal government persuaded all states and territories to implement tough new gun control laws. Under the National Firearms Agreement (NFA), firearms legislation was tightened throughout the country. National registration of guns was imposed and it became illegal to hold certain long guns that might be used in mass shootings. The gun ban was backed up by a mandatory buy-back program that substantially reduced gun possession in Australia. The effect was that both gun suicides and homicides (as well as total suicides and homicides) fell. Importantly, while there were 13 mass shootings in Australia during the period of 1979--96, there have been none in the sixteen years since. In 1996, then-Prime Minister John Howard stated that the "whole scheme is designed to reduce the number of guns in the community and make Australia a safer place to live."

Of course, the Australian gun control law in 1997 enjoyed an extremely high level of public support and was not hampered by any domestic gun industry (since Australia did not have any). Such would not be the case in the United States where pro-gun political views and NRA power create a very different climate constantly claiming that our second Amendment rights allow us to carry guns. In the wake of another tragic massacre of innocent lives, we should look carefully at the Australian experience to see if the American public will ever rise up as one against gun violence.

Name: _____

7th Grade Literature

February 13, 2013

SWBAT compare authors arguments by analyzing how authors interpret or omit related evidence to support opposing claims

Exit Ticket

Compare how the author's in the articles above use evidence to support their claims. Include

- **Two pieces of evidence the authors use to support their claim**
- **An explanation of how they use the evidence to support their claim**

Both authors use related evidence to support the opposing claims about gun control. The both include evidence about _____ and _____

The author of the article one uses _____ to prove that we should not have stricter laws about guns, while the author of article uses this evidence to prove that we should have stricter gun laws. The author of article one does this by _____

By contrast, the author of article two does this by _____

Additionally, both authors use _____ to prove opposing claims. The author of article one does this by _____

By contrast, the author of article two does this by _____

Below (0)	Emerging (2-3)	Approaching (4-6)	Meets (7-8)
Does not include 2 types of evidence	-2 pieces of evidence, no clear explanation	2 pieces of evidence, partial explanation of different analysis/inclusion	2 pieces of evidence, includes full explanation of different analysis/inclusion

Name: _____

7th Grade Literature

February 13, 2013

SWBAT compare authors arguments by analyzing how authors interpret or omit related evidence to support opposing claims