

Analysis Report on Political Discourse Communities

Irma Salazar

UNT Dallas

## Running Head: Analysis Report- Discourse Communities

The purpose of this paper is to report on current discourse surrounding contemporaneous social issues and analyze the word choice and language different sides may use to explain their position to others. I will weigh three different social issues--access to healthcare, paying taxes, and gun ownership--and examine popular conservative and liberal language used to rationalize the best way to approach issues that affect us all. Though not meant to be an exhaustive report on language used by either side, and fully acknowledging that there may be dissenting opinions on both sides that don't abide with the majority in their respective group, this paper aims to assess the social value of each language and I will provide reasoning for choosing a side.

Healthcare is a national issue that is being debated ever more intensely. To establish a common definition, this paper will consider healthcare as medical care to which individuals and communities have access to. Conservative people view healthcare as an 'earned privilege'. They believe that healthcare should be provided for people who have worked for that 'benefit'--something that you must earn. In other words, conservatives prefer to use the term 'earned privilege' to indicate that one needs to work to be able to afford and have the advantage of medical care. However, liberals differ from the conservatives' beliefs. Liberals view healthcare as a 'human right', or 'unalienable right', which cannot be taken away or refused. They believe that everyone should be able to have access to appropriate medical care. The word human invokes a sense of universality, meaning it doesn't just apply to a certain group of people, and 'right'--which alludes to the declaration of independence--is something that cannot be taken away. Personally, I prefer the term 'human rights' because I believe that no one should have to worry about not having sufficient money to pay their medical bills, and be able to attain the required care. The key element here is access. You cannot control every illness or injury you can

## Running Head: Analysis Report- Discourse Communities

possibly suffer from, and stratospherically high procedure charges make the number of people that cannot pay for healthcare even greater.

Taxation is a system that pays for people's goods and services that everyone in society benefits from, such as fixing and maintaining roads, building libraries, schools, and parks by taking a small percentage from wages, salaries, sales transactions, land, and other assets. There are people who believe the system works well, there are those who debate over which taxes are necessary or not, and others reject the system altogether. In short, some people want to 'keep their money', as described by them, and deem taxes as unnecessary at best, and treacherous theft at worst. Conservatives believe that each cent of money earned through individual work should be kept for oneself, and see no value or return on investing a percentage of their money to society. (reason for conservative word choice). The language calling it "my" money gives possession to oneself, and paints he who dares take even a portion of it a "freeloader" who unjustifiably takes what is not theirs. The purpose of the money being "taken away", whether it is for schools or roads, is irrelevant.

On the other hand, liberals share another viewpoint; they strongly believe that people need to 'pay their fair share' into goods and services that all of us benefit from. In their view, a civilized society should interact in a way that would allow everyone to share goods and services, and allow even the most unfortunate to access key (now public) services. In the view of the left, in order for this system to be most fair, each individual needs to pay accordingly to their income. (reason for liberal word choice). The word choice of "fair share" allows a liberal person to construct taxes not only as fair and just, but implies that since we are all contributing our share, even those who are reluctant should contribute as well, since taxes are something we all benefit from in civilized, modern society. As for myself, I prefer the term 'paying their fair share'

because just as the working class pays taxes to the government to help the community and the environment they live in, so should chief executive officers, for example, who own corporations that have more resources to support, for in the end, it is the labor and sales from others that have allowed for and streamlined their success.

There are two viewpoints when talking about owning a firearm. Some people strongly believe in the 2nd amendment, the right to bear arms, which allows an individual to own a weapon, which in modern times most often means a firearm. A person in this group may be considered a conservative person. They strongly believe that anyone and everyone has the right to possess a firearm to defend themselves from a threat, including a tyrannical government. The act of possessing a firearm is viewed by them as a “right” for them, alluding to the second amendment to the highest law in the land. By posing their position as “the” law, they leave little room for debate in their minds over whether someone should own a firearm: the answer 99.99% of the time, is yes. However, there have been tragic incidents of mass shooting events in the recent past that have brought into question, given the exponential growth of killing efficiency in modern weaponry, whether we really ought to let anyone and everyone own a firearm, in the name of public safety. There are people who believe that not everyone should be allowed to own a weapon, and that instead, sellers should run background checks for buyers before purchases may happen. Certain background checks run by the seller may include filtering for criminal convictions, history of mental illness, etc. The view that we ought to regulate gun ownership is considered liberal. They use the language of “sensible gun control” intentionally; the idea of controlling something implies that gun violence is out of control right now, and is something that affects public safety, while the use of the word “sensible” implies prudence and caution--it is this caution that would justify changing a law that gives everyone the right to possess arms.

Personally, the term ‘enacting on sensible gun control’ seems more appealing because if it is necessary to run background checks in exchange for public safety, then that wording makes more sense.

The language used to explain one’s position matters a lot. It may point to ethical and logical involuntary decisions we make on what is more valuable and may be used as a device to make these difficult choices that affect individuals and communities alike. This is connected to access to healthcare, paying taxes, and gun ownership, but it also connected to various social and political issues.