

Addicted to heath essay

[Psychology](#), [Success](#)



Robert Bork's argumentative article, "Addicted to Health," focuses on the issue of smoking restrictions enforced across the United States. Bork's purpose is to persuade readers that smoking restrictions are simply one more way in which the government is trying to control the people of America. While his arguments are interesting and, at times, convincing, his writing style is rather too one-sided and aggressive to be successful.

Robert Bork is a conservative legal scholar currently at the American Enterprise Institute for Policy Research. Therefore, he speaks with some credibility on his subject. However, his appointment to the Supreme Court was rejected by the Congress, and this appears to have swayed his overall attitude towards the American government. Therefore, although he appears to be a man of knowledge, it is fair to say that his views are untrustworthy. His subjective approach to the topic of smoking restrictions highlights this untrustworthiness. Bork refers to opponents but he does not allow much time or respect to them. Furthermore, there is a distinct lack of evidence to support the other side of his argument and, for that matter, his own. Bork's tone is perhaps the most worrying aspect of his article. While he uses language which is accessible to most people, he occasionally wavers into the politically incorrect, an example being his use of the phrase, 'Indian guide,' presumably referring to Native Americans.

The target audience for "Addicted to Health" seems to be the general public. Bork's language and points of reference are generally accessible to most literate individuals. His style is conversational, though not necessarily pleasant or comfortable. Reading "Addicted to Health" felt like being ranted at by a narrow minded, angry individual with too much power. Bork uses

sarcasm, aggression, and a variety of other styles, to appeal to his audience. His use of pathos is strong and successful in rousing emotion in a reader. Interestingly, however, the emotions roused in some readers are the opposite of the ones which he intended. His aggression and sarcasm serve to portray the author as being these by nature; arguably, neither are attractive qualities in anyone.

Bork's use of logos is praise-worthy. The sequence of ideas is clear and logical, and make the article easy to read and to follow. He starts by making clear his position on smoking restrictions, then goes on to compare other behaviors that could be seen as dangerous (for example, driving and drinking, separately), then moves on to the views of other people before reaching his conclusion.

While Bork has succeeded in writing an entertaining and thought provoking article, it seems to me that he has achieved this for reasons other than those he set out with. Rather than convincing the reader that smoking restrictions are the government's way of controlling people unfairly, he instead provokes feelings of irritation in the reader that a person can be ranting about a subject without having given it due consideration. Furthermore, the gross imbalance of his arguments are unacceptable for a man in his position. While I enjoyed reading the article, it was more so that I could disagree with Bork rather than be talked around to his point of view. Ironically, if the same subject was discussed in a more level and sensible manner, it is entirely possible that I may have been convinced by it.

References

Bork, R. Addicted to Heath.