

Trouble relating to women

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Trouble Relating to Women Presidential general election: Obama vs. Romney ad is ed by Sarah Minto as a civil campaign tool to enable the American understanding of the presidential contenders' policy on the nature of remuneration for American workers and reproductive health. The ad is targeting all the American voters who are employed and experiencing payment discrimination as a basis for understanding of different opinions through which the payment gap can be bridged. Specifically, the ad can be said to be targeting women as the issues of payment discrimination and reproductive health affects most women in comparison to men.

The Lilly Ledbetter fair pay act is the core subject of analysis in the ad and the position of the presidential candidate (Mitt Romney) on the subject being the topic. According to the Act, the employers would be allowed to deny coverage for birth control for women thus posing an implication on the women's reproductive health (Cimpl-Wiemer, 2008). The ad appeals to the target by enabling them understand the position of the candidates with respect to the sensitive issue of fair pay and reproductive health of the women.

At the time of the development of the ad, a presidential election campaign was in progress in the United States; thus, the issues affecting the American citizens were common discussion points. The Lilly Ledbetter fair pay act was one of the critical issues affecting the Americans, as they wanted an understanding of the position of the future government on wedges and reproductive health of women. The ad seizes the fact that Mitt Romney does not take a position on the debate thus questioning his understanding on the implication of the matter. This could significantly influence the support of the

candidate (Mitt Romney) as the Lilly Ledbetter fair pay act had a lot of impact for women.

Reference

Cimpl-Wiemer, A. (2008). Ledbetter v. Goodyear: Letting the Air out of the Continuing Violations Doctrine? *Marquette Law Review*, 92, 355-383.