

Opinion vs. research based resources: obamacare

[Sociology](#)



Since Obamacare was signed into law, in March of 2010, the concern about the changes it will bring began and have not concluded. (Faria, 2012) In the first article, Wilensky focused on the 3 major issues with America's healthcare, the number of uninsured, the rising costs, and the percentage of the low quality of health services being received., Obamacare really only addresses the first of those problems. The high costs and lack of quality health services are being "lip-serviced," but not dealt with. Using logic and mathematics, the author, determines that Obamacare will be, both, socially and economically incapable of meeting the needed healthcare services of the country, by the year 2030; Obamacare is, simply, not sustainable. (2012) While Wilensky offered logic and hard math, Begley's article, said that Obamacare issues are not being resolved because no one is approaching it logically or reasonably. Many people are afraid of Obamacare and, the author explains that many of those fears could be the result of misinformation. "Attack! The Truth About Obamacare" focuses less on the health services that will be lost or denied, but on losses that may not exist. Experts claim that Obamacare will inevitably treat different people completely differently at entirely different times, essentially negating the quality of health services that citizens will receive, but, also, the consistency of that care may suffer. (Oberlander, 2012) Many people fear that Obamacare will lead to a government takeover of the healthcare industry as a whole, allowing government-appointed officials to determine treatments you will qualify for or will be allowed to have. Begley claims that this is an exaggeration and distracts from the positive elements of the healthcare act. (2009)

Having read and compared both articles, I conclude, that, both, would be
<https://assignbuster.com/opinion-vs-research-based-resources-obamacare/>

acceptable as credible articles. However, Wilensky's article offers an unbiased perspective, using facts to make his point. Begley's views are much more biased; the article reads as much more defensive of the healthcare act and can be perceived as an argument in favor of Obamacare. Ultimately, I would probably rely more heavily upon the Wilensky article as a primary source and the Begley article as a secondary option. Both are worth including in any discussion on this topic because they are both well written and offer relevant points. I feel that in this case, however, Wilensky's approach would serve better. Whenever I begin any search for sources for a specific topic the first thing I look for is that it is scholarly in nature, from a reputable publication. I do this for the obvious reasons, the credibility and usefulness. I, also, do a lot of research online. The internet is a place "land-mined" with unreliable and misleading information. For this reason, the most important thing I look for when scanning for possible sources are the sites marked ". gov" or ". org." These sites tend to be more reliable than other locations on the internet.

In the end, the issues circulating around Obamacare are not likely to resolve themselves anytime soon. Many researchers feel that all of the controversies Obamacare has created may permanently taint the U. S. citizen's impressions of any form of " universalized" healthcare. (Gottschalk, 2011) There is a level of trust and faith that this country has lost in its government and its leadership. It is necessary to have clear and structured reforms that will impact healthcare in a positive way, encouraging equality and efficiency of healthcare services. (Wilensky, 2012)