Revue de Traduction et Langues Volume 19 Numéro 01/2020, pp. 31-41
Journal of Translation and Languages **مجلة الترجمة واللغات**
ISSN (Print): 1112-3974 **EISSN (Online): 2600-6235**

Political Debate Over the Reform of the American Health Care System: The Case of "Obamacare"

Mahboub Oussama
University of Sousse - Tunisia
oussama_mah@yahoo.fr
0000- 0001-7437-2761

To cite this paper:
Mahboub, O. (2020). Political Debate Over the Reform of the American Health Care System: The Case of "Obamacare". *Revue Traduction et Langues 19(2),* 31-41.

Received: 19/04/ 2020**; Accepted:** 07/07/2020, **Published:** 31/08/2020

Abstract: *The reform of the American health care system and its magnitude has always been a contested issue between the Democrats and Republicans. In this respect, the political struggle over health care repair has intensified during the enactment and implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) adopted by President Barack Obama. In an attempt to analyze the polarization concerned with this system's reform, particularly the ACA as a case study, this paper employs the metaphor theory introduced by the American cognitive linguist George Lakoff. This theory utilizes the metaphor of "nation as family" to refer to the two major ideologies composing the American political spectrum, namely liberalism and conservatism. Through employing a Lakoffian model of family-based morality, this paper seeks to provide a careful examination of the liberals' tolerant and empathetic standpoint towards public health care expansion on the one hand, and the conservatives' commitment to anti-ACA welfare provisions on the other hand. Accordingly, it attempts to explore areas of debate including universalizability of health care access, the interference with the market, and the issue of abortion and contraception. My paper draws the conclusion that the Democrats' unlimited approval of the ACA and Republicans' vehement resistance to it stem from principled moral choice rather than mere partisanship.*
Keywords: *American Health Care System, Conservatism, Ideology, Liberalism, Morality, Politics.*
Résumé : *Dans cet article, afin d'analyser l'attitude politique et le discours concernant la réforme du système de santé Américain, à titre d'exemple, l'ACA, Le Patient Protection And Affordable Care Act (loi sur la protection des patients et des soins abordables), nous avons utilisé la théorie de la métaphore introduite par le linguiste cognitif Américain George Lakoff. Cette théorie emploie la métaphore de «la nation en tant que famille » pour faire référence aux deux idéologies majeures composant le spectre politique Américain, à savoir le libéralisme et le conservatisme. Suivant le modèle Lakoffien sur la moralité familiale, cet article cherche à fournir une analyse approfondie sur le point de vue tolérant et empathique des libéraux à l'égard de l'expansion des soins de santé publics, d'une part, et sur l'engagement des conservateurs à l'égard des dispositions anti-ACA d'une autre part. Par conséquent, il tente d'explorer des domaines de débat, notamment l'universalisation de l'accès aux soins de santé, l'interférence avec le marché et la question de l'avortement et de la contraception. Pour finir, nous avons constaté que l'approbation illimitée des Démocrates de l'ACA et la résistance véhémente des Républicains à son égard découlent d'un choix moral fondé sur des principes plutôt que d'une simple partisanerie.*
Mots clés : *Conservatisme , Idéologie , Libéralisme , Moralité , Politique , Système de Santé Américain.*

Corresponding author : Mahboub Oussama

1. Introduction

Attempts of health care reform, like most of other welfare programs, have a habit of generating vehement debates over their necessity, feasibility, and magnitude. In this context, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) passed in March, 2010, and nicknamed "Obamacare," is no exception. The ACA reform as a case study cannot be undertaken in isolation from the historical debate over other welfare plans. In this context, it was apparent that the ideological polarization marked the enactment and application of the law. This issue helped raise a major question concerned with the endeavor that justifies the conservative attempt of halting Obamacare implementation and thwarting its provisions. Accordingly, this paper starts from the premise that while liberals prove to be compatible with their moral persuasion of nurturant parent which promotes mutual collaboration and social contribution, there is a considerable correlation between the conservatives' strong objection to Obamacare and their ideological persuasion of the strict father morality which emphasizes the self-reliant, individual, and responsible American character. In an attempt to link theory with empirical substance, this paper is composed of two major parts. The first will allocate a theoretical framework for the liberal-conservative moral disparity that characterizes their perception of the world, and their long-lasting dispute over welfare programs. The second part gives empirical evidence of areas of health care debate which consolidates the idea that liberals and conservatives belong to two different metaphorical frameworks of ideal family.

2. Family-Based Morality: A Theoretical Framework

The system of concepts characterizing liberals and conservatives' thought is better explained by the metaphor of the nation as family presented by the American cognitive linguist George Lakoff (2016). This theory entails the concept that "the government is a parent" (Lakoff, 2016: 179). Accordingly, there are two major kinds of parents that moderate families: a nurturant parent expressing love, empathy, and tolerance; and a strict father showing tough love, self-reliance, and individualism.

Lakoff associates nurturant parent morality with the liberal political ideology. According to the metaphor theory, the liberal attitude concentrates on values of cooperation, empathy, and care for others. In such an environment moderated by nurturant parent, liberals assert that "children develop best through their positive relationships to others, through their contribution to their community, and through the ways in which they realize their potential and find joy in life" (Lakoff, 2016: 108).

One of the major metaphors that the theory includes is "morality as social nurturance." In accordance with it, the maintaining of social bonds is necessary for guaranteeing that community members help and assist their fellow citizens. Liberals consider the preservation of these social ties as a moral responsibility (Lakoff, 1995: 199). Through their support of social and welfare plans, liberals think of the vulnerable and disadvantaged segments of society as victims to external coercive forces and hold no responsibility for their own situation. These hard circumstances deprive those vulnerable of equal opportunity to participate in a fair competition with their counterparts to seek their advantages. Consequently, liberals have an inclination to perceive the promotion of fairness as a chief government's duty (Lakoff 2016: 180).

In line with this endeavor, liberals' attitude promotes the notion of "morality as fairness." In virtue of this perception, persons who have no or inadequate amount of happiness are unlikely to show empathy or help others. Therefore, to guarantee establishing an empathetic, helpful, and nurturant community member, there should be some consideration of helping him enjoy a certain amount of self-interest, pleasure and satisfaction (Lakoff, 1995: 200). Therefore, liberals tend to think and talk about the world as an environment that needs attempts of change and reform to make it an appropriate place for people, their households, and generations to come (Lakoff, 2004: 12).

Furthermore, among the implications for "morality as nurturance" is the requirement that you do for other people as you would like them to do for you (Lakoff, 1995: 199). Also, "morality as empathy" includes sharing other people's sufferings, interests, and prospects (Lakoff, 1995:198). In virtue of the nurturant parent model, children are in a desperate need for protection from outer evils. Such care is derived from the parent's duty to protect his weak, innocent, and vulnerable children. The main goal is to help children meet their needs and realize pleasure in life. As a result, the sense of mutual cooperation and contribution is likely to make those advantaged people become nurturants themselves in the future (Lakoff, 2016: 109). This perception of the world makes liberals adopt nurturance rather than dominance. Besides, it pushes them to seek both to promote collaboration instead of competition, and prioritize respect over neglect (Lakoff, 2016: 113).

On the other hand, Lakoff portrays the conservative ideology in terms of a strict father representing the supreme authority which governs the family through reward and punishment. In this conservative household led by strict father, obedient children need to abide by rules of self-discipline, self-reliance, and personal responsibility (Lakoff, 2016: 66). Among the values that conservatives tend to value most is the idea of "moral strength" as a major requirement for survival in a cruel world. Thus, they consider one's own strength and self-dependence as determinants of the action's morality (Lakoff, 2016: 71). In the conservative perspective, what makes life difficult is the peril and competitive nature that characterizes the world. Therefore, since success and failure form an inherent part of our existence, they push us to seek survival and triumph rather than weakness and loss (Lakoff, 2004: 07). Accordingly, Lakoff and Elisabeth Wehling (2012) refer to the conservative focus upon the Darwinian concept of "survival of the fittest." This idea reflects the conduct that leads conservatives to keep justifying the pursuit of one's personal best interest away from social bonds or communal responsibility (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 121).

The conservatives' discontent with government intervention in socio-economic affairs comes from their refusal of parental meddling with issues that require adopting individualism instead of collectivism (Lakoff, 1995: 192). For conservatives, the father's responsibility of caring is limited to himself and his family, regardless of other people's needs. Besides, in the strict father's perspective, the notion of democracy emphasizes people's freedom to seek their own needs and serve their families' interests without committing oneself to needless social liabilities (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 32). Lakoff highlights this idea by noting that "the mature children of the Strict Father have to sink or swim by themselves" (Lakoff, 2016: 66). In order to demonstrate that both the support

and opposition to the ACA as a case study come from a principled policy choice rather than mere partisanship, this paper argues that the attitudes of both liberal and conservative adherents are consistently congruent with the Lakoffian family-based model of morality.

3. Areas of Debate

3.1 Universal Accessibility

As early as 2008, during his presidential campaign, the Democratic candidate Barack Obama expressed his solid position in favor of a universal healthcare reform. Accordingly, his speech revolved around the unjustifiable high number of uninsured Americans reaching almost 50 million. Moreover, he stressed the personal burdens due to the skyrocketing health care costs. Furthermore, he highlighted the fact that American citizens form the highest level of expenditure on health care among all First World populations (Odom, Owen, Valley & Burrell, 2011: 331). Among the moral implications that appear in Obama's speech to the audience over the imperatives to spread care benefits to those needy and vulnerable was his Christian testimony. In this respect, Obama emphasized the need to carry out the Christ's instructions in the New Testament as he ordered his companions and adherents to provide food for the hungry, shelter for those who do not find homes, and care for those ill. In so doing, therefore, Odom notes that Obama's health care universal agenda reflects a moral sense (Odom et al., 2011: 331). Accordingly, those who hold a nurturant parent persuasion have a view that the universalization of health care access is an attempt to promote social collaboration and caring for one another.

Central to nurturant parent morality is the pursuit of universal health coverage insurance for American citizens. Starting from the onset of 2014, the ACA emphasized the directive that healthcare insurance companies are not allowed to deny insurance seekers their coverage under the excuse of pre-existing conditions. Businesses that do not respect these criteria will pay a fine (Hall and Lord, 2014: 3). This proves to be consistent with nurturant parent model which considers protecting his children from abusive practices as a chief duty. In this respect, Obamacare played a major role in unprecedentedly institutionalizing Medicaid (a federal program that aims primarily at providing direct support to the poor and low-income population) as a paramount component of the American health care system. Under the ACA regulations, Medicaid undertakes the mission of covering around 16 million Americans out of 32 million awaited to benefit from health insurance coverage. Since the enactment of the Medicaid program in the 1960s, it is the first time that health insurance coverage is provided to all low-paid U.S. citizens (Grogan, 2011: 1502). Yet, as Republicans refused the Roosevelt socio-economic policies in the 1930s, (Braik Fethia, 2017: 95) and opposed the welfare plans in the 1960s, they continue their objection to the Democrat-led initiatives represented in the ACA.

Significantly, conservatives stand firmly against the ACA's attempt of universality because it seeks to accomplish this endeavor through tax collection. For strict father moralists, it is immoral that government collects taxes from serious individuals to spend them on expanding health care of the rest of people (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 32). This attitude plays a major role in the conservatives' refusal of the ACA's expansion of health care access to everyone.

Conservatives have a habit of distorting and vilifying the tax imposing and collection. They install the idea that this money is taken – without consent – from hardworking citizens to be spent on lazy dependent ones. Thus, conservatives succeeded in shifting the approval of tax payers as being responsible individuals and source of the nation's prosperity through financing public projects to a negative connotation reflecting the promotion of dependency culture and waste of money (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 105).

In line with strict father morality, the opposition to the ACA's attempt of universalizing health care coverage stems from its failure to meet the requirement of morality as strength. Those who could not insure themselves because of their laziness and lack of self-reliance deserve no help from others. For conservatives, prevalence of moral weakness is the major reason for failure because all people are equally given the chance to survive and succeed in the U.S. Therefore, poverty and vulnerability have nothing to do with social classification but they are largely linked to personal irresponsibility (Lakoff, 2016: 75). Besides, conservatives could not hide their contempt of the massive government spending on ACA by the Obama administration in a time the U.S. was facing one of the deepest economic recessions in its entire history (Eichengreen, 2015: 2). The conservative adherents have a habit of emphasizing the idea that has long been associating the American debt with the substantial government expenditure on welfare. They urge, instead, a removal of this generous spending to move the nation out of the slump (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 65).

Correspondingly, the liberals' support of the ACA's pursuit of health care insurance universalization stems from the persuasion that a disrespected and neglected child is not supposed to respect or sympathize with other people. This consideration lies at the very heart of nurturant parent's view that cooperation, as opposed to competition, should have precedence and govern people's relations. Such a replacement would help promote a sense of appreciation over tendencies of aggressiveness (Lakoff, 2016: 113). In their perspective, the best way of child raising is through positive communal interaction and contribution. Hence, what triggers children's self-reliance and responsibility is not punishment but mutual respect, tolerance and care (Lakoff, 2016: 108). By applying this to the ACA, those insured now are the ones who will be responsible for contributing to others' insurance in a later stage. Universality of health care is a principle which conveys that all people have the right to receive a minimum level of medical care. This latter can be provided through a host of different channels, among which is a free-market version of health care delivery (Odom et al., 2011: 331).

3.2 Interference with the Market

Liberals have long hoped for a national health care system based upon single-payer procedure where government undertakes the responsibility of paying for medical-oriented costs. However, when the ACA legislation was proposed to Congress for enactment, Democrats adopted a proposal that guarantees a continuity of market-driven health care system. As much as 89% of liberals defend the idea that it is the federal government's liability to spread health care coverage to all citizens, and 54% believe that health insurance needs to be fully a government-run system to ensure its efficiency. Yet in general, though there is some consensus among the public opinion over the need to

government involvement in health care system, there is a disparity in these views over the scope of this federal intervention. While 47% consider that spreading health care coverage to all segments of society is a prime responsibility for government, 50% of the public exempt government from this commitment (Pew Research Center, 2014: 68).

Democracy, for liberals and behind them the Democrats, is based upon a sense of caring and responsibility for oneself and for other citizenry. This position evokes a government with one major moral task: to act on an equal basis for protecting and sustaining all residents. Correspondingly, conservative perception of democracy revolves around guaranteeing people's liberty to seek their personal advantage, regardless of others' interests. This vision strongly emphasizes the non-excessive public interference in what is considered as fundamental personal liberties (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 04). The pretext that it is unprecedented that Congress compels individuals to purchase insurance and engage in trade practices formed a starting point for the ACA opponents to undermine its constitutionality. In fact, these shared political ideas have grown gradually to become a movement spread across the conservative Tea Party, the halls of Congress and the judicial branch represented by the federal courts (Blackman, 2013: 186).

Moreover, the ACA detractors counted that the privileges given to Congress meant to allow it to regulate commerce rather than to establish it. According to them, the bill went beyond its role as prior implementation of the commerce power showed that the modifications were limited to regulating certain aspects of the already existing economic practices instead of allowing Congress to bring about radical transformations. The coercive power generated a wide displeasure among the right wing members. The criticism targets the excessive government intervention in all population's interests through compelling people to engage in commercial practices in which they are told of what should and should not be done (Jost, 2012: 1660). As a response to the ACA's intervention in the market, and in his denouncement of Obamacare, the former Florida Republican governor Jeb Bush reveals,

> We've created a monstrosity of consolidating power in Washington, D.C., suppressing wages, making it uncertain for investment. In fact, the greatest job suppressor in the so-called recovery that we've gone through is Obamacare. And I think replacing Obamacare with a market-oriented approach — that is, where local and state input starts to drive the policies away from this top-down system is something the country ought to be doing (Bobic, 2015).

Furthermore, another issue that received vehement criticism by the conservative detractors is the provision of Medicaid expansion. Obviously, the states that are backed up by right-wing advocates and led by conservative governors emphasized the unconstitutional status of this provision since it threatens to deprive states of their federal funding if they do not comply with such expansion. Despite the constitutional power given to the federal authorities, states' sovereignty is also brought to the forefront as main aspect of individual liberty and free will guaranteed by the American Constitution. Besides, such compulsory practices undermine the politicians' autonomy in the policy-making process (Jost, 2012: 1661). In response to this, the conservative politician Ben Carson contends,

> You know Obamacare is really I think the worst thing that has happened in this nation since slavery. And it is in a way, it is slavery in a way, because it is making all of us subservient to the government, and it was never about health care. It was about control (Sullivan, 2013).

The name of the law itself, the Affordable Care Act, has generated the disparagement of detractors. Employing market-led expressions like "affordable" care reflects the economic trajectory of the matter, as if the health services are goods that require certain prices to be acquired or simply given for free. This latter option does not exist because health care in America is publicly funded. Still the circulating words of "free," "affordable," and "available" impose the market frame and, therefore, the consideration of vulnerable individuals as consumers and their health as commodities. This perception makes the government as a boss in a large business administering the prices of products and services. If a business offers goods for free, the ultimate consequences are going in debt or getting bankrupt. Such a trajectory upholds the conservative position that privatizing business and giving the upper hand to the self-regulatory market is the solution for the national deficit (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 107). Besides, the name of the law also gave conservatives the opportunity to mock, vilify and challenge it. According to Lakoff, the label "affordable" generates three major negative perceptions as he notes,

> First, it places health and life in the commerce frame, using the "health care as product" metaphor. Second, it doesn't place health care in a moral frame, ignoring the moral dimensions of care. This opened the door for conservatives to frame it from their moral perspective as a *government takeover* and to focus on the use of cost-benefit analysis to constrain elder care as *death panels*. Third, the word suggests low quality; what is affordable is not necessarily valuable (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 109).

Apparently, the nurturant parent adherents consider the ACA's interference with the market as a necessary action to curb prices skyrocketing and prevent abusive practices of private drug companies which seek profitability at the expense of major human rights to life and pursuit of happiness. Yet, another issue that has generated a heated debate between the two ends of the American ideological spectrum is the insurance of abortion and contraception.

3.3 Abortion and Contraception

The abortion issue is considered one of the most sensitive topics that generate controversy and conflict in American politics and society. In early 2012, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) made it clear that, under the ACA's directives, the majority of health insurance programs are required to include contraceptive tools, counseling, and abortion drugs as an integral part of the preventive measures endorsed by the bill. The aim is to meet the wants of employed women to help them avoid spending extra money on such needs out of the insurance market (Morden, 2017: 38). In virtue of the ACA's

instructions, half of states can buy health plans for covering abortion cases available on insurance marketplaces on governmental website. States are given flexibility to choose among the available online plans that cover abortion-related cases. Yet, around 23 states refused to offer abortion coverage proposed for sale on online healthcare exchanges, except in isolated cases of rape or cases that endanger the pregnant females' lives (Maron, 2014: 18).

The Pew Research Center (2014) reveals a survey showing that 51% of participants want abortion to be legal in all or most circumstances, whereas 43% express their conviction of its illegality whatever the case was. Still, the abortion issue generates some consensus among participants as the majority of those who call for abortion legality approve the insertion of some restrictive measures in this practice. Likewise, most of those who express its illegality accept it to be allowed in certain cases. In fact, consistent liberals form the segment that favors no limits on legal abortion, despite their division over the possibility of imposing restrictive directives sometimes (Pew Research Center, 2014: 65).

Among the recurrent hurdles affecting the ACA's full implementation are the legal and religious challenges. In 2016, the Supreme Court started viewing a suit to consider the ability of religion-related community organizations – like charity associations, educational institutions, and medical facilities – to block government from indirectly providing coverage for contraceptive purposes (Burgin, 2015: 01). In this respect, while liberals have a tendency to perceive abortion and contraception as necessary medical issues, conservatives incline to reflect on such debatable topics in terms of committing crime and murdering babies (Lakoff, 2016: 265). In the mind of strict father moralists, depending on an artificial contraception to prevent sex from resulting in pregnancy reflects an underestimation of the value of pregnancy and procreation.

Under the ACA's regulations, organizations and enterprises are ordered to provide employees, depending on the level of their incomes, with the opportunity to get contraceptive devices and drugs when needed (Kelly, Magill, and Have, 2013: 282). The nurturant parent's perception is that, in the abortion cases, the procedure is a fulfillment of certain acceptable measures that seek good outcomes, and the ones approving or conducting these procedures seek only the desirable consequences of protecting the mother from harm or pain, instead of the evil result of bringing an end to the fetus' existence. This attitude highlights the idea that "saving the mother's life is only contingent upon the fetus' removal, not its death. Its death is an unintended though foreseen effect, and thus neither an end nor a means to an end." The protection of the mother's life adequately justifies the medical intervention and the undesirable destiny of the fetus. Hence, the good outcomes surpass the harm results (Beauchamp and Childress, 1979: 103).

In many cases, vulnerable women resort to abortion and contraception as options that prevent other harms to come. In fact, as much as half of pregnancies in 2010 are unintended and the most affected segments include teenagers and poor African American women. Accordingly, each single year witnesses one million unplanned pregnancies among American teenagers, and half of them turn to abortion. Among the shortcomings that characterize unintended pregnancies are the lack of prenatal care and breast milking. These flaws lead in many cases to jeopardize the lives of the mother, fetus and child (Morden, 2017: 299). Starting from these considerations, nurturant parent adherents

perceive abortion as a virtue since it provides a solution to helpless girls in troublesome circumstances. In such a critical situation, they need empathy and help instead of blame and punishment. Therefore, if these helpless women are unwilling to be mothers which would destroy their future lives, abortion is a reasonable solution to help them keep pursuing their self-development. (Lakoff, 2016: 269).

This claim finds a way in the utilitarian's perception of good. For utilitarians, in the maximization of good and minimization of harm, there should be a consideration of the intrinsic instead of extrinsic value in certain issues. For them,

> Neither undergoing nor performing an abortion is considered by anyone to be an intrinsically good event. However, many people would sometimes consider it extrinsically good as a means to another end, such as the restoration of an ill woman to a state of health (Beauchamp and Childress, 1979: 22).

Besides, Beauchamp and Childress (1979) introduce some major requirements to justify certain actions under a principle known as double effect. This latter includes the obligation of the good essence of the action. The good – rather than the evil – effect must be the sole intention behind this act (evil can be potential but not intentional), and the action involves that good and evil outcomes are balanced (Beauchamp and Childress, 1979: 103).

The ACA's inclusion of contraceptive pills, sterilization, and abortion drugs as part of its preventive services triggers the dissent of strict father moralists. They show no tolerance with getting rid of unintended pregnancies that come out of lust or accident. Such a practice violates the moral standards set by the conservative model through having a lack of self-control over sexual desire – which is considered an internal evil – and through attempting to interfere in one's destiny (Lakoff, 1995: 194). These sacrilegious considerations seem to be major factors for conservatives to stand against the ACA provision that allows insurance for cases of abortion and contraception.

The disparity over the issue of abortion has its origins stemming in the difference between conservative and liberal "Christianities." Engaging in abortion practices is considered as a sacrilege and lack of personal responsibility in the eyes of strict father. This latter's intolerance comes from his perception that "God is seen as a strict father, offering tough love, defining what is moral, and setting absolute rules. If you obey the rules, you go to Heaven; if not, you are punished forever in the fires of Hell" (Lakoff and Wehling, 2012: 22). As for progressive Christianity, on the other hand, the graceful and compassionate God unconditionally nourishes, protects, and heals his people. Therefore, the liberals' support and conservatives' objection to the ACA provisions do not simply result from mere partisanship, but are derived from deep moral persuasions and principled policy choices.

4. Conclusion

This paper has traced the underlying reasons that lay behind the liberals' support for, and conservatives' opposition to, Obamacare. While liberals show a strong commitment to values of mutual caring, social cooperation and empathy, conservatives have an inclination to prioritize rules of individualism, competition, and self-responsibility. The paper has shown that the liberals' nurturant parent model pushes for seeking a universal version of health care insurance, launching regulative measures to the health care market to curb abusive practices, and expressing empathy toward helpless women who need abortion or contraception. In contrast, the conservatives' strict father model shows a tendency to resist these endeavors through emphasizing individual responsibility for receiving insurance, committing to self-regulatory nature of the economy away from government intervention, and imposing strict rules on irresponsible women who resort to sacrilegious practices to get rid of their unwanted pregnancies. The paper, therefore, has revealed that both the liberals' approval of the ACA and the conservatives' strenuous efforts to vilify the law stem from principled moral considerations rather than being mere political partisanship. Yet, it would be more informative to investigate the real impact of ideological polarization on the practical implementation of the ACA and prospects for its prolongation or repeal.

References

[1] Beauchamp, T. L. & James F. C. (1979). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[2] Blackman, J. (2013). Popular Constitutionalism and the Affordable Care Act, *Public Affairs Quarterly* 27(3), 179-197.

[3] Bobic, I. (2015). Jeb Bush: Replace 'Monstrosity' Of Obamacare. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/03/07/jeb-bush-obamacare_n_6822942.html (retrieved on 2 February, 2019).

[4] Braik, F. (2017). "New Deal for Minorities", *Journal of Translation & Languages* 16(1), 94-107.

[5] Burgin, E. (2015). "Introduction: Revisiting the Affordable Care Act", *Politics and the Life Sciences* 34(2), 1-6.

[6] David, K., Gerard M., & Henk T. H. (2013). *Contemporary Catholic Health Care Ethics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

[7] Eichengreen, B. (2015). *Hall of Mirrors: The Great Depression, the Great Recession, and the Uses-and Misuses-of History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[8] Grogan, C. M. (2011). "The New Medicaid under PPACA: What Will It Mean for General Internists?", *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 26(12), 1502-1505.

[9] Hall, A. M. & Richard L. (2014). Obamacare: What the Affordable Care Act Means for Patients and Physicians. https://www.bmj.com/content/349/bmj.g5376/related (retrieved on 17 April, 2020).

[10] Jost, T. S. (2012). "The Affordable Care Act Largely Survives the Supreme Court's Scrutiny—But Barely", *Health Affairs* 31(8), 1659-1662.

[11] Lakoff, G. & Wehling E. (2012). *The Little Blue Book: The Essential Guide to Thinking and*

Talking Democratic. New York: Free Press.

[12] Lakoff, G. (1995). "Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals in the Dust", *Social Research* 62(2), 177-213.

[13] Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. Vermont: Chelsea Green.

[14] Lakoff, G. (2016). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[15] Maron, D. F. (2014). "Under Obamacare, A Rollback of Abortion Coverage", *Scientific American* 310(1), 18-18.

[16] Morden, S. (2017). The Ethical Right to Healthcare in the Affordable Care Act. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Doctoral dissertation. https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/141/ (retrieved on 12 April, 2020).

[17] Odom, L., Richard O., Amina V., & Phillip B. (2011). "Obamacare: An Ethical Analysis of His Leadership and the Health Reform Initiative", *Leadership in Health services* 24(4), 325-336.

[18] Pew Research Center. (2014). Political Polarization in the American Public. https://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/ (retrieved on 17 April, 2020).

[19] Sullivan, S. (2013). Ben Carson: Obamacare Worst Thing 'Since Slavery'. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2013/10/11/ben-carson-obamacare-worst-thing-since-slavery/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.cd7be3f117ce (retrieved on February 2, 2019).