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Should we restrict travel traffic through Ebola affected countries?

 In this day and age we are affected by so many different diseases and ailments. In example of this, the CDC has seen a vast increase in influenza A outbreaks around our country. The politicians in our country at the moment are conflicted about what we are to do about the ever rising diseases that are being transmitted and brought into our own country. Some may say that we should restrict all passengers coming from these Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone onto US soil. On the other hand, some like our President for instance is imploring if we restrict travel from the affect areas it will only hurt our nation and the countries that are stricken by this disease. The President however, believes that the cutting off of travel will not allow the humanitarian aid needed to fight Ebola. In the material I am presenting your will find many of the arguments that I am talking about. I am simply asking should we restrict traffic coming from these areas to protect our own country. I found this particular topic appealing to me because it not only affects those people at ground zero but it is a growing issue worldwide. There are many sides to this issue, are we to cut off our nation completely and look like we are ignoring that it is happening or should we as a strong nation face it and help take on the crisis at hand?

Phillip, Abby. The Washington Post. 4 October 2014. 28 october 2014 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2014/10/01/why-hasnt-the-u-s-closed-its-airports-to-travelers-from-ebola-ravaged-countries/>.

Phillip tackles the subject of travel restrictions to the affected countries of Ebola naming Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea. These restrictions according to the Philip are making the fight on Ebola harder for the world. Phillip shows the countries that have implemented restriction to the affected areas and uses the model of Alessandro Vespignani to show that if restrictions are put in place to the US it will make the spread more inevitable. She explains that the restrictions that are already in place at US airports are redundant. The current restrictions and screenings allow people to travel if they are not showing symptoms of the disease. This is allowing people to come into the country that are infected but are not contagious. Phillip strongly agrees that if we cut off air traffic to these countries then we are not only ignoring the problem but we are making it worse by not helping out in the humanitarian efforts to keep food and supplies going to the countries .

 In this article By Abby Phillip a general assignment reporter for *The Washington Post.* She is using a logical appeal to get her point across to the readers, which in the case of *The Washington Post* are academic business minded readers. Since the readers that she is targeting are that of a business mind set she uses the facts to persuade readers. Phillip uses the idea if we are not able to get supplies and food to the people in the countries that are being wreaked Ebola then the outbreak will spread regardless of any restrictions that are put in place. I found that Phillip’s use of logic effectively persuades readers by giving a cause and effect position that if we restrict travel then we are effectively cause more damage.

This article gives the argument that is we cut off travel we are only ignoring the problem. This further pushes my ideas to a position of two minds. I feel that the information that was given in this article will give solid argument to one side of the question that I am asking.

Salzberg, Steven. Forbes. 5 October 2014. 21 October 2014 <http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevensalzberg/2014/10/05/how-to-stop-ebola-ban-air-travel-from-liberia-sierra-leone-and-guinea/>.

Salzberg asserts the idea that a travel ban would be the best way to prevent Ebola from entering the US. His article is in affirmation of the call for a ban that Governor Jindal strongly urged for early in October. Salzberg gives the statistics that 50% of infected people are taken by this disease and there is no treatment or cure of Ebola. In his agreement that the US can control and outbreak from happening because of our infection controls Salzberg states “prevention is better than control” (Salzberg). The idea presented by Salzberg is that we only cut off those three countries of travelers that are trying to get to the US until the worst passes. He does not feel we should isolate ourselves off from the rest of the world only the affect countries giving the US a stronger layer of protection in the face of the epidemic.

Steven Salzberg is a Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Biostatistics at the Institute of Genetic Medicine at John Hopkins University’s School of Medicine. Salzberg uses his ethos as a respected medical professional to credit his persuasiveness. Salzberg can relate to business readers and uses that to hit their empathy by pointing out that first off saying “I never thought I’d find myself agreeing with Louisiana governor” (Salzberg). He points out that because there is no treatment and Ebola is one of the deadliest diseases that can affect humans we must use prevention not control. The way Salzberg evokes fear by shows the CDCs estimations of the spread of the disease it make so a strong argument.

After reading and summarizing the article I feel I am definitely of two minds. The strong pathos in this article draws my attention to a new question. Can we protect our citizens by cutting commercial travel ban and still give the humanitarian aid to the three countries that have the outbreak? I am definitely of two minds after reading this article.

Weintraub, Karen. National Geographic. 8 October 2014. 21 October 2014 <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/10/141007-ebola-travel-ban-restrictions-health-world/>.

In this article the Weintraub give a logical approach to the aid that is needed in the countries that are affected by Ebola. She points out the opposition’s argument and uses obvious reasoning to deflate their idea that a travel ban should be enforced. Weintraub points out that the restrictions that West African countries are already imposing are more of a problem for Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea than anything. These travel restrictions are causing healthcare workers and supplies to be delayed which is making the situation harder to control. Weintraub conveys that if we don’t control and help the infected people and countries first that the spread will just get worse.

Weintraub makes several points in the article that form her reasoning why we should not enforce a travel restriction to the countries that are affected. She uses pathos and logos to give readers a humanitarian perspective on the situation. In using pathos she does a good job of persuading readers of the national geographic which is a broader scope than the other source I cited.

I began the research with my first question in mind, should we enforce a travel ban to Ebola affected countries? I initially felt like this was going to be way too easy of a question, simple enough to give a yes or no. I soon found that there was so much more to that question and that each source I read complicated and raised smaller yet important questions. It was so easy to see that there is more than two angles to this and that helped me decide what content I am going to use and how I am going to use it in my position thesis. When I realized all that is going into thesis it got deeper and deeper. I thought at the beginning of this that I was in agreement of the ban and now after reading all of the articles I feel I am of two minds.

Chamary, JV. "Ebola Is Coming. A Travel Ban Won't Stop Outbreaks." 13 October 2014. Forbes. 4 November 2014 <www.Forbes.com/sites/jvchamary/2014/10/13/ebola-travel/>.

Charmary is debating a travel ban to Ebola crisis in West Africa and is reporting on research that is being done based on computer simulated projection models. He first states “Ebola has gone global” (Chamary) and reports that secondary transmissions have now begin to happen. In trying to help us understand he writes the question that is on a lot of peoples mind “Why don’t we just ban flights from Africa” (Chamary).  He gives us the logical reason why a travel ban just wouldn’t be effective. What he claims most desperate individuals would do is find alternative routes out of the areas and find themselves traveling back to other countries without us knowing where. Charmary uses computer stimulated models that were developed by Professor Alex Vespignani a physicist at Northeastern University. The models that Vespignani uses calculate real world predictions. Charmary shows to different scenarios one that includes cutting all air traffic off and another that projects an 80% reduction in air traffic. Charmary’s idea is that if we reduce but not isolate the countries it can postpone the spread, but the it will not help in the long run. His demonstration of this gives us only a 4 week buffer to the spread of the infection. His sole idea is that we must fight the infection in West Africa to avoid a global pandemic.
    Charmary is a PHD in Evolutionary Biology and uses that ethos to carry his point throughout the article. He also relies heavily on logos to make the logical understanding that the outbreak will spread if we allow our own fears get in the way.  Charmary conveys his point starting with a logical understanding of how the outbreak can spread using the computer aided predictions. He uses these models to break the readers out of their shell of emotion and hit that logical portion of the readers psyche. After breaking the shell he then uses the “I Say” move to further persuade reader to his idea.

In reading this article I was hoping to get a different view on what we can do to either enforce a travel ban or see an alternative solution to it. This particular piece will add more dynamic to my position synthesis paper. I feel the new dynamic will give me a stronger thesis by providing a more relevant data. This particular article is swaying me to one side of the question but I feel I am still of two minds.

Fortin, Jacey. "Africa urges end to Ebola travel ban as infections set to soar ." 8 September 2014. Business Insider. 4 November 2014 <www.businessinsider.com/afp-africa-urges-end-to-ebola-travel-ban-as-infections-set-to-soar-2014-9>.

Fortin reports travel restrictions have been causing more harm than good. In the article Fortin quotes several African countries’ officials that are calling for a cease of the travel ban. Fortin explains that the humanitarian aid is now become a crisis due to such travel restriction. She agrees with African countries that want the ban to cease to put testing and detection processes that are effective in place.  This will allow the laboratory testing trials for a vaccine to continue without interruption.
This article was quite short and direct to the point. The author has geared this for the academic business reader that wants the facts and no fluff.  In regards to it being persuasive is something that is hard for me not being a straight to the point or logos reader. I feel it hit a good point on the travel bans that already are in place are hurting the progress and not helping us fight the disease.

I read this article expecting one thing when I was given quite another. It gave me a more localized view of the issue.  I didn’t think to originally look actively for something more local based.  The article further steps me in one direction. I will help me give a view that we don’t normally see some light.

Messing, Phillp and Italiano,Laura. "Ebola ruled out as passenger dies on Nigeria flight to JFK." 16 October 2014. New York Post. 4 November 2014 <www.nypost.com/2014/10/16/alarm-after-vomiting-passenger-dies-on-flight-from-nigeria-to-jfk/>.

    The authors of this story in the New York Post is in reference to the a passenger that died in transit to JFK from one of the Ebola stricken Countries. They reported that passengers may have been exposed to anything the person was carrying biologically. I response to the incident Rep. Peter King sent a letter to Homeland Security urging them to take immediate action on the procedures that are being use in airports for such instance. He wrote that his deep concern that the current processes are unfit for the Ebola spread. Messing and Italiano report that the body after investigation was free of Ebola. Even after the letter was written King is concerned that the passengers from these flights have the ability to mingle with the general public before being separated to a clinical screening. This means they are even allowed to use the same restrooms as the public before being examined.

 This source was very persuasive due to the inherent pathos that was used.  That pathos evokes the strong emotional feeling to readers making them want to join the fight to stop Ebola. The authors don’t use their own ethos to persuade their audience, rather the completely rely on the subject to let pathos do the work. I felt persuaded to jump on board with Representative King on the getting the correct and most effective processes in place to protect other passengers.

In looking at this article it was a bit off the spectrum from my direct question. This article will allow me to bring in some other smaller question that will play a role in the overall thesis. I am still of two minds over my question.

In all the research that has been presented here. I have a few strong sides to the argument, to protect our citizens at all costs by stopping all travel to Liberia Guinea and Sierra Leone or fight Ebola head on at ground Zero of the outbreak with all the aid we can get there.  I have found some other positions that were presented in the articles. One of them being should we cut off commercial travel and remain strong in transporatation of needed medical and humanitarian supplies? I am definitely of two minds. I see the benefits off cutting off all travel to protect our country from further out breaks and secondary transmissions. These arguments will allow me to effectively give a position in my Position Synthesis.