

Outline: Argumentative Paper on Obesity and Government Intervention

- I. Introduction
 - A. **Thesis:** The obesity epidemic needs a government intervention because the medical costs associated with obesity cost taxpayers money, unhealthy foods need tighter regulations, and schools need to provide healthier options.
- II. Body Paragraph 1: The medical cost associated with weight-related issues has significantly contributed to individual taxes.
 - A. **Supporting evidence:** "...the costs of obesity arising from individuals' poor nutritional choices are borne by society as a whole through taxes, lost productivity, and an overburdened healthcare system. In 2008, the medical costs associated with obesity and obesity-related illnesses totaled US \$147 billion in the United States" (Franck, Grandi, & Eisenberg, 2013, p. 1951).
 1. **Explanation:** This quote demonstrates not only the connection between obesity, medical costs, and increased taxes, but also shows the exact costs from a fairly recent year.
 2. **So what?:** This quote supports the claim that weight-related medical issues contribute to increased taxes for all taxpayers by explaining the connection and demonstrating the high dollar costs to show that this is a current problem affecting a government process (taxation) and therefore could appropriately be addressed by government intervention.
- III. Body Paragraph 2: Another reason that weight should be considered a governmental issue is that the market for unhealthy food in America has overtaken the general food market and the government needs to actively curb the incentives to frequent these establishments.
 - A. **Supporting Evidence:** "[M]eals are increasingly being consumed outside the home, and these meals tend to be higher in fat. A literal fat tax... theoretically would encourage individuals to opt for low-fat or nonfat alternatives" (Franck et al., 2013, p. 1950).
 1. **Explanation:** This quote alludes to many of the main problems with fast food consumption and explains what a fat tax would attempt to do to curb the consumption of junk food.
 2. **So what?:** Showing that a fat tax would be able to curb overconsumption of obesity-causing fast food demonstrates the need for the government to impose such a thing.
- IV. Body Paragraph 3: Finally, the government is responsible for ensuring that children have access to healthy food and exercise while in school.
 - A. **Supporting Evidence:** A connection between Michelle Obama's "Let's Move!" campaign and a reduction in overall childhood obesity across America has been demonstrated (Tucker, 2013, p. 1).
 1. **Explanation:** This information shows the effectiveness of government-backed programs, with "Let's Move!" as the specific example.
 2. **So what?:** Demonstrating the effectiveness of the "Let's Move!" campaign supports the concept of government involvement in school food and exercise initiatives to help curb childhood obesity and provide children with the foundation for establishing healthy habits.

V. Conclusion

- A. **Rephrased Thesis:** Obesity is causing taxpayers more money. Unhealthy foods are not regulated and inadequate nutrition and exercise in schools are leading to a rise in obesity. Therefore, the government needs to intervene in order to decrease the rates of obesity.
- B. **Strong Closing:** The government's intervention is important so that we can reduce the rates of obesity before they soar to an uncontrollable level.

References

Franck, C., Grandi, S., & Eisenberg, M. (2013). Taxing junk food to counter obesity. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(11), 1949-1953. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2013.301279

Tucker, C. (2013). Q&A with first lady Michelle Obama: How the Let's Move! campaign is changing the way kids eat, move. *Nation's Health, 43*(9), 5. Retrieved from <http://thenationshealth.aphapublications.org/content/43/9/5.full>

Writing