**America is a nation that has a free economy, and, in turn, a private-sector health care system.  Many** liberals, **however, propose that we make America *less* unique among the nations of the world. They want to assimilate America into European styles and tone down health care. We fought a war in the 1770s and 1780s to rid ourselves of other countries determining our fate. Why should we do everything with the consultation of foreign power now? We shouldn’t. John Adams said it best, “I cannot express it better than in his [John Jay’s] own words: ‘to be honest and grateful to our allies, but to think for ourselves.’ ”**

Because I agree with Human Events (<http://www.humanevents.com/2009/05/14/whats-so-bad-about-universal-health-care/>, 2009) I negate the resolution: **The United States ought to guarantee universal healthcare for its citizens."**

**I offer definitions for clarity in this debate:**

**ought** - (used to express [justice](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/justice), moral rightness, or the like) (Collins English Dictionary)

**guarantee** - Provide such an assurance regarding (something, esp. a product) (collins English Dictionary)

**universal healthcare** - A government-sponsored system that ensures health care coverage for all citizens of a nation, regardless of income level or employment status.

**My value is Liberty. liberty is defined as "**The state of being free within society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behavior, or political views" (collins English Dictionary). Liberty is what is being affected most by the implication of Universal health Care. The United States Government should not be able to tell you they YOU MUST buy health care. The government would be treading on your personal autonomy and ability to decide things. Since an over extension of the government's power would affect one's liberty, liberty should be the deciding factor of the debate.

**My value criterion: protecting one's autonomy. Autonomy is defined as "**freedom to determine one's own actions, behaviour, etc". The idea of the government forcing you into a system you do not want to be a part of is agaisnt your autonomy. Autonomy is the base of liberty, so it should be the value criterion of the debate.

**My first contention is that the US should not guarantee UH because there is no actual "right to health care".**

Universal Health care is not a right. No where in our Constitution or Declaration does it say that the United State much provide free health care for its people. Campbell writes:

**Campbell**, in 20**09** (MBT, US Representative (R-CA), OC Register opinion article "John Campbell: A Right to Health Care) July 13, 2009

**“The second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence says** in part: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.' Nowhere does it mention anything about free MRIs.** In school, we were taught that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were ratified in 1791, and collectively they form our Bill of Rights... **Rights are not about giving you something for free; they are about protecting natural liberties** from those who would take them away from you. **For instance, the Second Amendment guarantees the right to bear arms. It does not** however, **say that you get guns for free if you don't have one. This is analogous to the issue of health care 'rights.' A 'right' to services without charge, that forces someone else to provide for you, does not** and should not ever **exist”**

The United States is not required to provide health care -rather the government must serve as the actor to protect the natural rights of every human being. Therefore the US should not provide Universal Health care because it is not actually a right and its mandate treads on the natural rights of others (like the pursuit of happiness). Because there is no real "right" to health care, the government should not force you to either sign up for it or pay for it for others. This is against your autonomy and therefore against one's liberty, the value for this debate.

Contention two: Universal Health care takes away assets that you could use to pay for better, non-government run health care.

Universal Health Care takes money away from those to pay for a system that may or may not have to be used by the paying individual. It is not fair for the government to take away your assets in order to pay for other's issues.

**Michael Sandel [**Prof. of Government, Harvard University], Justice: What's The Right Thing To Do?, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, p. 60-61

**Desirable though it may be for the affluent to support the less fortunate – by subsidizing their health care or housing or education – such help should be left up to the individual to undertake, not mandated by the government...redistributive taxes are a form of coercion, even theft. The state has no more right to force affluent taxpayers to support social programs for the poor than a benevolent thief has the right to steal money from a rich persona and give it to the homeless."**

The United States government has no right to take away one's money to pay for an expensive program that may or may not work. Taking away money from an individual is against their autonomy, and is therefore conclusively against their liberty. Thus in order to protect an individual's autonomy and one's liberty, i negate the resolution **The United States ought to guarantee universal healthcare for its citizens."**
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