Observation 1: The Aff has the obligation of proving that the universal health care applies to every single member of the United States

Observation 2: Universal healthcare cannot include privatization because the resolution states that it guarantees universal healthcare for everyone, so the citizens would not be able to obtain privatized healthcare

Observation 3: Aff has the obligation of choosing only single payer, not multi payer because first it skews ground because the Aff can now support both sides of the debate and leaves me with no room to argue, second it is a research burden because the Aff can study all the literature on both privatized and public healthcare and I have no literature to look at. The Aff cannot support a hybrid theory between and public and private.

My value is Justice because ought is defined as duty or correctness. We need to find the most correct path in order to achieve justice. My Value Criterion is protecting the rights of citizens because we need to protect the fundamental rights of citizens in order to achieve a stabilized state that functions appropriately without revolt and oppression

My first contention is that Universal Health Care leads to a monopoly that oppresses the citizens of the US and violates their right to free will to choose whatever health care insurance they want

1. Universal Health Care causes privatization to collapse

Socialized Healthcare vs. The Laws of Economics By [**Thomas DiLorenzo**](http://whiskeyandgunpowder.com/author/tdilorenzo/) Aug 20th, **2009**, professor of economics at Loyola College in Maryland, a senior faculty member of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and an affiliated scholar of the research arm of the League of the South and the Abbeville Institute

The government’s initial step in attempting to create a government-run healthcare monopoly has been to propose a law that would eventually drive the private health insurance industry out of existence. Additional taxes and mandated costs are to be imposed on health insurance companies, while a government-run “health insurance” bureaucracy will be created, ostensibly to “compete” with the private companies. The hoped-for end result is one big government monopoly, which, like all government monopolies, will operate with all the efficiency of the post office and all the charm and compassion of the IRS.

Of course, it would be difficult to compete with a rival who has all of his capital and operating costs paid out of tax dollars. Whenever government “competes” with the private sector, it makes sure that the competition is grossly unfair, piling costly regulation after regulation, and tax after tax on the private companies while exempting itself from all of them. This is why the “government-sponsored enterprises” Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were so profitable for so many years. It is also why so many abysmally performing “public” schools remain in existence for decades despite their utter failure at educating children.

America’s Healthcare Future?

Some years ago, the Nobel-laureate economist Milton Friedman studied the history of healthcare supply in America. In a 1992 study published by the Hoover Institution, entitled “Input and Output in Health Care,” Friedman noted that 56 percent of all hospitals in America were privately owned and for-profit in 1910. After 60 years of subsidies for government-run hospitals, the number had fallen to about 10 percent. It took decades, but by the early 1990s government had taken over almost the entire hospital industry. That small portion of the industry that remains for-profit is regulated in an extraordinarily heavy way by federal, state and local governments so that many (perhaps most) of the decisions made by hospital administrators have to do with regulatory compliance as opposed to patient/customer service in pursuit of profit. It is profit, of course, that is necessary for private-sector hospitals to have the wherewithal to pay for healthcare.

Friedman’s key conclusion was that, as with all governmental bureaucratic systems, government-owned or -controlled healthcare created a situation whereby increased “inputs,” such as expenditures on equipment, infrastructure, and the salaries of medical professionals, actually led to decreased “outputs” in terms of the quantity of medical care. For example, while medical expenditures rose by 224 percent from 1965–1989, the number of hospital beds per 1,000 population fell by 44 percent and the number of beds occupied declined by 15 percent. Also during this time of almost complete governmental domination of the hospital industry (1944–1989), costs per patient-day rose almost 24-fold after inflation is taken into account.

1. Without privatization, Universal health care becomes the only viable form to obtain health care and it violate’s the citizens right to liberty because they are not allowed to choose another viable option because now the government is in charge of 1/6 the economy, which is the health sector.
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This health care bill (ACA) is a massive overreach by the Federal Government that will result in our government having more involvement in your family's health care decisions and greater government intervention . . . ." [n214](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344183125025&returnToKey=20_T15265861901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.485078.65886861447#n214) Senator Roberts called the Act a "stunning assault[] on liberty" filled with "Orwellian policies." [n215](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344183125025&returnToKey=20_T15265861901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.485078.65886861447#n215) Senator Inhofe agreed: "[W]e don't want the government telling us what we can and cannot do. A government-run universal health care system or a socialized system is not the answer." [n216](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344183125025&returnToKey=20_T15265861901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.485078.65886861447#n216) Senator Ensign declared, "What happened to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? I guess Americans can only have them if they comply with this new bill and buy a bronze, silver, gold, or platinum health insurance program." [n217](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344183125025&returnToKey=20_T15265861901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.485078.65886861447#n217) Said Senator Kyl, "If the Reid bill has a motto, it is 'in government we trust.' With the turn of every page, it is no exaggeration to say the Reid bill creates a Washington takeover of health care . . . [it] amount[s] to a stunning assault on liberty."

The government gains too much power and it will wield it unjustly

1. With a monopoly on the market, the US government can be able to tax the market however it wants without any restraint because it, just like everyone else, is naturally inclined towards self-interest and it will try to make the most profit out of the health care system unlike with the privatized sector where the “checks” from opposing companies kept the prices at an acceptable level. Also, the ineffectiveness of the US government will also lead to an increase in costs.

Socialized Healthcare vs. The Laws of Economics By [**Thomas DiLorenzo**](http://whiskeyandgunpowder.com/author/tdilorenzo/)2 Aug 20th, **2009**, professor of economics at Loyola College in Maryland, a senior faculty member of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and an affiliated scholar of the research arm of the League of the South and the Abbeville Institute

The more money that has been spent on government-run healthcare, the less healthcare we have gotten. This kind of result is generally true of all government bureaucracies because of the absence of any market feedback mechanism. Since there are no profits in an accounting sense, by definition, in government, there is no mechanism for rewarding good performance and penalizing bad performance. In fact, in all government enterprises, exactly the opposite is true: bad performance (failure to achieve ostensible goals, or satisfy “customers”) is typically rewarded with larger budgets. Failure to educate children leads to more money for government schools. Failure to reduce poverty leads to larger budgets for welfare state bureaucracies. This is guaranteed to happen with healthcare socialism as well.

Costs always explode whenever the government gets involved, and governments always lie about it. In 1970 the government forecast that the hospital insurance (HI) portion of Medicare would be “only” $2.9 billion annually. Since the actual expenditures were $5.3 billion, this was a 79 percent underestimate of cost. In 1980 the government forecast $5.5 billion in HI expenditures; actual expenditures were more than four times that amount — $25.6 billion. This bureaucratic cost explosion led the government to enact 23 new taxes in the first 30 years of Medicare. (See Ron Hamoway, “The Genesis and Development of Medicare,” in Roger Feldman, ed., American Health Care, Independent Institute, 2000, pp. 15-86). The Obama administration’s claim that a government takeover of healthcare will somehow magically reduce costs is not to be taken seriously. Government never, ever, reduces the cost of doing anything.

All government-run healthcare monopolies, whether they are in Canada, the UK, or Cuba, experience an explosion of both cost and demand — since healthcare is “free.” Socialized healthcare is not really free, of course; the true cost is merely hidden, since it is paid for by taxes.

Whenever anything has a zero explicit price associated with it, consumer demand will increase substantially, and healthcare is no exception. At the same time, bureaucratic bungling will guarantee gross inefficiencies that will get worse and worse each year. As costs get out of control and begin to embarrass those who have promised all Americans a free healthcare lunch, the politicians will do what all governments do and impose price controls, probably under some euphemism such as “global budget controls.”

1. These astronomical prices and will force many to have to live a lower quality of life

Because the cost of health care will be eventually become so inflated in taxes and more expensive than it was even within the private sector, citizens will be forced to have to pay so much more that they will become impoverished and have a lower quality of life than before universal health care was implemented

We need to avoid universal health care because it violates’ citizens right to liberty to choose on account that the private sector collapses. This violation is not just because we now are not able to choose the most correct path and we cannot achieve justice. Therefore, we need to uphold citizens rights in order to achieve Justice. Thus, I negate.