I negate

I value morality, implied by ought in the resolution.

First, humans are born with their bodies as their possessions

The possessions of human beings are theirs to keep and determine what to do with. Mack explains:

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&pdftype=1&fid=6819892&jid=SOY&volumeId=27&issueId=01&aid=6819884

**The signature natural right** of any rights-oriented classical liberalism is the right of self-ownership. This **is the original, nonacquired right of each individual to do as she sees fit with that which comprises her own person** **(e.g., her bodily parts, her mental faculties, her energy, and her skills).** Thus, my defense of the inclusion of a natural right of property within a plausible rights-oriented classical liberalism is a defense of affirming this natural right along with the natural right of self-ownership. I shall, in fact, maintain that we have the same good reasons for ascribing to each person a natural right of property as we have for ascribing to each person the natural right of self-ownership.

This control stems from one’s ability to think rationally and control his actions thus allowing her to govern herself as well as his natural dignity, giving his body worth to his inherently. This is furthered by the minimalist state. Nozick:

Individual Autonomy and State Involvement in Health Care by Thomas Rice. Journal of Medical Ethics , Vol. 27, No. 4 (Aug., 2001), pp. 240-244

**The minimalist state treats us as inviolate individuals, who may not be used in certain ways by others as means or tools or instruments or resources**; it treats us as persons having individual rights with the dignity this constitutes**. Treating us with respect by respecting our rights, it allows us ... to choose our life and to realize our ends and our conception of ourselves, insofar as we can, aided by the voluntary cooperation of other individuals possessing the same dignity.** How dare any state or group of individuals do more. Or less."1

Second, one may only gain and lose property based on agreement with others, where both agree to the exchange.

Nozick2 writes:

<http://vault.hanover.edu/~ahrens/texts/Nozick%20Anarchy%20State%20Utopia%20excerpt.pdf>

**The subject of justice in holdings consists of three major topics.** **The first is the original acquisition of holdings**, the appropriation of unheld things. **This includes the issues of how unheld things may come to be held,** the process, or processes, by which unheld things may come to be held**, the things that may come to be held by these processes, the extent of what comes to be held by a particular process,** and so on.

We shall refer to the complicated truth about this topic, which we shall not formulate here, as the principle of justice in acquisition. **The second topic concerns the transfer of holdings from one person to another.** By what processes may a person transfer holdings to another? How may a person acquire a holding from another who holds it? **Under this topic come general descriptions of voluntary exchange, and gift and (on the other hand) fraud, as well as reference to particular conventional details fixed upon in a given society. The complicated truth about this subject (with placeholders for conventional details) we shall call the principle of justice in transfer.** (And we shall suppose it also includes principles governing how a person may divest himself of a holding, passing it into an unheld state.)

One cannot force another to give up property without his voluntary permission.

Thus, no actors, including states, may take from another without permission:

Nozick3 writes:

**Taxation of earnings from labor is on a par with forced labor.** Some persons find this claim obviously true: **taking the earnings of n hours labor is like taking n hours from the person; it is like forcing the person to work n hours for another's purpose.** Others find the claim absurd. But even these, if they object to forced labor, would oppose forcing unemployed hippies to work for the benefit of the needy. And they would also object to forcing each person to work five extra hours each week for the benefit of the needy. But a system that takes five hours' wages in taxes does not seem to them like one that forces someone to work five hours, since it offers the person forced a wider range of choice in activities than does taxation in kind with the particular labor specified. (But we can imagine a gradation of systems of forced labor, from one that specifies a particular activity, to one that gives a choice among two activities, to ... ; and so on up.)….

**The man who chooses to work longer to gain an income more than sufficient for his basic needs prefers some extra goods or services to the leisure and activities he could perform during the possible nonworking hours; whereas the man who chooses not to work the extra time prefers the leisure activities to the extra goods or services he could acquire by working more. Given this,** if **it would be illegitimate for a tax system to seize some of a man's leisure (forced labor) for the purpose of serving the needy,** how can it be legitimate for a tax system to seize some of a man's goods for that purpose? Why should we treat the man whose happiness requires certain material goods or services differently from the man whose preferences and desires make such goods unnecessary for his happiness? Why should the man who prefers seeing a movie (and who has to earn money for a ticket) be open to the required call to aid the needy, while the person who prefers looking at a sunset (and hence need earn no extra money) is not? Indeed, isn't it surprising that redistributionists choose to ignore the man whose pleasures are so easily attainable without extra labor, while adding yet another burden to the poor unfortunate who must work for his pleasures? If anything, one would have expected the reverse. Why is the person with the nonmaterial or nonconsumption desire allowed to proceed unimpeded to his most favored feasible alternative, whereas the man whose pleasures or desires involve material things and who must work for extra money (thereby serving whomever considers his activities valuable enough to pay him) is constrained in what he can realize? ...

Nozick furthers:

Why not similarly, hold that some persons have to bear some costs that benefit other persons more, for the sake of the overall social good? But **there is no social entity with a good that undergoes some sacrifice for its own good. There are only** individual people, **different individual people, with their own individual lives. Using one of these people for the benefit of others, uses him and benefits the others.** Nothing more. What happens is that something is done to him for the sake of others. Talk of an overall social good covers this up. (Intentionally?) **To use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has. He does not get some over balancing good from his sacrifice, and no one is entitled to force this upon him least of all a state or government that claims his allegiance** (as other individuals do not) and that therefore scrupulously must be neutral between its citizens.

Thus the standard is limiting involuntary property seizure.

My thesis and sole contention is that universalized health care seizes property involuntary through taxes.

The government requires tax collection and re-administers it to health care at large. Rice writes:

**Individual Autonomy and State Involvement in Health Care** by Thomas Rice

*Journal of Medical Ethics* , Vol. 27, No. 4 (Aug., 2001), pp. 240-244

**Government has the power to influence any number of aspects of health care strongly.** It can, for instance, control the number of providers as well as the kinds of services they deliver; set prices and the types (and even quality) of services that can be provided, particularly when public resources are involved; and have a strong influence on the introduction and diffusion of new products and technologies**. One of the most important roles of government is the collecting of taxes, using the revenues to support further regulation of the sector, as well as to finance the distribution of services to those it deems most fit to receive them**-**most notably the poor**, the elderly and veterans.

However, the rich can already afford healthcare, offering them no incentive to want to participate in this program wherein they pay more than they receive back. Even if some people want to, not everyone will. Because not everyone is willing to participate in the universal coverage, it is immoral to put it into action.

Thus either you exclude those who don’t wish to participate, making the plan no longer universal, or you force them to join the plan, making it immoral.

Thus you negate.

FRONTLINES

**A/T People already are in the community voluntarily**

1. People can’t always leave due to financial and other barriers so it isn’t always voluntary.
2. Just because they are in this community doesn’t mean they would prefer a more moral one. If the community were to be improved and available, they would choose that one instead.
3. Cross apply Nozick 4, that communities aren’t entities of themselves just made up of people so the society should always try to be as moral as it can based on the desires of the people that create it.

**A/T No taxes is bad**

1. The US isn’t the perfect moral society but we can MINIMIZE violations. Solving for violations from healthcare brings it closer to the perfect state.
2. People could still choose to have certain taxes. Only taxes that people don’t agree to violate.
3. Taxes wouldn’t be needed if the government were smaller and didn’t have as systems that could lead to violations

**A/T Some jobs pay more**

1. The goal of the NC framework is to solve for what each is due based on their work. Since possession isn’t a moral distinguishable difference, cross apply Nozik 3, that it is only immoral to turn people into slaves by confiscating their possession. Involuntary use of body is the violation
2. It is empirically accepted that people that have higher paying jobs usually work more hours at that job and to get them. So they have what they deserve.

**A/T Government will become paralyzed and useless**

Government’s priority should always be taking a moral and legitimate course of action over just *taking* action. Also, TURN; not letting the government nationalize health care encourages the government to develop more specific goals that are both more efficient and moral.

**A/T This isn’t a good enough link into the standard**

1. The redistribution itself is invalid as it doesn’t give everyone the same benefit based on how much they give in so even if a lot of people will agree, its still not coherent with the framework
2. Even with the option to not have healthcare, the requirement to pay taxes still creates the violation

**A/T Everyone will want healthcare**

**AT – universalizing health care makes it cheaper.**

The impact is negligible. The aff is not addressing a TON of the really really poor people who won’t get access. You can make health care a little cheaper for the middle and upper classes by nationalizing it but it doesn’t help the vast majority of the incredibly impoverished.

Also, TURN; when you nationalize an industry the demand for it may be greater in which case prices actually go up. For example, the oil crisis a few decades ago—prices went way up as demand went up.

The round is already over you’re going to vote negative on three different layers.

The first layer is the basic rights issue. The aff does not prove that health care is a necessary part of basic rights. He has to prove why universalized health care is the SOLE thing that’s absolutely necessary and not any other form of aid including normal health care or just ANY other form of aid and he doesn’t prove this His entire case is based on this his case falls through right here because he’s not showing us why universalized health care is the sole thing we need to make the world awesome and amazing as opposed to some other form of aid he doesn’t address this.

Second layer is the framework debate he says that social contract is true because a random card in his contentions said so.

He responds to my ca

Third is the contention first extend my turn he doesn’t respond to the turn on the third contention saying that nat. health care increases cost extend that he’s increasing cost and so he’s causing more harm less people will be able to afford stuff this takes out C1 and other points also because if nobody can afford it due to increasing prices then even more peoplewill die but next extend my point saying that the impact of the aff is so negli