**Affirmative**

I affirm.

The resolution does not specify a single type of universal health care system, therefore, I do not have to defend a single type, and rather, I defend a general principle.

I value morality because the word ‘ought’ implies whether or not the action is moral.

My value criterion will be Consequentialism. Respecting all humans equally mandates that we look at Consequentialism.

|  |
| --- |
| Cummiskey[[1]](#footnote-1), David. Kantian Consequentialism. Published by Oxford University Press. 1996. (p.142).  If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value (GMM 436), but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others (chapters 5 and 7). The concept of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one may sacrifice some to save many. |

Furthermore, all ethical theories should avoid death because we can’t have a future without life.

|  |
| --- |
| Bostrom, Nick Bostrom “The Concept of Existential Risk” Oxford Martin School and Faculty of Philosophy <http://www.existentialrisk.com/concept.pdf> (2011)  **Continuity is as important to our commitment to the project of the future of humanity** as it is to our commitment to the projects of our own personal futures.  **Just as the shape of my whole life, and its connection with my present and past, have an interest that goes beyond that of any isolated experience, so too the shape of human history over an extended period of the future,** and its connection with the human present and past, have an interest that goes beyond that of the (total or average) quality of life of a population- at-a-time, considered in isolation from how it got that way. **We owe**, I think, **some loyalty to this project of the human future.** We also owe it a respect that we would owe it even if we were not of the human race ourselves, but beings from another planet who had some understanding of it.(28: 472-473)\ |

I contend that the United States should provide universal health care to its citizens.

Contention 1: The right to health care improves the rights of citizens.

Subpoint A: Health care saves lives

|  |
| --- |
| **First, in 2009, the Harvard Medical School Study affirmed that lack of Universal Health Care leads to nearly 45 thousand deaths in the United States per year. The same study found that people without health insurance have a 40 percent higher risk of death compared to those with health insurance. In 2012, Kim Bailey showed that 3 Americans die each hour because of lack of health insurance and that the number of people who died prematurely due to lack of health insurance rose by more than 25 percent from 2000 to 2010. Next, research by Benjamin Sommers, Katherine Baicker, Arnold Epstein of the New England Journal of Medicine in 2012 showed that expansion of health care in US counties decreased the death rate by 16 percent. We can conclude that guaranteeing Universal Health Care would prevent tens of thousands of deaths per year** |

The impact of this is that the health care saves lives.

Furthermore, the Health care improves US democracy, which increases the rights and liberties of its citizens.

|  |
| --- |
| Puneet Sandhu, (J.D., U. California, Berkeley School of Law), CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW, Aug. 2007, 1156-1157. (RICH1384 )  **The political ground for a right to health care is that it is instrumental for effective citizenship and the exercise of other fundamental rights**. **Effective citizenship requires not only civil rights like voting and freedom of speech, but also the satisfaction of basic needs. Ill health may compromise or eradicate a person's liberty, autonomy, and exercise of the franchise. Healthy citizens are more likely to engage in, and thus contribute to, a robust democratic process.** Put more broadly, **civil and political rights and social rights are not distinct, but interdependent; the exercise of civil and political rights depends on the fulfillment of social rights. Essentially, by producing health, a right to health care promotes active participation in society by the greatest number of citizens.** |

Subpoint B: The government has an obligation to protect individual rights.

|  |
| --- |
| George Kateb, political theorist, Princeton, THE INNER OCEAN, 1992, p.120. (PDNSS50245)  The agreement, **the social contract, is made** and sustained **for the sake of individual rights.** We do not exist for each other; that truly means that we all do not exist for the sake of a mystique. **We owe each other respect, with all the duties attaching to such respect. If one gives up everything, it is not for the people, but for the rights of other individuals,** including the unborn. |

Therefore, the government has to offer health care to its citizens since it is a fundamental right. In addition, we have to respect and sacrifice certain things for the rights of other individuals.

Subpoint C: Offering Health Care means Better Health for Citizens

|  |
| --- |
| Norman Daniels, (Prof., Ethics, Harvard School of Public Health), JUST HEALTH: MEETING HEALTH NEEDS FAIRLY, 2008, 12. (RICH1446 )  We have generally accepted the idea that **modern medicine's magic bullets have made billions of people in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries live the longest and healthiest lives in human history.** This focus on **medicine and the inspiring myths that surround it is constantly reinforced in our culture by the mass media and by the professional and business interests that are dependent on the medical sector.** |

By providing universal health care to its citizens, we increase the life expectancy and the quality of life for our citizens.

Subpoint D: The protection of human rights justifies any coercion, including war.

|  |
| --- |
| Frank van Dun, Senior Lecturer of Philosophy of Law at the University of Maastricht, JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN STUDIES, Fall 2001, p. http://www.mises.org/journals/jls/15\_4/15\_4\_1.pdf. (PDNSS532)  Even in the richest states, **budgetary limitations often lead to sharp confrontations between pressure groups** and **vested interests in various** social, economic, and cultural **domains**. Using the term “human rights” to describe one’s interests does not change this fact of real-world limits. Rather, it creates the risk of inflating political rhetoric and passion, now that the flag of human rights flies over almost the whole arena of government policy. Each policy option can be interpreted at one and the same time as both a measure to further some human right and as an indication of the neglect or even violation of any number of other human rights. Therefore, there is at all times unlimited room for weighing various “rights” and for setting and revising priorities. The political and administrative bodies to which this weighing of rights has been entrusted or that have succeeded in monopolising it have ample opportunities for expanding their power and influence. Nothing remains of the old idea that a right is worthy of respect in all circumstances except, perhaps, the most extreme emergency. The human rights of the UD are not and cannot be absolute, even in the most normal of circumstances��"unless anything short of Utopia should count as an emergency. By their very nature, they are susceptible to continuous weighing, negotiation, and qualification. They are a politician’s delight, for **every human right translates into “a right to more government intervention on its behalf.”** This is no less true for the ghosts of natural rights that linger in the first half of the UD than for the economic, social, and cultural “rights” in the rest of it. Of course, we should not confuse the ghost and the real thing. For example , Article 2 of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen clearly states what a person’s natural rights are: liberty, property, freedom from arbitrary arrest, and resistance to oppression. **In the UD**, on the other hand, **a person is not informed that his life, liberty, security of person, and property are his fundamental rights. He is told only that he has the right to life, liberty, and security of person (Art. 3) and property** (Art. 17). He should not expect more. For it is obviously inconsistent to claim that everyone is entitled to the full realisation of the economic, social, and cultural “rights” and at the same time to claim that any person’s fundamental rights are his life, liberty, and property. The administration of the former requires the concentration of massive coercive powers of taxation and regulation in the hands of the state, and so must presuppose that a person’s life, liberty, and property are not his rights. **However, this inconsistency evaporates once we realise that the UD’s “rights to life, liberty, property” do not specify to whose life, liberty, or property a person has a right. It rules out the possibility that he has an exclusive right to his own life, liberty, or property, but it does not rule out that some or all others have an equal, or perhaps more pressing, claim on those things in order to enable them, say, to enjoy the arts or a paid holiday. Thus, a person’s life, liberty, and property are thrown upon the enormous heap of desirable scarce resources to which all people are said to have a right. As such, they, too, end up in the scales with which political authorities, administrators, and experts are supposed to weigh the ingredients for their favoured policy-mix.** Here we catch our first glimpse of the shadow of Hobbes behind the contemporary notion of human rights: the person who believes he has “a right to everything” is likely to find out that there is no thing that is his right. A Hobbesian Predicament The following thought experiment will bring out the Hobbesian character of the UD’s conception of human rights. **Imagine two people, the only survivors of a shipwreck, who find refuge on a small deserted island. They have with them nothing but their human rights, in particular their “right to work” and all that it entails according to Articles 23, 24, and 25 of the UD**. One can imagine what will happen if they sit there insisting on their “right” of being employed by the other at a just and favourable wage, or to receive an unemployment compensation high enough to allow them an existence worthy of their dignity. **One can** also **imagine what will happen if, instead of just sitting there, they attempt to enforce their human rights against one another:** their own version of Hobbes’s war of all against all.Finally, one can easily **imagine what would happen if one of them won that war: Hobbes’s solution for the incompatibility of their “rights” would emerge. The winner could then arrange for himself a nice unemployment compensation (e.g., a tax on an-other’s labour) to match his new-found dignity as a ruler, and keep the other man quiet by leaving him as much as is consistent with “the organization and the resources of their state.” Indeed, starvation, universal war, and the Leviathan State are the only possible outcomes under a regime of human rights��"and only the latter outcome is compatible with survival. Imagining a two-person situation makes this conclusion clear, but its validity does not depend on the numbers. Large numbers only serve to obscure the logic of the situation. the burden of taxation and regulation just below the threshold of revolt.** |

Therefore, the government’s actions in providing human rights justify any coercive action, including taxes.

Contention 2: Bioterrorism is on the rise, and UHC helps eliminate it.

Burnbull W, Abhayaratne P. 2002 WMD Terrorism Chronology: Incidents Involving Sub-national Actors and Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Materials. Monterey, Calif: Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies; 003. Available at: http://www.cns.miis.edu/pubs/reports/pdfs/cbrnk.pdf. July 20, 2012

Bioterrorist incidents have increased markedly since 1985, with two peaks in 1998 and 2001. The 1998 peak followed publicity of the anthrax threat posed by Larry Wayne Harris; the 2001 peak followed the September through October anthrax mailings. Successfully executed attacks have been few but high in impact; the 1984 Rajneesh Salmonella attack resulted in 751 cases of infection; the 2001 anthrax mailings resulted in 22 cases of infection, five deaths, and approximately 10,000 individuals being offered post exposure prophylaxis. The vast majority of incidents (at least 98% during 2000–2001) have been Medical Aspects of Biological Warfare hoaxes, which have nonetheless produced considerable social disruption.

Sub Point A) A biological attack is closer than it seems

Reality check to Bioterrorism

Dave Gaubatz of the American Thinker and with 15 years as a U.S. Federal Agent, a U.S. State Department Arabic linguist, and the first civilian Federal Agent deployed into Iraq at the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003.  reports that “Terrorist sleeper cells are located primarily in North Carolina, Michigan, and Canada. The "sleepers" are prepared to conduct bioterrorist attacks within the U.S., and nuclear material is available to them. "Prepared" in this instance indicates they have the necessary tools to carry our their attacks and are prepared to die.”

(Recent threats July 23 2012 AP/Yahoo online news source)

Syria says will use chemical weapons if attacked

The Syrian regime threatened Monday to use its chemical and biological weapons in case of a foreign attack, in its first ever acknowledgement that it possesses weapons of mass destruction.

The impact of this is: Biochemical warfare threatens all aspects of life

Jane Evans Department of Military Strategic Studies U.S. Air Force Academy, Global Security Studies, Spring 2010, Volume l, Issue 1, p102, <http://globalsecuritystudies.com/Evans%20PANDEMICS.pdf>, July 20, 2012

It is important to note that the result of a naturally spreading disease and something like bioterrorism is one and the same. Failure to prevent a biological weapons attack results in the same outcome – infection of the population – and requires the same solution. Preparation for widespread disease should therefore be a key focus of national security. More indirect threats to national security include “the health of the armed forces and, most significantly, to the social, economic, and political stability of certain key regions – especially Russia – that also challenge American security” In this sense, diseases lower the ability of the State Department or the Department of Defense to adequately provide international security to the United States. Both internal and external national security is threatened by the spread of disease.

With Universal Health care, we then prevent our citizens from a deadly attack by offering medical services.

Frontlines

**Decreases Privatization**

Perm: We can have both private health care companies and a universal health care system. A universal health care system does not exclude private health care companies can exist. Furthermore, a government cannot and will not enact a law to make private health care companies from going out of business.

**Health care is not a right**

Just because a right is not stated in the Constitution does not mean that is not a right. Rights do not depend on the Constitution.

|  |
| --- |
| Jennifer Fahnestock, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, RENEGOTIATING THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: HEALTHCARE AS A NATURAL RIGHT  **A human right**, the existence of which derives from principles of natural law, **is based in the dignity and worth of the human being**. Thus, **the right exists regardless of whether** positive **law has given it expression**; **a human right not recognized by positive law is a failure in the law, not an absence of the right**. **A just government is compelled to recognize the rights of its citizens**. [n57](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344218454299&returnToKey=20_T15267226551&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.274785.0522242862#n57)  Under this reasoning, **a natural right to healthcare exists regardless of whether it has been established by the Constitution**. **Because of its natural existence, the government must give the right due recognition.** |

**Law doesn’t recognize health care**

|  |
| --- |
| Jennifer Fahnestock, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, RENEGOTIATING THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: HEALTHCARE AS A NATURAL RIGHT  **A human right**, the existence of which derives from principles of natural law, **is based in the dignity and worth of the human being**. Thus, **the right exists regardless of whether** positive **law has given it expression**; **a human right not recognized by positive law is a failure in the law, not an absence of the right**. **A just government is compelled to recognize the rights of its citizens**. [n57](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344218454299&returnToKey=20_T15267226551&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.274785.0522242862#n57)  Under this reasoning, **a natural right to healthcare exists regardless of whether it has been established by the Constitution**. **Because of its natural existence, the government must give the right due recognition.** |
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