Reasons to presume affirmative and skep affirms

v=m as per ought

meta-standard is maximizing happiness (mostly analytics)

## The inefficiency in the current American health care system drives up costs and limits access to quality services.

**Emanuel and Fuchs 1[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The American health . . . for all Americans.

Thus the standard is reducing inefficiencies in the current health care system.

Aff must run plans as per def of “guarantee”, neither debater can fiat solvency, neg turns must show how squo doesn’t bite or have a policy-implementable alt with solvency (all logical reasons; no theory)

## With this in mind, THE PLAN TEXT: The United States will guarantee universal health care by implementing a voucher system. I reserve the right to clarify. All disadvantages must be specific to the advocacy. Emanuel & Fuchs clarify the plan,

## This is E&F 2:

The Universal Healthcare . . . health care expenditures.

I contend that a voucher system solves for the inefficiencies in the status quo.

## 1. The plan creates substantial administrative savings.

## E&F 3

Eliminating the employer . . . still more efficiency

## 2. The plan controls costs by limiting spending to revenue raised.

## E&F 4

Another major advantage . . . is worth it.

## 3. The plan ensures efficiency by only covering efficient innovations.

## E&F 5

Fourth, the independent . . . by health plans.

## 4. The plan leads to better, more efficient treatment.

## E&F 6

Second, competition among . . . adds little benefit.

Thus, I affirm.
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