Healthcare Moral

Version 1 (Arguments adapted from Crisp, 2017):

* + Some countries use a system for healthcare that guarantees certain minimum standards and availabilities of care to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay. This is generally called Universal Health Care (UHC). However, simply guaranteeing UHC through law does nothing to ensure that citizens receive adequate care. Therefore, the important question arises – who will pay for UHC? The clear answer is the U.S. government.
  + The U.S. government has long promised Americans life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is impossible to reach these guaranteed rights however, unless one is in good health.
  + Additionally, while individual health is the responsibility of every citizen, it is almost an inevitability that most normal Americans will experience an injury or illness that cannot be self-solved, whether due to a lack of knowledge and skill, or due to incapacitation resulting from the injury or illness itself.
  + Good health is also unique in that it has no equivalent, if you break your iPhone, you can choose to not replace it, but generally there is no alternative to fixing a broken arm or receiving chemotherapy for cancer.
  + Furthermore, healthcare today is so complex and expensive that even hard-working Americans, with full-time jobs and good savings, not just poor people, can be excluded from access to necessary healthcare. Significant healthcare costs beyond what the average American can pay could happen to anyone, at any time.
  + Considering that America is seen by many as the land of opportunity, American citizens should demand UHC from their government. That way, everyone has access to a sufficient level of healthcare, helping to enable all Americans to pursue life, liberty, and happiness.

Version 2:

* Some countries use a system for healthcare that guarantees certain minimum standards and availabilities of care to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay. This is generally called Universal Health Care (UHC). However, simply guaranteeing UHC through law does nothing to ensure that citizens receive adequate care. Therefore, the important question arises – who will pay for UHC? The clear answer is the U.S. government.
* It is obvious that this is the case given that the primary responsibility of the U.S. government is taking care of its citizens. The U.S. government runs the risk of being seen as immoral if it cannot fulfil this basic obligation.
* There is huge inequality and suffering with regards to healthcare as well – Citizens with good paying jobs have much easier access to healthcare, as compared to retirees, those that are unemployed, or dependents (children or the disabled).
* However, even hard working Americans can have a health emergency that goes far beyond what the average person has the ability to pay.
* America is the land of equality and freedom! How cruel is it that something such as healthcare, which is a basic requirement for life, can be so impossible for normal American citizens to get access to.
* Giving American citizens access to UHC is far from a handout – ‘going without’ material goods like cars, cell phones, etc. means you perhaps have less fun than you would like, but ‘going without’ needed healthcare leads to increased pain and suffering; If the U.S. government can alleviate this pain and suffering, it is morally obligated to do so.
* If the U.S. government wants to be seen as a morally upright force for good in the world, they are ethically obliged to ensure that all Americans have access to UHC.

Healthcare Non-moral

Version 1 (some arguments adapted from Bloom 2018):

* Some countries use a system for healthcare that guarantees certain minimum standards and availabilities of care to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay. This is generally called Universal Health Care (UHC). However, simply guaranteeing UHC through law does nothing to ensure that citizens receive adequate care. Therefore, the important question arises – who will pay for UHC? The clear answer is the U.S. government.
* The U.S. government already spends a significant amount of GDP on healthcare, totaling more than 18.3% in 2022. This is in comparison to some of our peers with UHC, such as Canada (12.2%) and Japan (11%). Surprisingly, our estimated lifespans are shorter (78.5 years, vs 82.6 and 84.45, for Canada and Japan)!
* Increased coverage of healthcare services allows for all American citizens to benefit from population-level impact changes on many current healthcare crisis today. UHC has been shown to reduce catastrophic healthcare costs, lower maternal and infant mortality, and reduce health disparities across regional and socioeconomic barriers.
* The effects of a small-scale increase of healthcare access, through statewide Medicaid expansion have already been seen. Those who have benefited from Medicaid expansion had eliminated catastrophic medical costs, lower medical debt, reduced depression, and improved perception of their own health status, compared to those who did not benefit from Medicaid expansion.
* Considering that America has been spending more money to get worse outcomes, American citizens should demand UHC from their government. That way, everyone can benefit from an increased life-span, and an increased quality of life.

Healthcare Control

Version 1:

* Some countries use a system for healthcare that guarantees certain minimum standards and availabilities of care to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay. This is generally called Universal Health Care (UHC).

Capital Punishment Moral (Death Penalty Information Center Report on Racial Discrimination, 2020):

* In many countries, the legally authorized killing of someone is used as punishment for a crime. This is known as capital punishment, or alternatively, the death penalty. However, should capital punishment continue to be used in current day America?
* Many believe that the only concern should be whether capital punishment is moral, and if it is not, then it should no longer be used.
* There is a great deal of evidence indicating that capital punishment in America is indeed immoral and unfair. First, juries have been known to make mistakes, inflicting the death penalty on innocent people. To many people, executing an innocent is seen as extremely immoral, and the ‘justice’ achieved by correctly executing the guilty is not a worthwhile enough benefit for the huge ethical risk of killing an innocent.
* Additionally, there is an enormous risk of racial bias when looking at sentencing and placement on death row. Studies show that 42% of prisoners on death row are African American, yet only 12.5% of our population is black. Furthermore killers of Whites are sentenced to death at higher rates than killers of Blacks.
* The data is convincing, the death penalty is not a practical means of achieving justice. Society bears significant moral costs in doing so. The state-sanctioned murder of innocents and the clear racial bias in sentencing and execution is ethically unacceptable. America needs to move past the usage of capital punishment.

Capital Punishment Non-moral (Kaplan 2016)

* In many countries, the legally authorized killing of someone is used as punishment for a crime. This is known as capital punishment, or alternatively, the death penalty. However, should capital punishment continue to be used in current day America?
* Many believe that the only concern should be whether capital punishment makes economic sense, and if it is not, then it should no longer be used.
* There is a great deal of evidence indicating that capital punishment in America is indeed overly expensive and a waste of money. First, the total burden on our courts is grossly inflated, capital punishment cases result in over twice the number of hearings and court filings (20 and 65, as opposed to 10 and 29). Sentencing also takes significantly longer, with capital punishment cases taking almost 200 days more than comparable other cases. Our overloaded justice system cannot handle the artificially inflated burden of addressing these capital punishment cases.
* This increase in court burden also results in significantly greater direct costs to taxpayers, at an estimated $800,000 – $1,000,000 more per offender, as compared to the costs of life imprisonment. Additionally, the average cost of pursuing the death penalty continues to increase significantly, from approximately $1,100,000 in the 90’s, to over $1,700,000 today. It can be expected for this price to continue to rise, and significantly faster than the cost of life imprisonment, making capital punishment even more inefficient going forward.
* The data is convincing, the death penalty is not a practical means of achieving justice. Society bears significant economic costs in doing so. The significant increase in burden on both the courts and American taxpayers is economically unacceptable. America needs to move past the usage of capital punishment.

Capital Punishment Control

* In many countries, the legally authorized killing of someone is used as punishment for a crime. This is known as capital punishment, or alternatively, the death penalty. However, should capital punishment continue to be used in current day America?
* 24 states currently have the death penalty, while 23 states and DC have abolished the death penalty. Furthermore, 3 states have a current moratorium on the death penalty, and Attorney General Merrick Garland announced a current federal moratorium on the death penalty.
* Since 1976, more than 8,700 defendants have been sentenced to death, with more than 1,550 having been executed. Approximately 2,500 convicts are currently on death row today.

Music Moral