

Single-payer Universal Healthcare Negative

I negate the resolution. The United States ought to implement a single-payer universal healthcare system.

I offer a few definitions before I begin:

1. Healthcare: the organized provision of medical care to individuals or a community.
2. Implement: to put something into effect.
3. Single-payer: one entity that collects funds and pays for healthcare on behalf of an entire population.
4. Universal: of, affecting, or done by all people or things in the world or in a particular group; applicable to all cases.
5. Ought: used to indicate something that is probable.

Observation 1: Due to use of the word *ought* meaning to do something that is probable, the negative seeks to prove how it is not reasonable for the United States to have a single-payer healthcare system.

Observation 2: Every argument made must be topical to single-payer universal healthcare and the current status quo of the healthcare system.

My Value Premise is Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is the doctrine that actions are right if they are useful for the benefit of a majority. It is the United State job to maximize the welfare of society and one way to benefit a significant amount of people in society is by maintaining an adequate economy for all citizens. The United States is constantly trying to maximize the economy especially after COVID for its citizens. In order to achieve that one thing, they have to prioritize protecting the economy.

My Value Criterion is protecting the economy

It is the United State job to protect the economy at all costs. The resolution specifically using the term *ought* which implies that single-payer healthcare should be implemented only if it probable. It is not probable to have singer-payer universal healthcare if it destroys the economy which in return will hurt more people in the long run.

Contention 1: Allowing universal healthcare will increase the chances of an economic collapse. The economy is already in jeopardy due to inflation and the recession. According to Amadeo in 2022: If the U.S. economy were to collapse, you would likely lose access to credit. Banks would close. Demand would outstrip supply of food, gas, and other necessities. If the collapse affected local governments and utilities, then water and electricity might no longer be available. A U.S. economic collapse would create global

panic ... If you want to understand what life would look like during an economic collapse, think back to the Great Depression.

Sub Point A: Single Payer Healthcare will be very expensive.

According to Brownstein in 2019: "... a plan similar to what Warren and Senator Bernie Sanders are pushing would require \$34 trillion in additional federal spending over its first decade in operation. That's more than the federal government's total cost over the coming decade for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid *combined*..."

Sub Point B: Single Payer Healthcare crashing the economy would do a lot of harm.

According to Kimberley Amadeo in 2022: "If the U.S. economy were to collapse, you would likely lose access to credit. Banks would close. Demand would outstrip supply of food, gas, and other necessities. If the collapse affected local governments and utilities, then water and electricity might no longer be available. A U.S. economic collapse would create global panic". Also, according to Amy Gutman in 2014 [4]: "There has long been substantial evidence linking job loss to shorter lives and more health-related problems. ... in the year after men lost their jobs in mass layoffs, their chances of dying doubled...the heightened risk... still significantly higher 20 years later."

Sub Point C: Falling economy means falling health.

According to Gutman in 2014: Amy Gutman, Spring 2014, "Failing Economy, Failing Health", Harvard Public Health, HOW UNEMPLOYMENT MAKES US SICK There has long been substantial evidence linking job loss to shorter lives and more health-related problems. A 2009 study on the impact of the 1980s oil crisis and subsequent recession in Pennsylvania, published by economists Daniel Sullivan and Till von Wachter in the Quarterly Journal of Economics, found that in the year after men lost their jobs in mass layoffs, their chances of dying doubled. And though the heightened risk tapered off over the years, it was still significantly higher 20 years later. If such trends were sustained indefinitely, the authors wrote, it would mean a loss in life expectancy of 1–1.5 years for a worker displaced at age 40.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote for the negative.

Sources:

- 1.
2. <https://www.schwab.com/learn/story/market-perspective>
3. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/10/high-cost-warren-and-sanders-single-payer-plan/600166/>
4. <https://www.thebalance.com/u-s-economy-collapse-what-will-happen-how-to-prepare-3305690#:~:text=A%20U.S.%20economic%20collapse%20would,%2C%20euro%2C%20or%20even%20gold>
5. https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/magazine/magazine_article/failing-economy-failing-health/
6. <https://www.thebalancemoney.com/u-s-economy-collapse-what-will-happen-how-to-prepare-3305690#:~:text=A%20U.S.%20economic%20collapse%20would,%2C%20euro%2C%20or%20even%20gold>
7. <https://www.pasadenastarnews.com/2022/09/17/the-u-s-economy-is-being-pushed-to-the-brink/>

Side Note: All of these points and contentions are in the wonderful BDL September/October packet created by Coach Sasan. Please review his pack that was passed out to all students to read up on these topics if you decide to use this case. Please understand this still needs work and is just to help you all.