

Consider is starving.
such action is
considered

[Economics](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Consider the following case. Jim was saving his money for his healthcare, but on his 40th birthday, he decided to use all his life savings on a new Corvette. Six months later he realizes that his poor lifestyle choices have resulted in him in having a series of health problems: emphysema, diabetes, and kidney failure.

Due to these health conditions, he now needs chronic care for the rest of his life. There are two possible healthcare solutions for Jim. The first solution is to put him in a universal healthcare system where the government will pay his medical bills.

However, even though his medical needs will be met, he will not be treated with the latest and greatest medical technology. The second option would be to place Jim in a pay-for-service system where he can pay for his medical treatments, but the service will not treat him until he pays. So which solution would be the best for Jim? Is health care a right? According to Peikoff, health care is not a right. Merely being existed in this world does not grant us the right to healthcare. It is only a right to healthcare if one can pay for it. From the American viewpoint, the only rights we have are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

They are considered a right because they require actions and efforts and the results of one's actions are for them to keep. One does not have a right to the other people's property just simply because one needs it or wants it. For example, a homeless man can't steal food from others or commit crimes simply because he is starving. Such action is considered as violating people's right and property. However, it is permissible when the others are voluntary

agree to share their products. It is evident that the homeless man can't afford his health care. According to Peikoff, it is morally wrong for him to rely on the government for his health care because to pay his healthcare, the government gets its money from the citizens through taxation. The homeless man did not provide any action or effort for him to receive his rights to healthcare.

His needs to healthcare simply show that it is the others' responsibilities to provide him with health care. This contradicts the principles of liberty. Peikoff states those who can't afford their healthcare have to rely on charity. One of the significant values in America is the equality of opportunities hence it should be protected. Healthcare plays a part in protecting the equality of opportunities, therefore, according to Bradley, healthcare should be a right.

Healthcare is also necessary for the enjoyment of our basic negative rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. An individual who is not capable of providing themselves the basic needs, such as healthcare, to succeed in life will not have the equal opportunity to pursue their life goals and happiness. Therefore, in order to protect our negative rights, we sometimes require the positive action from others. We all have individual goals and life plans, and most of our goals can become tangible when we are healthy.

However, since we live in an imperfect world, sometimes our journey may have setbacks. Illness can be one of them. It can restrict our opportunities and life plans. Healthcare, therefore, helps ensure that our setbacks can be eliminated to ensure that we have at least the minimum level of opportunities to succeed.

Not all of us have to luxury to make sure that our liberty is protected therefore some have greater needs from the government. Considering the case above, Peikoff would place Jim in a pay-for-service system because Jim's poor life choices resulted in him having those health issues. He is responsible for his actions and the result of his actions. It would be immoral if the government were to pay for his medical treatments. It would also be unjust for the citizens to pay for someone else's action. Just because he is sick and needs help with medical treatment, he doesn't have the right to someone else's property.

So Peikoff would suggest Jim pay for his treatment along with charity help. As for Bradley, he would place Jim in a universal healthcare system because treating Jim by providing him with his medical needs that will help restore him as close as possible to his normal function. Even though Jim has made poor choices in his life, he still has the right to liberty that must be protected by the government.

For Jim to pursue his life plans, he must be healthy, and therefore it is morally right for the government to pay for his medical treatments. Peikoff's solution to the case can be viewed as more successful than Bradley's because Jim should be responsible for his action. Every individual is entitled to the basic rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and it is that individual's responsibility to protect those rights from others. One can't depend on others to fulfill their needs or happiness.

When Bradley's response to the case by saying that the government should pay for Jim's medical treatment just for him to be able to pursue his life plans

again, one could consider his response misleading. If the government is responsible for making sure that citizens are at least at the minimum level of opportunity to succeed in society, then one could ask why do we still have homeless people in our society? They are clearly under the minimum level of opportunity to succeed. I would agree with Peikoff's solution to the case and place Jim in a pay-for-service system because he should be responsible for the consequences of his action. He had the option of saving his money for his medical needs, but instead, he decided that a new Corvette is more important than his health. It is not fair for the people who have worked hard to earn money and are being forced through taxation to pay for Jim's healthcare.

It is unfortunate that Jim is sick, but everyone is responsible for their health, and it is our responsibilities to find a way to pay for own health care.