

Laws that protect  
citizens from  
themselves are not  
justified essay  
sample



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Introduction: As Patrick Henry once said, “ I know not what other course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death.” So, when government makes laws that breach our individualism, our privacy, and our liberty, that’s when they’ve gone too far.

Value: My value, which I am calling upon, is liberty. With liberty we can span on to freedom, individualism, and privacy.

Resolve: In today’s round I will firmly negating the resolve which states laws that protect citizens’ from themselves are justified. Criteria: The best criterion for this debate is liberated order, which is Accountability for consequences of liberties.

Definitions: All definitions taken from the Webster’s online dictionary.

Liberty: Freedom Privacy: Being free from any unauthorized intrusion in ones life.

Individualism: The belief that the interests of the individual out to supercede the interests of the group or society.

Freedom: the relative absence of perceived external restraints on individual behavior.

Moving on to my first contention, which states: The government has gone too far in breaching the system. Taking control of our lives is wrong. The proceedings of an individual supercede the interests of the group. In the example of euthanasia, which in Greek means (good death), “ Whose life is it any way”. It is everyone’s own life to live and die as they please. This is not

legal because it is considered murder. On Mar. 7 1996, the 9th US circuit court ruled by an 8-3 majority that the law that criminalized physician assisted suicide violates the protection clause in the 14th amendment.

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

They stated “ when patients are no longer able to pursue liberty or happiness and do not wish to pursue life, that state’s interest in forcing them to remain alive is less compelling”. A mentally competent, terminally ill adult, having lived nearly the full measure of his life, has a strong liberty interest in choosing a dignified and humane death rather than being reduced to a child like state of helplessness, diapered, sedated, and incompetent. ” The whole of the Bill of Rights is a declaration of the right of the people at large or considered as individuals”|It establishes some right of the individual as unalienable and which consequently, no majority has a right to deprive them of.” Albert Gallatin. It may be considered murder, but ending a life of pain and suffering of ones own will is achieving the greater happiness.

This leads me to my second contention, which states: A quote by Ronald Reagan, “ Government exists to protect us from each other. Where government has gone beyond its limits is in deciding to protect us from ourselves.” People create laws by giving up rights. We make the laws to <https://assignbuster.com/laws-that-protect-citizens-from-themselves-are-not-justified-essay-sample/>

protect ourselves from each other. Jeremy Bentham a philosopher states the greatest good for the greatest number. He also says, "The course of action that makes one person happy is likely to produce unhappiness for someone else. Because each person is allowed to determine his/her own happiness, there is no objective standard for resolving the conflicts that inevitably occur." There is no objective standard for resolving the conflicts. My choice is my choice. NO matter what, it is always going to make someone unhappy, but just because they don't agree with me, should that give them control and accountability of my life. I believe not.

Which leads me to my third and final contention: Accountability for our actions. The government says at age 16 I'm responsible enough to drive my car. If the government says I'm responsible enough to drive my car, I should be responsible enough to choose whether or not to wear my seat belt. They say you're accountable to choose the choice but make a law so you have to anyway. In the case of right to bear arms. They breach the 2nd amendment. A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

The government is being hypocritical in both cases. They give us an age limit for accountability to own a gun. But, they turn around and give us all the rules, it's almost like you don't even own the gun at all. Thomas Jefferson said, "Laws that forbid the carrying of arms" disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes" Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to

encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man my be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.”