

Individual Freedom vs. Government Control

The United States has a long history with its struggle between individual freedom and government control, especially when it comes to healthcare. Some say universal healthcare-representing government-would put private practices out of business, limit people's options for care, and strain the government of its resources. Others say private insurance-representing individualism-would allow companies to reject coverage based upon medical history and drive prices up. Both sides have valid arguments. In this case, it's logical that a mix of both aspects would be key in solving this dilemma. Government control provides the foundation for stability, while individual freedom encourages the growth of the system.

With a hybrid model, healthcare would essentially be a right with privileges. This mandate would require insurers to sell a basic package to all citizens, providing welfare to all citizens. On top of that, if one desires supplemental coverage, one has the privilege of purchasing an additional premium coverage offered by insurers. Of course, a big issue that would come up would be funding. How does one fund such a big project, let alone is it even viable? In reality, there are multiple governments that embrace this model. For example, the Swiss model charges adults a set amount, while their children are covered at a fraction of the cost. And the Dutch model allows its citizens to apply healthcare allowance if their income is under a certain amount.

The case of healthcare proves that sometimes it's not the question of whether individual freedom or government control is more important. Both sides have their arguments, but sometimes reading between the lines and creating a compromise results in an even better position than before.