That selling human organs should be legal

1) Saves lives
More than 10,000 people in the UK currently need a transplant, and 1,000 people die every year while on the waiting list.[1] In fact, “An average of 18 people die each day waiting for transplants that can’t take place because of the shortage of donated organs.”[2] The number of organs needed exceeds the number available for transplants. These 1000 people that die could have been on the waitlist for years, because of lack of organs, or the blood type needed etc. This number is also not completely accurate because it excludes the figures for patients denied organ transplants because of habits.
If we were to allow the sale of organs, those willing to sell their organs would help save some, if not the majority of those 1000 patients!

2) Easier access to organs - available & affordable
Paying for donors, would guarantee a greater supply. With a greater supply for the demand, prices can be lowered. Therefore, organs would be both more easily available and affordable.
With an increase in supply, or a rightward/upward shift in the supply curve, prices, ceteris paribus, go down. [3]
In Iran, the sale of organs is illegal. It is the only place in the world like this. The number of deaths resulting from a shortage of organs is significantly less.

3) Incentive to give up organs
If people know they can get financial incentives for giving up their organs, they will be more likely to provide a supply. This may even help some people who are in need of finances.

4) Morality
Keeping the sale of organs illegal would mean that someone who engages in consensual, open commerce would go to jail and thus is punished for a victimless crime, instead of resources being used for “real” crimes, like murder. “Organ scarcity continues to prevail...inequitable therapeutic dispensation; escalating costs; trade; crime; and premature death.”[4] Millions of people are suffering, not because the organs are not available but because “morality” does not allow them to have access to the organs. Therefore, it’s immoral to legislate against the sale of organs.
In addition, our organs are our possessions and the property of the donors and as such, they...
In addition, our organs are our possessions and the property of the donors and as such, they should do with it what they wish, especially if it is for the cause of a “victim-less crime.” These donors would give permission if they wish to sell their organs, not be forced. 

How can we deny that someone not give up their possessions?

5) The government is not legitimate to make anything illegal.

Con needs to justify that the government has the right to make the sale of organs illegal.

Everyone is entitled to “freedom of choice.” If someone chooses to do drugs, it’s their decision. If someone chooses to sell their organs, it’s their decision. Why can the government stand in their way?

Con needs to prove that the government exists and that the pros of the actions they do outweigh the cons. Also, how can a government impose such a law, if morality is subjective?


---

**Blackflag (CON)**

My opponent has violated the integrity of this debate by plagiarizing his arguments from another debate, from debate.org (http://www.debate.org/debates/AAN-Tourney-This-house-would-legalize-the-sale-of-organs./3/comments/8/)

I request that all arguments made are negated, and 9space makes some new ones for the next round.

---

**Cross-Examination**

**Csareo!!!!:** Do you concede that your arguments were plagiarized from this offsite debate? (http://www.debate.org/debates/AAN-Tourney-This-house-would-legalize-the-sale-of-organs./3/comments/8/)

**9spaceking:** how do you know....

**9spaceking:** .....master spotter.

**Csareo!!!!:** Copy and paste
9spaceking: dammit....

9spaceking: so I need new points eh?

9spaceking: Can I include them here?

9spaceking: organs can help people who need organs

Csareo!!!!: This space is for asking questions

Csareo!!!!: Since you have no arguments, the case is negated.

9spaceking: eh okay. But you have BoP too. 😃

Csareo!!!!: I do? The person who makes the affirmative case has the BOP. That being you.

9spaceking: it's a normative resolution, thus I'm sure BoP is shared

Csareo!!!!: That simply isn't true, but I trust the judges to know the difference.

---

9spaceking (PRO)

Sorry about that plagiarism, I'll be adding new points now and trying to paraphrase because round one pretty much sums up all the possible arguments for this kind of debate.

Governments have the need to help people, and people have the right to give their selling human organs away. In addition black markets will go down because if people can sell human organs, it will obviously be legal, and since BM's organ quality are normally bad, the legalization would vastly improve the quality and quantity of human organs. In addition people need organs, people will die without them.

Thank you, thank you.

---

Blackflag (CON)

**Contention One: Fault in System**

Originally the selling of human organs was unregulated. There were reasons why this changed. The main problems stemmed from the supply, in relation to the demand. There were simply too many people, with too many problems, and not enough human organs to satisfy everyone. This led to most governments instituting the waiting list. Generally, one will go to the hospital, be diagnosed or in emergency, and the doctor will authorize moving you to the organ donor list.
Once you make it to the top of the list, you receive whatever organs are donated to the system.

The capitalist system, while different, has a lot more issues.

**Contention Two: Capitalism dictates the rich get the first and the best organs**

By legalizing the sale of organs, you are turning a government service into a technical capitalist market. When something is in high demand, it will cost a lot. The rich, who have the most money, can always afford to bid higher than their poorer counterparts. Not only will they get their organs first, but they’ll get the best one’s. While poor people die, because there are not enough organs to supplement their needs, the rich live happily with the organs of another. If the poor manage to get any organs, they’ll be in poor condition and unsanitary.

**Contention Three: Business's exist to make money**

This has actually played out before in the pharmaceutical industry. There are 1000’s of medications, and millions of sickness’s. Obviously there is not enough medication to help everyone, and do you know why that is? Pharmacies aren't interested in supplying medicine to a condition that only affects 2 people, nor are scientists interested in creating them. That's because insurance, pharmacies, medicinal think-tanks, aren't interested in helping people. They’re interested in making money.

[P1] Government exists to provide for the people

[P2] Business’s exist to make money

[C3] Government is more reliable to provide for the general welfare.

**I contend that organ prices would rise from their level on the black market.**

"the legalization would vastly improve the quality and quantity of human organs"

I highly doubt this claim. Corporations aren't interested in providing quality organs. They can give shoddy one’s and still be in extremely high demand.

Remember how their bottom line is money? Quantity will most likely decrease, do to a lack of donations, but I will concede that prices on the black market will decrease.

**Cross-Examination**

9spaceking: But governments have the rights to help people, no? And people are dying,
helping only rich people is better than helping no people, eh?

-Csareo!!!!: Under the current system, people are supplied from organ donors regardless of their social status. Helping without discrimination is better than helping with discrimination, right?

-9spaceking: By banning sell of human organs, it's all about the black markets. And black markets, as said before, have less quality organs than usual. And who's not to say that the Black Market will give the rich priority over the poor?

-Csareo!!!!: Black Markets aren't indicative of quality, as there can be good organs, and bad organs, running through illegally. It all depends on the price tag.

-9spaceking: Yes, but since organs are less available when it' illegal, there

-9spaceking: whups

-9spaceking: I meant to say...

-9spaceking: Yes, since organs are less available when they are illegal, there are less good-quality organs in comparison to when organs are legal due to the incentive of money when you sell your organs

---

**9spaceking (PRO)**

Making selling human organs legal does not mean there will be no more donations. In fact, it means there will be MORE donations because of the incentive. In addition, when selling human organs weren't legal, people had to buy them via the black market, or use donated organs. But what's the point of getting donated organs? People probably donate them when they're dead, since they don't need it any more, and thus the organs are older and more useless than someone who's only in his 20, looking for a job, can't find one, and sells one of his kidneys so as to get enough money to sustain while he's in the no-job period. As you can clearly see the selling of his organ not only gives him money, helping him, it also helps the waiting list as there are more supply for the demand with the legalization of human organs. As for rich getting priority, again, in the black market the rich probably get priority as well--who's to say they don't?

In addition, about the businesses needing to make money, my opponent contradicts himself because just the legalization of the selling of human organs makes more money, which, by my opponent's logic, is good.
My opponent has failed to rebut my argument about the black market being prevented by the legalization of human organs. Note this when you vote, judges.

Blackflag (CON)

Round Forfeited

Cross-Examination

9spaceking: Are you there?
9spaceking: Hello? Csareo?
9spaceking: Burp
9spaceking: I think I won this. 😊

9spaceking (PRO)

I win.

Blackflag (CON)

Round Forfeited

Cross-Examination

9spaceking: Extending all points. Why You forfeit this man?
Csareo!!!!: I wasn’t notified at all for this debate. I’ll have to bring that up to admin.
Csareo!!!!: Expect a full argument for round 5

9spaceking (PRO)

I win. Vote me.
Forgive me for my forfeit's, I'm sure I'll regret them during the final judgement

My opponent makes the very false claim that "donations" will increase do to an incentive. I am sorry to inform my opponent, that if you are being incentivized with material goods, the transaction no longer counts as a donation. While more people may sell organs, there is evidence that indicates to a stoppage in the markets. Currently, the current underground system supplements the supply needed with the price available to pay. If we were to change this system by allowing capitalist transactions of organs, we would now see a system of "all the organs" going to "all the highest" wallets. This will actually lower revenue for the majority of people, but increase it for the minority. Those already wallowing in cash.

People are already being payed to "give" their organs, so my opponents contention is moot either way. It's just in my scenario, you are not discriminated based on your social status, or your bank funds. This alone negates the oppositions strongest contention, therefore negating the resolution itself.

My opponent's claim is true regarding the black market, but again, he fails to realize that the "black market" is simply a mitigated form of the "free market". Except now the legally traded organs are going to the 1%, and the illegal organs are going to the 99%. I pose a question to the opposition. Are there more or less organs on the black market relative to the legal system? The correct answer is less. There are less illegal organs on the market than legal organs.

Let's not forget. Not all organs are compatible with all people. Legalizing the organ trade outside government bounds will send the 10% of functioning organs to the 10% richest citizens. While the poor receive unsanitary and unsafe organs from their local drug dealer, at a price they can still hardly afford. It isn't just morally wrong for a government to legalize the organ trade, but at this point, recklessly irresponsible and will result in many deaths.

Opposition. are you confident enough in your case to risk human lives? If you can't be confident
Opposition, are you confident enough in your case to risk human lives? If you cannot be confident in deciding the fate of 10,000’s of people, then why should the populace be? I thank the opposition for their time, and leave them the floor.