Team A Case -- Flow Sheet

Arguments	Counter-Arguments	Rebuttal or Evaluation Arguments
1. Use of atomic bombs on Japan shortened WWII by months or years, saving tens of thousands of lives A consensus in the Joint Chiefs of Staff: the Japanese will not surrender until they are utterly defeated. (President Truman) An invasion of Japan could have cost 500,000 American lives and more than a million Japanese (Journal of American Military History 2011).	1. Japan was nearly defeated before the U.S. used atomic bombs. "The Japan army was down to its final divisions, and their entire air force was nearly eliminated by June 1945" (Harrison, prof of history, Yale U., 2004).	The Japanese military doesn't matter. That only made them more desperate and dangerous. They were committed to killing Americans until they were all dead themselves.
	2. The invasion of Japan is always used as the alternative to dropping the bombs on Japan. But there were other military options that would have been much less costly in lives (The Economist, 2015).	This may have been true, but it wasn't what American military leaders perceived. To them, according to our primary documents from Truman, Eisenhower, and Dulles, the only alternative was invasion.
2. Japan started the war by attacking Pearl Harbor, which justified a full U.S. military response Japan doesn't have a moral case against the U.S. since they murdered 2,500 innocent Americans in December, 1941, and always tried to inflict maximum damage on the U.S. (Secretary of State John Dulles)	1. The U.S. had been supporting Allied powers since 1938, so the U.S. was already in effect fighting against Japan and Germany prior to Pearl Harbor (Davidson, prof of history, 2010).	That doesn't mean that the U.S. was a miliary combatant in 1941. Japan undermined its moral position by attacking Pearl Harbor without provocation or justification.
	2. The 2,500 persons killed at Pearl Harbor were almost all American soldiers, not civilians. This event doesn't come close to justifying dropping atomic weapons on Japanese cities.	But they were still innocent.
3. The U.S. had to try to indimidate the Soviet Union, which was working on its own nuclear weapons and became an enemy of America immediately after WWII The Soviet Union threatened the U.S. throughout the Cold War, and acquired nuclear weapons by 1950 (Weyrich, prof of history, Stanford U., 2008).	1. The fact that the Cold War was starting by 1945 hardly justifies using atomic weapons. This is the equivalent of saying the U.S. could kill 200,000 innocent people to prove to the Soviet Union that it was tough.	We'll concede that this is not an important justification for use of the atomic bomb, and that messages sent in WWII didn't affect the Cold War.
	2. The message would not have been sent to the Soviet Union anyway. The U.S. was fighting a war, of course it was going to try to defeat Japan. The Soviet Union had also attacked Japan.	

Team B Flow Sheet		
Arguments	**Counter-Arguments**	**Rebuttal or Evaluation Arguments**
1. Using atomic weapons on Japan was immoral 200,000 people were killed with no warning, almost all of whom were civilians, and 65% of them were children under 10 years old (Union of Concerned Scientists, 1996).	1. War itself is immoral. War is sanctioned murder and death. There is no way to avoid mass killing of people from enemy countries.	But there are degrees of immoral. There are war crimes today. There is a Geneva Convention, which are the rules of war. Intentionally killing hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians is immoral, even in war. War is always awful.
	2. Many more innocent people in Japan would have been killed if the U.S. had to invade Japan. This was the only viable alternative to using atomic weapons. Up to a million Japanese would have died (JAMH evidence).	This is a guess, not an actual historical fact. In battles, Japanese casualties were almost all soldiers, not civilians. And there was an alternative to invasion.
2. The U.S. could have demonstrated the power of atomic weapons to Japan to warn them America demanded that Japan surrender before dropping the bombs, but the only realistic way to get Japan to surrender would have been a demonstration of the use of the bomb (Terrence Davidson, prof of history, Boston Univ, 2010).	1. This was not a realistic option. The U.S. and Japan were in the midst of a very violent war. There were no negotiations like this. There is no precedent or example of this working.	It was an option being considered, actually (General Eisenhower document). It was a new strategy, for a new weapon. It was very logical for it to have worked. If there was any chance of it working: you must vote for us. We think there was no proven chance of it working.
	2. Japan was committed to fighting till the death (President Truman evidence). They needed to be defeated, not persuaded. Japan may not have believed that the U.S. had additional bombs.	The Truman document is self-serving. Truman wanted to believe this, to justify his use of the weapon. Japan surrendered when they realized the power of the atomic bomb. A demonstration would have showed them that power.
3. Using atomic bombs on Japan ushered in the nuclear age, which makes the U.S. vulnerable to other countries using nuclear weapons against us By being the first country to drop the bomb, the U.S. announced to the rest of the world that (a) their security depends on having nucs, and (b) the U.S. may use them, so they have the right to use them too. This is extremely dangerous (NYT, Feb 21, 1974).	1. There has been no harm to come from this in more than 70 years. The threat that they are describing hasn't come to pass.	We'll concede that this isn't the main reason to object to the use of atomic bombs on Japan. So you shouldn't consider the impact that use of atomic bombs has had on the later "nuclear age."
	2. The U.S. was in an arms race with Germany and the Soviet Union at the time. If the U.S. hadn't developed and used the atomic bomb first, our enemies would have, which would have been a lot worse for the world.	They are only asserting that the Soviet Union would have used the bomb. They haven't used it in nearly 70 years. And Nazi Germany never succeeded in building a bomb.