

SAMPLING

From the 2014 Red Book Final Installment

By the time we gather in Springfield for NITC 2016, debaters will have assembled a brief book that will be the most valuable asset. Imagine entering NITOC with a binder of vetted applications, copies of flows from qualifying tournaments, a secret roster of fellow competitors, and other strategies specifically written to the resolutions for NITOC?

The following is a sampling of the 2014 Red Book Final Installment. Be sure to register and be a part of the action that will bring you success at NITOC!

[REGISTER TODAY](#)

MonumentPublishing.com/NITC

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Bishop Rhodes	Aff Value: Honor -	Aff argument is that we have a moral obligation to uphold contracts and charters (honoring our word) and some of those charters propose mitigation of conflict.	doesn't show a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts, only one to uphold honor. Since the aff stance only shows a moral obligation to mitigate some conflicts because of the said value, point out that the res is absolute, and the aff does not show obligation to mitigation. Also ask for definition of honor. the case I hit ran it as a verb (honoring commitments) however, when he read it, it came across to be a noun (for our Honor)
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Value: Governmental prudence -	Neg argument is the government should be prudent in their decision making and deciding which obligations they have, since America isn't in a place to effectively mitigate conflicts, it would be prudent to refrain from mitigation, nullifying the obligation.	This argument implies that mitigation would be an unwise decision, and that the U.S. is incapable of mitigation. All the aff has to prove is that morals are not situational or change upon circumstances. The U.S. is capable of fulfilling moral obligations. Historical examples of mitigation benefiting/growing the economy could be brought up (WWII)
Bishop Rhodes	Aff Value: Economic prosperity	Aff argument is that government has a moral obligation to promote prosperity and mitigation gains economic prosperity. Basically stating that mitigation is always beneficial because of the economic gains. Can be very effective.	Rebuttal: Show current state of U.S. economy (i.e. \$17.5 trillion debt) and give examples where mitigation is very costly and wastes money (i.e Iraq War - \$7 trillion spent and not much gained as far as prosperity goes)
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Value: National Security	The stance the neg takes here is not a disagreement with the resolution, but rather with the aff case. It's hard to use but isn't a rule violation in the Stoa rules since it allows the neg to disagree with the aff case and still uphold the resolution. This case just attempts to show that we have a moral obligation to uphold national security, and all conflicts affect national security, or eventually will.	Rebuttal: First, simply point out that because they are agreeing with the resolution that the judge really has two affirmative cases in front of him. If he buys that, great, if not that's okay, too. Second, point out that not all international conflicts affect our national security (i.e. If Sri Lanka and Madagascar go to war, it won't affect the U.S.) Thirdly, posit that even if the judge accepts the claim that all international conflicts eventually affect domestic security, that the case presented would warrant intrusion to countries where we have no authority to stop conflicts that may only eventually affect us. This stance claims that we have a moral obligation, then, to undermine the sovereignty of other nations to protect the security of our own. These points are very difficult to effectively rebutt.
Bishop Rhodes	Aff value: Responsibility - (Globalism)	This case advocates the United States' responsibility to remain competitive in the global economy. It shows that the world is moving towards globalism, and that encompasses mitigating conflicts that don't directly affect you, because eventually, they will. Aff asserts that the United States is moving towards globalism and therefore has a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts because of their responsibility to protect citizens.	This ideology currently being promoted is moving more and more towards a one-world government which tramples the rights of people in exchange for "peace" and "common good". Globalization will negatively impact the United States and obviously, we do not have a moral obligation to move towards this ideology, therefore we don't have a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts. Mitigating conflicts that don't involve the U. S. in any way does not show any obligation, but does bring about the impactful detriment of globalization.
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Value: Responsibility - (Purpose of Govt.)	This case states that the only obligation governments have is to their own people. It claims further that Govs are amoral and only individuals can have moral obligations.	Either we have a logical fallacy (govs can't have moral obligations - yet they claim we have one to our citizens) OR They may claim the obligation to our citizens is a social contact obligation, not a moral one. If they point this out, show that gov's are moral entities (It's not that hard) and say they, like people, can have moral obligations. Once that's done all you have to do is show that a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts isn't a legal responsibility, rather something that is the right thing to do. These should refute both the resolutional attacks.
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Idea: Resolution / Value Link	This idea is a basic resolutional argument. What is advocates for is that the aff case (really any aff case) doesn't show a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts, it only shows an obligation to uphold the aff value	Simply show that that is the purpose of value debate. The resolution begs the question "Why is it true?" and thats what the value does. Show it would be impossible to say the obligation exists for mitigations sake, but rather it exists because of value x, y, z etc.
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Idea: Obligation	What this idea tries to get across is that it is wrong not to fulfill a moral obligation. in the same way that it is illegal to not fulfill a legal obligation, it is immoral to not fulfill a moral obligation. They persuade the judge to see that if we have a moral obligation to mitigate a given conflict and don't, it is blatantly wrong.	(Hard to refute as far as the reasoning goes) You really have 3 options. Either you prove that we do mitigate all conflicts (Very hard to do; virtually impossible), You assert that the resolution isnt talking about all conflicts (also hard to do), or you simply have a really good definition of moral obligation that favors the aff side. (That's your best bet)
Bishop Rhodes	Aff Idea - International Conflicts	What the affirmative argues here is that they only need to show a moral obligation to mitigate 2 or more international conflicts. since the res says "International conflicts" and not "international conflict", there is no implied statement that the U.S. has a moral obligation to mitigate all conflicts, only a few	First off, point out how one sided that debate would be. Aside from that, show that it obviously would be talking about international conflicts as a whole since it never states "The U. S. has a moral obligation to mitigate international conflicts that affect x, y, z". The resolution doesn't limit the moral obligation to only a few organizations we are in, or a few treaties we have signed; If it did, we wouldnt be debating a moral obligation, we would be debating a contractual obligation.
Bishop Rhodes	Neg Value - Global Security	This case will agree with the resolution, only it claims that the world is more and more shifting towards a one government society. It says because international conflicts negatively affect that shift, a moral obligation exists to mitigate those conflicts. It's much like the Globalism case mentioned above, simply from the negative standpoint.	Once again, point out globalism is a bad thing. This is very hard idea to prove as far as showing the moral obligation . It could never even affect the U.S. I would also point out that (like the national security neg) the judge really has two affirmative cases.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Brandon Bartlett	U.S. must protect Human Rights, but in no specified way	The United States has a moral obligation to mitigate because international Conflict violates human rights; however, there is not specified way in which the U.S. is called to fulfill that obligation. Thus, we do not inherently violate the safety of our people, since military means are not mandated. Mitigation can be nothing more than the application of soft power; therefore, the government has no duty which restricts them from acting in the defense of the innocent.	1. Soft power will always require hard power to back it up. The reason why the United States can be influential in peace talks (more so than Taiwan or Sealand for instance) is because we have a greater military. I (as an individual) can not call the leaders of two countries to have peace talks simply because I do not have a military. Therefore, the exertion of soft power requires hard power to back it up (this is ignoring economic sanctions, but those more often hurt the sanctioning country more than the country which has the sanctions imposed upon it). Ergo, the use of soft power is only the threat of war, thus, our people are still put in jeopardy. Since a country could, at any time, "call our bluff", the use of soft power violates the primary purpose of government/social contract etc. 2. It can also be argued that not all conflicts can be solved with soft power alone, which means the United States (in that case) would be caused to a certain action, since there is only one action possible (the use of hard power).
Brandon Bartlett	The United States is bound to follow the Constitution which calls us to mitigate	We are morally obligated to follow the law (as long as it does not violate a higher moral obligation). The Constitution sets treaties to be "the supreme law of the land", therefore, the United States has a moral obligation to follow all treaties. We have treaties binding us to mitigate, therefore, we have a moral obligation to mitigate.	1. Moral obligation cannot change, but laws do. 2. In practice, not all of these treaties are binding 3. Legal obligations are derived from moral obligations (morals are the basis for law), however, law can be wrong. Therefore, we ought to look at the abstract moral law instead of written treaties. This then turns the round to the primary purpose of government/social contract etc.
Brandon Bartlett	Mitigation harms human rights.	Moral obligations cannot and will not contradict. Therefore, if it can be proven that mitigation has harmed human rights (a moral obligation) then the rez. is disproven. Mitigation has harmed human rights (Drone Strikes, Lebanon, the Camp David accords), thus, vote neg.	Mitigation, by definition, will not violate NET human rights, and that is what is most important. Using a definition of mitigation such as "To make less..painful" mean that if we deface human rights, we have not mitigated. It would be ridiculous to make the aff have to justify quelling a conflict AT ANY COST, thus, the rez is specific to successful mitigation.
Brandon Bartlett	Aff must prove general rule	This is a RA point which can go along with most any case (specifically, this went with protection of human rights, and keeping promises). The point goes as follows: In today's rez. we are given no context, thus, we must only prove that, in general, mitigation is a good thing; in some instances mitigation may very well be wrong, however, this does not disprove the general rule.	Obligations are binding, thus, the rule must be applicable to EVERY situation (with the possible exception of a moral hierarchy depending upon your framework). From this point the round precedes as usual defeating the HR/promises/any other contentions that may be run under such a framework.
Brandon Bartlett	Wisdom is superior to all other values	Wisdom is required to reach any value (knowing how to act, etc.) therefore, it is superior to all values. It is unwise to mitigate (Applications of Vietnam and Drug War), therefore, there is no moral obligation.	1. (Value Clash) The justification for wisdom is as a means to an end. Values ought to be "Summum Bonum" (an end in themselves), making my value of <x> superior. 2. The definition of mitigation assumes it is successful (in most cases), therefore, mitigation will always be wise.
Christian Brazell	Moral obligation to mitigate non-military conflicts	The idea, used by the aff, is to argue that we have a moral obligation to mitigate conflicts such as world hunger, human trafficking, etc. Because these conflicts are international, the moral obligation to mitigate exists.	These are areas of international consensus, not international conflict. Everyone agrees that these issues need to be solved, so internationally there is no conflict.
Christian Brazell	US has a moral obligation to mitigate because we gave our word.	The aff argues that any promise, no matter to whom it is given, must be kept. The US has given promises to the international community that we will mitigate int. conf. , so the moral obligation to mitigate exists.	1.) Our promises, in the forms of social contracts and UN Charters, are not absolute. The Constitution can be amended, we can get off of the UN Charter at any time. Because morality is absolute (and promises are absolute), these "promises" do not necessitate mitigation. 2.) It is not always moral to keep a promise and tell the truth. In Nazi Germany, citizens often broke their promise to tell the truth to the government to protect Jews that were hiding in their home. What we find is that we are not morally obligated to fulfill a promise, but to uphold a principle.
Christian Brazell	Morality is Relative	The Neg argues that because everyone has different views of morality, there is no ultimate moral obligation to mitigate international conflicts. This argument extends to both government and citizens to fit the structure of the Aff case. The Neg further argues that legal obligations are not moral obligations, so a legal obligation to mitigate does exist but a moral obligation could never exist because morality is relative.	1.) Some things are really, absolutely wrong (or right). It is irrelevant whether or not people in Congress have conflicting ideas about morality, what matters the age-old question "What is good?" 2.) It is irrelevant if people have differing views about birth control, eugenics, or marriage. The only question we are asking today is if it is morally obligated for the US to mitigate international conflict. Then proceed to prove via your value how you know who might disagree in D.C., the US must mitigate.
Christian Brazell	Lewis' Moral Dilemma	The neg brings up a dilemma known as Lewis' Dilemma. The central contention of this dilemma is that we can not know all of the consequences of our actions. We act with a specific result in mind, but often there are adverse unintended results. The conclusion is that we cannot be morally obligated to a result. The application: mitigation is a result. We never know what will happen when we act with the intended result of mitigation, and thus the moral obligation to mitigate does not exist.	If we followed this line of reasoning, then the American Revolution would never have happened, slavery would never have been abolished, and the US would never have intervened in WWII. It doesn't matter that we don't know what will happen, everyone knows we can't tell the future. But this is in no way a warrant for inaction. Alexander Hamilton once observed that "those who stand for nothing fall for anything." We do have a moral obligation to uphold [value], and thus a moral obligation to mitigate.
Dan Welchons	Morality is Borderless	The affirmative asserts that because morality doesn't change, whatever moral obligations the government has to its own people it also has to the rest of the world. The next step is to that the government ought to protect the US population.	The social contract works pretty well against this argument. Basically the US government has special obligation to the people of the US because of the social contract

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Dan Welchons	The US means the UN	Aff says that the "United States" can be interpreted as the UN because "state" and "nation" mean the same thing.	1. The resolution says "United States" which is capitalized indicating a proper noun. meaning the the actor must have the name "United States" regardless of what synonyms may exist. 2. the resolution says "has" which is in the singular while the noun is in the plural. The only way that these words are allowed to disagree in number is if the noun is a proper noun.
Dan Welchons	Moral obligations require concience	The negative argues that if your conscience is seared you can't have a moral obligation, because moral obligations are duties of coscience. Than they bring up an example of something like abortion and see the American conscience has been seared.	1. a seared conscience is still a conscience, it just means that you ignore your conscience to the point you no longer notice it. 2. a conscience seared in one place does not mean that the rest of the conscience no longer exists. It is possible for a person to not acknowledge one sin while still aknowledging another for instance those endorse abortion still relise that genocide is wrong they simply don't accept their actions as genocide. 3. Moral obligations don't require acceptance, the Nuremburg Trials found that even though the Nazis did not accept their actions as wrong, they were still wrong. The same is true for obligations, even if you don't accept that you ought to do something, you still ought to do it.
Dan Welchons	People and the Government mitigate conflicts	The affirmative argues that both the people and the government have an obligation to mitigate conflicts because the "United States" is both people and the government	You have two options on how to respond to this one either way you need to establish CX whether they need to prove both have an obligation or if they need to prove either to win. 1. If they say they need to prove both, accept this point and go hard after one or the other. 2. If they say that they need to prove either one to win, say if I give money to a charity I am not acting as the "United States" I am acting as a private citizen; the only entity capable of acting as the "United States" is the government. Thus when the resolution say the "United States" ought tho take an action, the action must be taken as the "United States" and the only entity capable of doing that is the government.
Dan Welchons	Mitigation is only peaceful methods	The affirmative states that since military intervention causes the violence to increase before it makes things better, only peaceful methods of mitigation count as "mitigation"	1. Simply show instances where peaceful actually made things worse. 2. it runs counter to the real world interpretation of mitigation, for instance the NATO intervention in Libya was undertaken to mitigate the conflict.
Dan Welchons	Mitigation is anything that makes the conflict less severe, including not doing anything	The affirmative says that mitigation is anything that leads to the conflict ending. For instance, dropping nuclear bombs on Japan would be mitigation. Also if by not getting involved the conflict ends the US mitigated the conflict	1. the US must be a third party actor, otherwise it is not mitigation, it's just continuing to fight. 2. The US must actually take an action because the word "mitigate" is a verb and therefore an action. 3. the must take an action because otherwise we have made the conflict less severe, we have simply let it run its course. 4. the action must be taken specifically sa "mitigation" otherwise the action applies to a different situation ie stategic concerns, etc. and therefore has no bearing on mitigation and moral obligations.
Dan Welchons	US is obligated to mitigate conflicts because if a conflict goes un-mitigated it can spread to the US	the Aff establishes that we must protect American civilians and then expains how conflict threaten US citizens abroad. From this they extrapolate an obligation to mitigate conflicts	Because the reolution says that the US has a "moral obligation" and moral obligations are not rooted in practical benifit, the aff must prove an obligation in absence of US interests.
Elizabeth Danford	Integrity/Treaties bind us to mitigate	The US has signed treaties such as the UN Charter which say we must mitigate int'l conflicts. Because of that, we are morally obligated to mitigate.	1) Legal \neq Moral. We are legally bound to mitigate through treaties. 2) Treaties aren't inherently moral. We can be legally bound through a contract to murder someone, and that would be immoral.
Elizabeth Danford	Mitigation vs. Escalation	Mitigation means making a conflict less severe, but sometimes we must escalate a conflict order to bring it to a good resolution. Either an action is one of escalation, or it is one of mitigation. Not both.	Mitigation is one WHOLE action. Our goal in intervening in international conflicts is that we lessen the severity as a whole. PART of that may include temporary escalation. This argument is a part to whole fallacy: Part of mitigation may include escalation, but that doesn't mean the entire action is escalation. The entire action is mitigation, as it lessens the severity of a conflict. We have to look at how the whole action impacts a situation, not just the section of time where we escalate the conflict.
Elizabeth Danford	Cannot be obligated to hurt US	If mitigation can be proved to harm US interests/people, then it is immoral under the idea of social contract. If the government isn't fulfilling its duty to protect the people and promote their welfare, then the government is acting immorally	1) Hierarchy. Yes, the government's duty is to it's people first, and that's why our obligations exist in a hierarchy. Our first priority is our people, but that doesn't absolve us of other obligations. 2) Mitigation helps US. A lot of the time, the reason we mitigate is to serve our national interests, whether national security, ecomonic stability, or otherwise. On rare occasions, that can backfire, but mitigation on the whole helps the US.
Elizabeth Danford	Value: Truth	We must first have Truth (know as much information as possible about a situation) before attempting to mitigate. Since mitigation without truth can be immoral, we can have no moral obligation to mitigate.	This is part of the strategy of mitigation, not the moral obligation of mitigation. Yes, strategically, we should get to know as much as possible about a situation before entering, but that has no impact on the actual moral obligation. If knowing the truth aids us in lessening the severity of a conflict, so be it. Regardless, we always have the moral obligation to try to make a situation less severe. A case like this doesn't impact the moral obligation, only the strategy involved in carrying out the action.
Elizabeth Danford	Conflict = majority	The term "conflicts" in the rez means we must prove that mitigation is morally obligatory at least 51% of the time. Also sometimes tagged as "general rule"	How do you plan on proving that? You only have a 45 minutes in an LD round, there's not enough time to go down the list of every conflict ever and prove a moral obligation in every situation. This is an undebateable standard.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Elizabeth Danford	Resolution is present tense	The resolution says that we must have the moral obligation to mitigate in conflicts that are going on right now. If there's a conflict in the world that we don't have the Moral Obligation to mitigate, then the rez is disproved.	Ideally, agree to this. If you can't, then you could argue that we're looking only at the principle behind mitigation and whether or not it is a moral obligation in theory, not on a case-by-case basis.
Elizabeth Danford	Moral obligation is a theoretical principle	Moral obligations exist outside of a case-by-case basis. Moral obligations are always true regardless of anything that could affect their outcome.	Ideally, agree to this. If you can't, argue that moral obligations must remain moral/have moral results. Also, we must always see how theoretical principles apply to real life. If, in real life, mitigation hurts our primary obligation to the US people, then it cannot be a moral obligation. In theory, yes, but reality, no.
Ellen Densmore	Mitigation is amoral	The negative argues that mitigation is a tool with no inherent moral quality, and therefore we cannot be morally obligated to it.	The primary refutation for this argument is to say that yes, mitigation is a tool, but we are morally obligated to use it to achieve a moral end; i.e., if you as the affirmative are valuing human rights, the moral obligation is to protecting human rights, not to mitigation in and of itself, but any intermediate steps that are required to protect human rights (like mitigation), become a moral obligation.
Emily Erickson	Cost Benefit Factor	This means that if the benefits of our mitigation outweigh the harms of our mitigation, it counts as being moral.	Two wrongs don't make a right. Just because mitigation ends up having some good ramifications does not justify the immorality that happens in the process.
Emily Erickson	Mitigate is a Verb	Because to mitigate is a verb/action, no one knows what its end result will be. Therefore the government doesn't know if it will be moral in the end.	To mitigate is an action, but it is the action of making something (Conflict) less severe. This action could be carried out in various ways, however whatever the policy aspect is, the definition to mitigate is to lessen in severity.
Emily Erickson	Value: Constitutionality	This is run by the negative, who will claim that the constitution is the source of the US's morality. They then say that nowhere in the constitution does it mandate that the US mitigate conflicts, therefore mitigation in and of itself is not a moral obligation.	1) Disconnect morality from the constitution. Obviously the constitution outlines our government's duties, but it does not outline what is or is not moral. The constitution can be amended, morality cannot. 2) Historical Context: The constitution was not written in an age like today, when a battle in Europe or Africa really can affect the United States. Had the founding fathers foreseen an era when international conflicts posed a threat to the rights of American citizens, they might have made mitigation a mandate. 3) Non Exclusive. While the constitution doesn't mandate our government legally to mitigate, it never restricts the government from doing so. Therefore there is nothing immoral constitutionally about helping other nations.
Emily Erickson	Kant's Categorical Imperative	So far I've only seen this run on aff, where they state that by Kant's Categorical Imperative dictates that some thing is moral if it is good for everyone to do. They then define "mitigate" as something which is inherently good, and state that because it is inherently good for people to help other people, mitigation fulfills Kant's Categorical Imperative and the resolution is therefore true.	All that you have to do to defeat this argument is show that mitigation is not something that is inherently good for everyone to do. Different nations have different interests or agendas which they would try to push when mitigating a conflict. These different interests conflict with one another and simply inflate the conflict. Therefore, every nation trying to carry out what they believe is making a situation better is not a good thing.
Evan Buck	Mitigation means Ending the Conflict the Quickest	The negative tries to prove that mitigation means ending the conflict the fastest. So theoretically, in the Syrian conflict, the US would "mitigate" the conflict by supporting the strongest side, the Assad regime. Mitigation thus means devaluing human rights at the expense of "mitigating" the conflict	1.) Mitigation has no time constraints. Mitigation means to lessen the pain or severity of a conflict, not the DURATION of the conflict. 2.) Does this mean we do not have the moral obligation to mitigate conflicts at home to protect the people? Because if mitigation = time and helping the powerful, then we might as well help gangs win against the police.
Evan Buck	We have a moral obligation to mitigate because of power	The affirmative says since we as the United States have the strongest military and the largest hegemony (soft power) influence, we have a moral obligation to mitigate. Countries like Zimbabwe don't because they don't have the power to do so.	Did Great Britain have a moral obligation to mitigate international conflicts when it was a global empire? No, because mitigation is a moral option, not a moral obligation. We do not have to mitigate all of the time. Moral obligations = something you HAVE to do, not something you can choose to do.
Evan Buck	We need to mitigate because of protecting American interests	The affirmative says we only have a moral obligation to mitigate international conflicts if American interests or lives are directly threatened.	1.) It is not at all what the resolution is saying. It's adding a phrase that the rez writers never intended: "The US has a moral obligation only to mitigate those international conflicts we WANT to." 2.) Case turn: Since soldiers are American citizens, and sending them to mitigate a conflict inevitably kills soldiers, we are violating American life in order to uphold the moral obligation TO life. Contradiction.
Evan Buck	Deontological Mitigation	Whew, this case is rather complicated. Basically the Affirmative says since mitigation is an intention, not an outcome, we have the Categorical Imperative to mitigate to protect life. (Look up deontology and categorical imperative to fully understand the crux of this case)	Agree that mitigation is an intention, not an outcome, but then prove deontological thinking is impractical in LD debate since the core assumption when weighing values is "what does the greatest good for the greatest amount of people?" Then prove mitigation does not produce the greatest good, while protecting our citizens does.
Evan Buck	Utilitarianism Disproves Mitigation	The negative says that mitigation does not produce the greatest good for the greatest amount of people; rather, staying at home does. It's the converse of the prior case I put on here.	Prove mitigation does uphold the greatest good.
Evan Buck	Mitigation means (specific list in case side column)	The Affirmative says mitigation means (a) military power OR (b) diplomacy OR (c) observing a conflict OR (d) secretly helping out one of the sides in a conflict	This is a pretty jacked-up, incredibly broad interpretation of mitigation you got to deal with here, which does help AFF but also somewhat helps you. De-link each of those four from morality, prove mitigation is a moral good not a moral obligation, and you should have it.
Evan Buck	We have moral obligation to uphold treaties, thus a moral obligation to mitigate	Pretty straightforward from philosophy title	Prove treaties are legal obligations, not moral obligations. Show compelling examples where treaties did horrible things for human rights. Not all treaties make us mitigate.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Evan Buck	Governments have multiple moral obligations	Affirmative says since people have multiple moral obligations, and governments are made up of people, then governments have a moral obligation to protect our people AND to mitigate.	Show the fallacy of composition in this line of thinking. Show that governments are representatives of the people but are separate entities that are established ONLY to protect their citizens' rights.
Evan Buck	We don't have the resources to mitigate	Common neg argument that says since we're in trillions of debt and have pressing needs at home we don't have a moral obligation to mitigate.	Just because we don't have the ability, doesn't mean we don't have the obligation. It just means we can't fulfill it now but must once we can. Also, we do have the ability as we're 'MURIKA with the strongest army and most soft power influence. (+1 if you get the reference)
Evan Buck	Mitigation is a noun	Mitigation means to make a conflict less severe or painful. Thus, if a conflict is not made less severe or painful then it was not mitigation and we had no moral obligation to mitigate. But if it was successful then it was mitigation and we had a moral obligation.	This stance is particularly abusive to the Negative side, as it shifts standards and makes the round undebateable. Mitigation is not a noun but a verb. "The US has a moral obligation TO MITIGATE [the action word] international conflicts."
Evan Buck	Mitigation does not mean escalation	Mitigation means the conflict is made less severe. If our actions in any way intensify suffering it was not mitigation and we had no moral obligation.	Somewhat similar to the "mitigation is a noun" argument, but slightly nuanced from it. Still argue that mitigation is a action, not an outcome, and we can't have a moral obligation to an outcome. We need to weigh the morality of our actions, because we all agree it would be great to lessen suffering around the world. The question is, is that a MORAL OBLIGATION?
Evan Buck	Moral obligation to uphold integrity	Similar to the treaties argument but different. This AFF stance says when the US has promised other nations to help them in times of need through mitigation, we then have a moral obligation to mitigate. This may include treaties.	Press for what exactly constitutes a US commitment. Also show that treaties = legal obligations, not moral obligations. Basically run the same arguments against treaties as you would this stance. Also show how integrity is not inherently moral (you can be very dutious and have integrity to a ruthless dictator, for example).
Evan Buck	Social Contract proves we shouldn't mitigate	Since we have a social contract to protect people at home, and not a social contract to mitigate, that proves we have no moral obligation.	(1) John Locke actually articulated a moral obligation to mitigate in his social contract theory. (2) Governments can have obligations apart from the social contract.
Evan Buck	The resolution is in the present	Since the resolution implies an ongoing, present action, any examples of prior mitigation may be helpful in determining a moral obligation but ultimately are insufficient. We either need to (1) look at current, ongoing conflicts to determine moral obligations or (2) debate abstract, theoretical, nonchanging principles.	The whole reason we have "applications" in LD debate is to help show our case logic working in the real world. Just how "current" does current have to be in order to be eligible for this debate round? Morality never changes, thus past examples should be sufficient and debatable for the round. We shouldn't determine a serious topic like moral obligations from just modern examples.
Evan Buck	The resolution is unprovable/undebateable	The Neg essentially runs a rez k, saying the resolution is unprovable because we can't look at a majority of examples of mitigation in a 45-minute debate round	Sure, we only have 45 minutes, but we're asked to prove the rez true or false. Sorry if you don't like it, in which case DON'T DEBATE IT. The Neg is not fulfilling his burden.
Evan Buck	US citizens have a moral obligation	When US citizens have the means and there is a need, we have a moral obligation to fulfill mitigation	We can't force charity. Charity is just that - voluntary. It's not a moral imperative to give all your income to a specific charity. In the same way, it's not a moral obligation for our citizens to mitigate conflicts. Mitigation is amoral and is an action of the government.
Josiah McGee	Emmerich de Vattel-international law	This is one interpretation of Vattel's condensed theory of international law. Basically, Vattel helps affirmatives argue that governments have a responsibility to help each other do their jobs in addition to protecting their own citizens. For example, Nigeria is incapable of finding the kidnapped girls right now. Because Nigeria is incapable and the US possesses the capability, we are bound to help Nigeria's government do their job.	Simply arguing that the obligation is to the people of Nigeria rather than the Nigerian government does nothing. In order to counter this argument or philosophy of responsibility, one needs to examine the purpose of government. Emphasizing the purpose of government as being to protect one's own citizens refutes Vattel's philosophy.
Josiah McGee	super value of compulsion	Essentially agrees to the value of the affirmative but qualifies it using compulsion. The basic contention is that mitigation can only be an obligation if circumstances demand mitigation and exclude the possibility of any other solution.	This is similar to other philosophies already presented. However, running a "super value" to qualify another value is something new to me this season. My response is to demonstrate how my value still obligates us to mitigate and there is no other option.
Josiah McGee	counter plan	negative- I feel it's fairly self-explanatory that a negative would run this. That an LDer would run this is another story. Former TPer's have attempted (somewhat successfully actually) to run what I'm told is a counter plan. I don't do TP, but what I have observed is negative teams foregoing any attempt to refute the opponent's case or the resolution, and instead offering to help the affirmative do their job better.	This is the first season I have witnessed successful execution of this case style. One response is to inform the judge that resolution remains affirmed, and the debate is about the principles of the matter not practicality.
Josiah McGee	economic security	The affirmative runs the value of economic security and argues our government is responsible for protecting not only life, but economic security of citizens around the world. This means mitigating trade disputes and doing whatever necessary to ensure conflicts do not affect the global economy.	Our government is not obligated to uphold the wellbeing of the global economy. We are not a global banking agency. Our government, or whichever actor chosen, must protect our national interests first.
Josiah McGee	American people as the actor	Affirmative: The resolutional actor is the US. Although many define US as the government, a few affirmatives define the US as the people. They do so to explain that individuals, not being inhibited by primary and secondary obligations, all have a responsibility to look out for the safety of their fellow man. This actor engages only in soft power and humanitarian aid type mitigation.	One could argue that the American people cannot be morally obligated to solve conflicts between nations. Man is obligated to look out for individuals, not nations or governments who are fighting. Also, practicality can be used.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Josiah McGee	stability	Affirmative values stability and argues mitigation achieves greater stability. Greater stability results in a chain reaction producing greater peace, goodwill, harmony, and less conflict in the future. Thus, future negative results can be avoided by mitigating conflict now.	First, the idea that mitigating one conflict prevents another leaves something to be desired logically. Second, most opponents running this case have hidden values besides stability, and the negative has to look for them before they can adequately respond.
Josiah McGee	popular sovereignty	Negative values popular sovereignty as the criterion for government action. A government cannot be morally obligated to act or intervene in international conflict unless the people of the United States approve.	The negative must be prepared and ready to explain how the examples presented by the affirmative contrast with the will of the American people. Thinking of new examples, challenging statistics presented, and allowing for healthy clash between values refutes this value.
Josiah McGee	A moral obligation is qualified by knowledge of the conflict.	Essentially, the affirmative uses knowledge as a criterion and argues we are morally obligated to mitigate those international conflicts we know about, and since it would be impossible to mitigate those we don't know about they are irrelevant in the round.	First, in the technology driven 21st century very little happens that goes undetected by every available source of information. Second, international conflict between two nations is something you can't miss and using lack of information is an excuse to avoid addressing controversial conflicts is a cop out.
Josiah McGee	A moral obligation is qualified by exclusivity	The affirmative uses exclusivity as a criterion. Basically, the United States is morally obligated when we are the ONLY ones with the necessary knowledge, location, resources, and power to mitigate.	Negative could ask the affirmative to affirm or deny moral obligations in well known conflicts the entire international community responded to. Depending on the response received, negative could then ask the judge whether a moral obligation truly allows the government to choose when to get involved, or whether to only get involved when no one else can or will. Moral obligations cannot be defined by how others respond.
Josiah McGee	International conflict is defined as intra-state or between people groups.	Affirmative defines international conflict this way and suddenly a wealth of examples are now up for discussion.	This definition can be refuted by explaining we are talking about conflict between two nations whether it be armies or diplomats conducting the argument. If the negative accepts the definition, it can be used against the affirmative. Explaining how impractical the affirmative's goals are helps the judge vote negative.
Josiah McGee	ability	The negative often explains a moral obligation must hinge upon ability. For example, if you fail to accomplish something you were incapable of, no one would accuse you of being immoral. In a similar fashion if you fail to mitigate and it is not immoral to do so, you cannot be considered morally obligated to mitigate. In a nutshell, unless failure equals immoral behavior a moral obligation does not exist.	This is one argument an affirmative might consider accepting. The easiest path is the one of least resistance. This argument does not become deadly unless an affirmative slips and agrees that failure is not immoral.
Kathryn Woolsey	Mitigation Violates United States Welfare	The Negative asserts that mitigation harms US economy.	1. International Conflicts due to globalization would harm our economy if we do not mitigate 2. The United States despite our current economy is the most powerful nation on Earth.
Kathryn Woolsey	Mitigation harms life.	The negative asserts that all mitigation harms life.	Give examples of where mitigation saved life. Then say that just because some circumstances we lose life still doesn't release us from a MO to mitigate the conflict.
Kathryn Woolsey	We have a Moral Obligation to mitigate because of the Golden Rule	The Affirmative states that because of universal human rights we have a moral obligation to mitigate per the golden rule.	1.The Golden Rule only applies to citizens. 2. Our Gov. doesn't want other nations to get into our business. 3. The debate is not about other countries MO.
Kathryn Woolsey	IPO's are better equipped to mitigate IC	The negative states that United States does not have a moral obligation because there are others who are better equipped.	1.The US provides most of the funding and military support for IPO's 2. We are not talking about whos better equipped we are talking about whether or not we have a MO to mitigate IC.
Kathryn Woolsey	Mitigation protect US national interest.	The affirmative states that conflicts must be of a certain magnitude like the Gulf War and Desert Storm and when they are of that magnitude it always protects the US national interest to mitigate.	1. show how US citizens don't want to get involved in IC through evidence. 2. also show how many countries do not want US presence in their country.
Kathryn Woolsey	Adherence to original intent	The negative states that for Justice to be upheld we have no moral obligation to mitigate ALL conflicts we must adhere to our governments original intent to protect Justice and US citizens. Res A: 1. Prove a general principle 2. Not fulfilling is evil	1. We have a MO to mitigate IC based on our MO to protect our citizens because IC harm our citizens. 2. Justice is unachievable.
Kathryn Woolsey	We have a moral obligation to mitigate to protect American life.	Affirmative states that international conflict is always present and the US is affected by it and it endangers American lives we have a Moral Obligation to mitigate.	1. Show examples where US citizens were harmed in intervening in IC. 2. Show also how the US citizens don't want to get involved in IC through evidence.
Kathryn Woolsey	MO to protect life	AFF states With a criterion of consequentialism. US hegemony obligates mitigation	1. Show how intervening in IC have harmed life. 2. Show how US influence is harmed when trying to mitigate.
Kathryn Woolsey	Our Gov must follow the Social Contract	Negative states no moral obligation exists because of the social contract with the American citizens through our declaration of independence.	Show how IC affect US citizens and therefore we must mitigate those IC.
Kathryn Woolsey	We have a moral obligation to protect people from unjust death (Anti Value)	All countries have a moral obligation to mitigate and because the US is exceptional we have this moral obligation too.	1. Intervening in IC harm life (show examples) 2. Only talking about US
Peter Allevato	Resolution is Absolute	According to the Law of Undistributed Middle, since there is no quantifier in the Resolution it must be absolute.	1. The Law (or fallacy) of the Undistributed Middle is a much contested law of formal logic, many scholars dispute its existence.
Phillip Allevato	Moral Obligation to Keep Our Word	Multiple treaties, as well as the Constitution, mandate that our government do/do not get involved in conflicts (depending on the side, it can be used both ways).	Treaties conflict with each other and the Constitution, and could also create immoral circumstances. Treaties and laws are not moral, and could cause harm, so they are not a moral obligation.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Rebekah Vehrs	Our Obligation is determined by the goal/intent of mitigation, not the outcome	This is used on both aff and neg, as a way to weigh applications. When the Aff uses it, they say that examples of mitigation gone bad, i.e. Vietnam, don't disprove that an obligation exists. When the Neg uses it, they say that any examples where our "intent" was mitigation apply, and show that mitigation is almost always bad.	1. Not the definition. 2. Hard to determine our actual intent/goal.
Rebekah Vehrs	Mitigation is determined by the results	Only example where our mitigation had GREAT results apply.	1. This take away all Neg ground, and only allows aff examples.
Rebekah Vehrs	We are obligated to protect the innocent	All governments and individuals are obligated to protect the lives of people who are not actively involved in combat.	1. The government is not obligated to protect the lives of people all around the world. 2. We don't have the ability to protect everyone innocent person in every conflict. 3. Mitigation harms innocent people
Rebekah Vehrs	The U.S. is obligated to mitigate because it spreads freedom	When we mitigate, it increases our opportunity to help free people, and establish nations like 'MURIKA. :P	This hardly ever turns out well in the real world. Other countries cannot be exactly like the u.s., and we aren't obligated to make them so.
Rebekah Vehrs	Governments have a different basis of morality than individuals	Basically, Individuals might be obligated to mitigate, but governments aren't	Morality doesn't change when individuals form a group
Rebekah Vehrs	Mitigation kills Americans	When we mitigate, innocent Americans die. Either soldiers, or innocent Americans who are victims of blowback from mitigate.	1. Turn, mitigation saves. 2. Making a conflict less severe won't harm Americans.
Rebekah Vehrs	We have a moral obligation to mitigate because it increases global peace	Making conflicts less severe increases global peace, and global peace is the highest value.	1. Turn, mitigation destroys peace. 2. Peace isn't the highest value, therefore the neg value determines if mitigation is a moral obligation
Rebekah Vehrs	We have an obligation to mitigate, but we aren't always obligated to act	This is an affirmative argument that basically accepts the neg case. They say that mitigation does increase the debt, and might kill innocent people sometimes, but that doesn't mean it's not a moral obligation	1. Obligations require action. 2. If mitigation harms the value of life, or national welfare, it isn't moral, and therefore not a moral obligation
Ryan Woolsey	Morality is gray	Essentially you would define Moral Obligation as obligations arising out of considerations of right and wrong then proceed that mitigation is not one or the other but a mixture of "rights" and "wrongs." The governments moral obligations are never fully right or wrong but "gray." there for we cannot have a moral obligation to mitigate international conflict.	There are two ways you can respond. You could turn the whole color analogy and say how "gray" is still a byproduct of "black and white" (aka wrong and right). Therefore the obligation is still arising from considerations of right and wrong. The second way to respond would be showing that the statement is illogical. If you think deeper, he is saying an action becomes gray when mistakes are possible (argue no moral obligation). Since humans are flawed that means there would be no such thing as a moral obligation. Since we know Moral Obligations exist (b/c x,y,z) the Negative philosophy is wrong.
Ryan Woolsey	We have a moral obligation to mitigate potential conflicts	This was used in an AFF case to justify using examples like WMD. "If you side with the negative, you will let terrorists get ahold of our Weapons of Mass Destruction."	Two responses: First, take that philosophy to its logical conclusion to show its irrationality. If the U.S has a moral obligation to mitigate potential conflicts it would be impossible to fulfill that moral burden. Find some info on why being involved in all international affairs would be a bad idea (if you have a "obligation implies ability case" this should be right up your alley." The second and much simpler response would be saying "enemies are not international conflicts." Turn applications like WMD's against him.
Ryan Woolsey	Moral Obligations can never be methods	This is a negative philosophy. Start off by proving mitigation is not an end in and of itself but a means to achieve an end. Then explain that we never have a moral obligation to a specific method but the ideal behind it. Confusing I know so let me put it in an analogy. If a robber breaks into a dad's house he has a moral obligation to protect his wife and kids. Not to get a gun and shoot the man, not to run away, just to protect his wife and kids. Mitigation is the method (gun/run away) but our moral obligations can only be the ideals behind the method (protect wife/kids)	Just outright agree. This philosophy doesn't disprove the resolution. Your value is where you should be bringing moral obligations into the round (U.S has moral obligation to protect human right, the constitution, national welfare, ect) while the means to achieve that value is mitigation of some form. So agree that we don't have a moral obligation to mitigate just for the sake of mitigation but we have a moral obligation to mitigate because it is the only way we can uphold *insert value*
Ryan Woolsey	The U.S moral obligations are what the U.S citizens want us to do	Uses this to bring in polls on how the people don't want us to be mitigating international conflicts therefore we have no moral obligation to mitigate them	Best way to counter this would be to wash the applications by finding polls that find contrary information. Use that to say different polls, during different times, covering a different demographic get different results, therefore cannot be an accurate mechanism for determining our moral obligations.
Ryan Woolsey	Aff Value: justice	Aff takes the point of view that all innocence is due protection therefore we must give every man his due by upholding the value of justice	The best way you can attack this value is hit it on vagueness. If you have ever read Plato's Republic then you know what I am talking about. Make the point that in order for a value to be standard for determining moral obligations it must be tangible in some way. Then take your argumentation to the real world through arguments like "no one man or organization should have the ability to determine if someone is innocent." Or "How are we to determine what every man is due."
Ryan Woolsey	Neg value- National Welfare	The U.S must preserve national welfare and mitigation harms national welfare	1) you can argue that this value is incomplete. Sure national welfare is good but only if it is being used by a good nation. For the sake of stereotypical LD examples, during WWII we really didn't want Hitler to have national welfare.

	Philosophy	Case Side	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Idea or Value)	(Explain the value raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Ryan Woolsey	Aff value- Honesty	Defines it as "freedom from deceit." Says its the highest value because honesty is the only way the government's actions can have impact. You will see this value mostly with contract cases.	Because this value is something judges can relate to you need to be careful with your argumentation. Start off with making the point that honesty is good but not the highest value. The reason is because, at times, we need to compromise honesty in order to preserve higher values. Like keeping the informantion of sensitive documents and contacts secret. We are deceiving, but it is a nessecity in order for society to function correctly.

	Case Side	Application	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Aff or Neg)	(Explain the application raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Bishop Rhodes	Neg App: Vietnam was a failure	This shows that in Vietnam, involvement caused the loss of many lives that could have been avoided. This "moral obligation" ended up hurting us more than it ever helped the people of Vietnam. If we had a moral obligation to mitigate this conflict, we wouldn't have used containment, but rather reached for a more successful strategy that would have allowed us to win the war.	Aff just needs to state that the reason Vietnam was a "failure" in the negatives opinion, was because of the tactics used in the conflict. The moral obligation was fulfilled. simply posit that the res asks for the aff to prove moral obligation exists, not that it always achieves the perfect outcome. Then bring up example of when mitigating conflicts have helped the U.S. Examples can be brought up to show why mitigation is good and bad.
Bishop Rhodes	Aff App: WWII - Very beneficial mitigation	This application states that WW2 is a example of mitigation at its finest. Mitigation only cost a fraction of a percent of total war deaths, U.S. gained large amounts of gold resources and trading partners, our economy was booming again, and the war brought us out of the recession. etc...	Rebuttal: First point out that the reason the U.S. got involved was because of the Pearl Harbor bombing and for its own national security interests. If the reason we got involved was a moral obligation, we would have gotten involved in 1939 - not 1941. Next, point out that mitigation from WW1 led to WW2. (i.e. Treaty of Versaille putting all the war debt on Germany and the Germans not feeling so happy about that). Basically point out that because of the harsh mitigation tactics used in WW1, WW2 was caused.
Bishop Rhodes	Negative	NATO / UN may mitigate conflicts, but that doesn't mean the U.S. has a moral obligation to	What are the purposes of these organizations? The U.S. is in both NATO and the UN by choice. Congress can always vote and pull out of them. The purpose of these organizations is to mitigate conflicts and promote peace. The reason we are in these organizations is because of our moral obligation to mitigate.
Cheyenne Ossen	Negative	Vietnam War: This is an example where the US did not have a moral obligation to mitigate an international conflict, because it was not in the best interest of the US National Security	In rebuttal: The US had an moral obligation to promote freedom, as it was reported from Travis the Awesome Times.
Dan Welchons	affirmative	South Sudan conflict: we should intervene in the South Sudan Conflict to stop the recent massacres	Point out that Ethiopia is already solving the problem through peace talks
Dan Welchons	Negative	Somalia: The US tried to intervene but the forces were ambushed and the intervention failed miserably	this is just an example of bad tactics: the US went in during the day, over the city and with a low level flight. No wonder it didn't work
Dan Welchons	Negative	US support for Afghan rebels during the Soviet invasion: basically we set up the Taliban through our mitigation and now we're reaping the consequences of our mitigation	1. we were supporting the Mujahideen before the Soviets invaded. 2. we were not trying to mitigate the conflict, in fact our government was trying to goad the USSR into its own version of the Vietnam war
Dan Welchons	affirmative	Senkoku Islands: Because the US is mitigating the Senkoku island dispute between China and Japan, the two countries have not gone to war over the Islands	The US has actually remained neutral in this conflict, meaning that it is actually potential cost of that is deterring the two nations from going to war
Elizabeth Danford	Negative	We caused 9/11. Our aid and support for Israel and interference in the Middle East made terrorist angry, thus they attacked us.	What was the alternative here? Sit by and let our ally Israel get ripped to shreds by surrounding countries? Cower in fear "just in case our actions might make terrorists mad"? That's terrible foreign policy. Maybe it caused backlash once, but does that mean we should we structure our entire foreign policy around fear and cowardice? I think not.
Elizabeth Danford	Affirmative	Russia/Ukraine. We should intervene on behalf of Ukraine and protect their sovereignty.	The situation in Ukraine is terrible, yes, but getting involved may make it worse. A larger-scale war with Russia is potentially devastating. There's a reason our government isn't doing more here.
Elizabeth Danford	Negative	Switzerland: Didn't get involved in WWII, was able to stay neutral and safe.	1) Apples to oranges. This is not a good comparison, because Switzerland is very small relative to the US, its military isn't as well-equipped for mitigation, and it is not a world power. 2) Hasty generalization. Just because it works for one country doesn't mean it will work for all. 3) US established as a world power. Because we have made the decision to essentially be the world's police force, we're stuck in a position where many countries rely on us to do so. Switzerland didn't have that burden.
Elizabeth Danford	Negative	Korean War Backlash: Because we mitigated the Korean War, North Korea is now sending us threats of a nuclear attack. This is a potential national security threat.	1) And the alternative was...? Sure, we could have left South Korea to be taken over by communists. Not a good plan. That would have lead to the harming countless people's human rights - an expansion of what goes on in NK today. 2) Our foreign policy cannot be one of cowardice. It makes the US look weak on the whole, AND it allows people to suffer. If we have the ability to help and choose to ignore suffering, that is a moral atrocity.
Elizabeth Danford	Affirmative	Kosovo: We ended the conflict between the KLA and Yugoslavia.	We assisted a terrorist group. The KLA, the side we backed, was responsible for many killings, torture, and other abuses.
Elizabeth Danford	Negative	Guatemala - The US backed the oppressive Guatemalan government forces in the Guatemalan Civil War. An estimated 200,000 people died, caused mostly by the oppressive government that we aided.	1) Not an international conflict, a civil war. This is extrajudicial. 2) UN Fixed. We are a part of the United Nations, and the United Nations was able to bring this conflict to a peaceful resolution and negotiated for an improved human rights situation.

	Case Side	Application	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Aff or Neg)	(Explain the application raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Emily Erickson	Affirmative	Rwandan Genocide: The affirmative usually states that the genocide could have been stopped if the United States had intervened sooner, quoting President Bill Clinton, the UN, etc.	1) Finite Power. Imagine the United States had somehow managed to stop the Rwandan Genocide from happening, the affirmative's philosophy is mandating the mitigation of all such atrocities. There have been hundreds of genocides in the few hundred years that the United States has existed, but that doesn't make us responsible for them. Continuous intervention in such conflicts has to end somewhere. 2) Not an International Conflict. I know some definitions of international include people-groups fighting from one another, but simple logic can show this is a nationally contained genocide, not a conflict between two or more *nations*
Emily Erickson	Negative	WWI, Treaty of Versailles. The negative uses this as an example of when we tried to punish a country for acting immorally, however the result was detrimental to Germany and sparked the resentment that became WWII.	Depending on their definition of international conflict, you could state that this didn't mitigate the conflict directly because it happened after the war. Secondly, the United States was not an actor. In fact, we didn't want to be associated with the treaty because we knew it might lead to future problems. Lastly, this could be washed by simply stating some policies will not fit each situation correctly, that doesn't make mitigation inherently bad.
Emily Erickson	Affirmative	WWI, Zimmerman Telegraph, Sinking of the Lusitania. They claim that these two things justified our involvement in world war I because they were threats to the security/welfare of the United States.	1) Mexico was not a significant threat. Even if Mexico *had* agreed to randomly attack the United States, the size of our military even in 1914 was sufficient to stop them in that event. 2) Escalated Conflict. The European nations had been at a stand still for months and would have probably negotiated treaties within months if the United States had not added fuel to the fire by entering the conflict.
Evan Buck	Negative	El Salvador Civil War - We wanted to mitigate conflict and stop spread of communist insurgencies, so we helped train El Salvadoran freedom fighters who committed horrific human rights atrocities.	Our intention was to ESCALATE to stop the spread of communism, not to MITIGATE. We basically gave them guns and told them to do our dirty work.
Evan Buck	Affirmative	Falklands War - US helped mitigate a conflict between Britain and Argentina over the Falklands Islands.	The logic isn't there to show that BECAUSE the US mitigated, the war was any shorter. We did not have any interests there at all. Britain was militarily superior and would have won anyway without us. This doesn't prove a moral obligation, just that we *might* have done some good in one isolated example.
Evan Buck	Affirmative	Russo-Japanese War - Russia and Japan had a hissy fit and started fighting, Teddy Roosevelt stepped in and said WOHAW PEEPZ CALM DOWN and helped mitigate the conflict through a treaty.	The conflict would have ended anyway apart from our help as both countries were seeking mediation. Also Teddy Roosevelt did not mitigate out of a moral obligation but for selfish motives to increase his own glory.
Evan Buck	Affirmative	Rwanda - massive genocide happened, US stood by, millions died.	It was the UN's moral obligation to mitigate, not the US's. UN peacekeepers literally sat around and admitted perpetrators of the genocide into buildings full of innocent people so they could be slaughtered. The US might have made the conflict worse if we attempted to mitigate.
Evan Buck	Negative	Mali - in the Malian crisis, the world community begged the US to get involved. We didn't, and Mali and France eventually solved the problem themselves, proving mitigation is simply a choice we have, not an obligation	Sure, we might have not fulfilled our moral obligation to mitigate, and things might have turned out all right, but that doesn't mean the obligation doesn't exist.
Evan Buck	Negative	Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan - Soviets invaded Afghanistan to turn them communist, the US mitigated the conflict by assisting the mujahideen, who eventually birthed al-Qaeda and were responsible for the 9/11 terror attacks	Like the El Salvador Civil War, we did NOT mitigate. We escalated the conflict to stop communism. We handed the mujahideen weapons and told them to do our dirty work, which is not mitigation. The mujahideen would have probably have taken care of the problem themselves anyway.
Josiah McGee	affirmative	Chinese territorialism- the recent land and territory grabs by the Chinese government created conflict with nations like South Korea, the Philippines, and Japan. Interestingly enough, we have consider all three to be allies of sorts. Aff uses this example to illustrate a group of allies in need.	The example fits most definitions of international conflict well. The negative needs to emphasize the amount of subjective reasoning involved. For example, certain land and waters being fought over have been claimed by multiple US allies. Whose claim to the territories does the US choose to support?
Josiah McGee	negative	Iran and Israel- the negative often argues that the US cannot referee conflicts without proven threats to national security, human rights, or similar values.	Either the affirmative emphasizes the validity of the threat and violation of international law, or the affirmative argues potential threats are just as compulsory as confirmed threats.
Josiah McGee	affirmative	Nigerian kidnapping- this example depends on the definition of international conflict. Recently, Boko Haram kidnapped nearly 300 school girls and have threatened to begin selling them.	You really can't deny what has taken place. One would be best served to deal with this example philosophically and very tactfully. One could argue negotiation with terrorists is not a moral option, though it would make the situation better. One could also argue that attacking Boko Haram would also mitigate the situation, and it would. The problem is one would have to risk taking the lives of captives who have already been married off to the soldiers. A moral conflict arises when deciding whether to mitigate, and that tension can be used to refute a binding obligation.

	Case Side	Application	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Aff or Neg)	(Explain the application raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Josiah McGee	affirmative	Opium wars- I recently heard this example used to exemplify the effects of US involvement in a conflict not originally including the US. The US became involved by crafting a treaty and forcing China to sign. Ultimately, the treaty led to immense economic benefits for the US, Britain, and France. Mitigation supposedly promoted the value of economic security.	I believe the best approach is to question whether mitigation actually took place. Forcing China to sign a treaty did not build strong relations with the Chinese people or government.
Josiah McGee	affirmative	Syrian civil war- affirmative argues that Syria poses a threat to either human rights or national security.	Syrian conflicts rarely produce positive results. However, the lack of solid information about who did what makes the issue very much a "he said, they said" scenario. Can the US be morally obligated to mitigate a conflict without the capability to make a moral judgment about who is right or wrong?
Josiah McGee	negative	Chinese social contract- negative argues that social contract is paramount and uses China as an example of the consequences of violating that social contract.	Easily refuted by explaining that a violation of citizen's rights cannot be tolerated, even if halfway around the world.
Josiah McGee	negative	Afghanistan: used to emphasize the importance of choosing the correct response to conflict. mitigation may not always be the best response.	Argue that our intervention did not necessarily constitute mitigation. That, or argue we are still in the process so we cannot know the results yet.
Josiah McGee	negative	Napoleonic wars- negatives argue that nations do not need to meddle in international conflicts, but rather should focus on domestic issues like national security. We had no reason to stick our noses into Napoleon's war with the rest of Europe, especially because Europe eventually defeated him.	The answer depends on the affirmative you are running. Generally speaking, I think most affirmatives could respond with the argument that the Napoleonic Wars still caused an unnecessary loss of life, freedom, and human rights due to the protracted length of the conflict. Had we gotten involved, the conflict may have ended sooner.
Josiah McGee	affirmative	NATO/UN- I've seen affirmatives run these as examples of the US mitigating by supporting international authorities. The impact is the US supports values like peace, life, and security without violating the sovereignty of the nations involved because they support the international authorities.	A basic understanding of international law helps in this case. Neither the UN or NATO have complete authority over any nation. There are varying levels of authority the UN holds over different nations depending on various resolutions and treaties. If a nation is not a part of the UN, the UN technically has no authority over them. Mitigating by supporting the UN or NATO can easily violate the sovereignty of the nations involved unless the nation gives explicit permission for international authorities to intervene.
Josiah McGee	negative	American Civil War- this is one not used in the way you might think. It is used to refute the morality of intervening in current civil wars. For example, Britain helped the south [at the time technically a separate nation] and initially mitigated the losses and damages to the South. However, it also caused the conflict last longer than expected. In a similar fashion, if the US mitigates in Syria, we may be helping "the wrong side" and making the civil war last longer than anticipated.	It's an odd example, and has a few holes. First, it's talking about actions Britain takes not US. Second, a moral obligation is not necessarily predicated upon what we don't know, but what we do know. Third, each Civil war is fought for different reasons, and the US Civil War cannot be compared to all. Finally, Britain aided the nation now considered to be committing human rights violations. The US does not have to support human rights violations in order to mitigate conflict. Hopefully that all makes sense.
Josiah McGee	affirmative	Iranian hostage crisis- in summary, Iran storms our embassy and takes 50 Americans hostage including senior officials. The captivity lasts 444 days. Affirmatives argue the government should have taken steps to mitigate in order to avoid the damages to our reputation and to better ensure the safety of US citizens.	In response to this example, one could easily say we did mitigate because the captives came home. However, our mitigation methods were not beneficial in the long run and damaged our reputation and foreign policy.
Josiah McGee	negative	Iran Contra affair- negatives argue that even though technically legal, by passing Congress to make deals with terrorists and rebel organizations may have been unconstitutional. Unconstitutional actions by a leader are considered immoral, as is lying to Congress about your actions.	Potential responses include the fact that technically the deal was legal because of the methods used. Also, all parties allegedly involved were pardoned and no one really knows exactly how the deal took place. Finally, morality trumps legality and eventually leaders have to make tough decisions.
Kathryn Woolsey	Negative	Afghanistan: Used in the round that mitigation harms our economy.	In rebuttal: The US spends twice as much on welfare then we did in the Iraq and Afgan wars combined
Kathryn Woolsey	Affirmative	First Gulf War - This Global threat was a domestic threat.	1. The only reason we mitigated was to protect our resources. 2. Most of terrorism is tied back to the first gulf war.
Kathryn Woolsey	Affirmative	Somalia - Lives were lost MO to protect.	MO to protect US lives. Intervening in IC harm US citizens.
Kathryn Woolsey	Negative	9/11 - how by the US getting involved we stirred up trouble.	Regardless if we get involved in IC terrorists will still try to squash western influence. If we dont intervene in IC that will not change there directive.
Kathryn Woolsey	Affirmative	Bosnia	Rebutal: NATO was the primary mitigator not the US.
Lexi Stefani	Negative	Drone Strikes and Abortion. These examples are used to show that the U.S. doesn't have a moral obligation because we simply cannot make moral decisions. These applications are supposed to prove our immoral track record as a nation.	1) The biggest problem with these applications is that they assume the U.S. has only made immoral choices. That is simply not the case. Sure, we don't always do the "best thing", but that by no means makes us incapable of making moral desicions (show some examples) .
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	World War 2- we were obliagted to protect our own country, and stop the holocaust, and we saved many lives by mitigating	
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	Armenian Genocide- Instead of stopping this genocide, we sat by and let it happened, resulting in the loss of many lives	1. Can't gaurentee we could have actually lessen the conflict. 2. Not an international conflict

	Case Side	Application	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Aff or Neg)	(Explain the application raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	The Marshall Plan- right after WW2, we sent aid to Western Europe that restored the economies and saved many lives	1. No conflict. This was after WW2, so there was no conflict actually occurring
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	Biafra- The U.S. flew food to the Biafran people during their war with Nigeria, saving millions of lives	1. It was the International community, not just the U.S. 2. We didn't mitigate the actual conflict, just one of the side effects
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	Korean War- the U.S. mitigated the war between South and North Korea, saving South from becoming a part of North Korea	1. Lost countless servicemen in the process, which violates American life.
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	The Kosovo Conflict- we helped to end the the Kosovo War	1. The UN and NATO were involved directly, not the United States, therefore this application doesn't directly show that the U.S. had the obligation.
Rebekah Vehrs	Negative	Israel- Israel just minds their own business, and they have a great economy, all without help from other nations	1. Israel is constantly at war, and constantly losing innocent citizens in terrorist bombings. 2. The U.S. sends millions in aid to Israel, they don't ignore them.
Rebekah Vehrs	Negative	Drone Strikes- The U.S. mitigates conflict with drones, and it kills innocent people and causes retribution	1. Not an international conflict. Assassinating homicidal individuals is not mitigating a conflict or war between nations.
Rebekah Vehrs	Negative	Columbia- U.S. mitigation (Our war on drugs) has acutally increased violence and drug trafficking	1. Not an international conflict- fighting drug lords does not equal an international conflict 2. Not mitigation- we aren't making a confcilt less severe, we're trying to stop drug trafficking, which is not necessarily the same thing
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	NATO- NATO mitigates conflicts and protects life, proving that mitigation is a moral obligation	Maybe for NATO, but not the United States
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	The Dafur Genocide- The government in Sudan has hired militias to kill their own citizens in Darfur, Sudan. And the United States has the obligation to help.	1. Not an international conflict (depends on your definition) 2. The U.S. has mitigated using non-violent means without much success, proving that mitigation doesn't uphold AFF value.
Rebekah Vehrs	Affirmative	The Dayton Accords- The United States helped to work out a peace agreement to end the Bosnia War	1. No Conflict. The Serbs had already surrendered, the war was over.
Ryan Woolsey	Affirmative	Granada- Also could be tagged as "Operation urgent fury." Essentially, a Coup had seized control of the country and was threatening U.S lives. So Regan interviened and ended the conflict in 2 days.	Two ways to respond: 1. Depending on your definition of Internaitonal Conflict you could say that this application falls outside of the resolution therefore should be negated from the flow. 2. Depending on your case you could say this wasn't mitigation. We seriously abused the rights of the Granada citizens (ie no due process, no mass communication, ect) in the months following the war.
Ryan Woolsey	Negative	Iraq- Also could be tagged as "Saddam Hussein." Essentially talks about our war with them and how, in the end, it harmed our welfare. But there is another way you could take it. Saying that our government doesn't always get things right prior to mitigation. For instance, we believe they had WMD's, but after intervening found out that was an incorrect premise.	To address the first interpretation of this application simply pull from current events. The improvements of American Iraqi relations is considered one of the forgein policy success stories of our time. There is plenty of info to find and then just impact it by saying "in the long run, mitigation has been upheld." To address the second interpretation you can say it doesn't impact back to why mitigation is bad. We dont know every detail before we mitigate but does that me we should negate the resolution? No.
Ryan Woolsey	Negative	World War II (U.S supported Stalin)- Essentially saying we will support or allow for evil people/actions when we mitigate.	TURN: can say that what followed WWII was the cold way in which we were outwardly against what Russia was doing in its own nation. You could even pull in some current issue (Ukraine) and show how the U.S hasn't fully supported Russia in over 69 years.
Ryan Woolsey	Affirmative	Terrorism- just in general. Sometimes accompanied with 911. Pretty much saying there is no way we can just stand by and let our people be killed by terrorism.	Assuming you have the standard definition of International Conflict (between 2 or more nations) then you can simply say that this is not an international conflict. Because no nation openly supports terrorism the conflict is not between two or more nations therefor falls outside the relm of this debate.
Ryan Woolsey	Affirmative	2004 Haitian coup- a coup took control of the government, so the U.S interviened to preserve democracy and the freedom of the people.	A lot is factually faulty about this example. The majority of the population was actually in support of the coup. The reason why the coup began is because speculations of election fraud. Also, the former governmnet accused the U.S of allowing the coup to take power in the first place because we were at odds with them. Not exactly an example that calls for affermation of the resolution.
Solomon Moody	Negative	WWII- America imposed sanctions on Japan in order to impede their military. Japan need oil, so they decided to get it from certain islands in "their pacific ring". So they decided in order to get the oil they need to cripple the American fleet in pacific.	1. Japan was at that time was a horrible country committing mass genocides. Look to Europa and Nanking. After the Japanese took these cities they committed horrible atrocities on the Chinese people. The Japanese trained their troops in barbaric ways. They would have live bayonet practice. It would be Morally wrong for the US to help this country at this time. 2. Japan would have probably attacked the US anyways. The Philippines at that time was under US rule. And so if Japan wanted to take their "Pacific Ring" they would need to cripple the US fleet in order to take the Philippines.

	Case Side	Application	Rebuttal
(Your Name)	(Aff or Neg)	(Explain the application raised in the round.)	(Explain how you think you should BEST respond.)
Solomon Moody	Negative	Thailand Cambodia conflict. The what conflict? Exactly. This app is only important if someone uses "globalization" where all international conflicts can harm the US. Nobody know about this conflict. It is just a border conflict between two small South East Asian countries. This fight had been going on for a long time. During the early 2000's the Khmer people "Cambodians" burned down the Thai embassy and other Thai owned business. These two countries have also fought over a temple. So this is clearly an international conflict but with no impact to the International Community.	