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In august of 1945, the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were a questionable decision by Harry Truman, the president of The United States of America. Throughout the years, it has been a heated debate in terms of whether the decision was morally correct and justified. Historians have analyzed and presented many arguments. In this short essay, I will attempt to expand on how historians feel about the decision by Truman to use atomic bombs. The revisionists bring into perspective and question the motivations of Harry Truman claiming he had more on his agenda than just the war. In my opinion, the decision to use atomic bombs was somewhat justified because if looked at statistically, the death toll with an invasion would have been higher and Truman was simply acting in self-interest and self-defence. The revisionists that critique Truman’s decision have come up with many theories to suggest that he had more on his agenda than just ending the war. It seems that according to revisionists, Harry Truman had other alternatives to reach his goals. The atomic bombs were not the only means towards the surrendering of Japan. He had the option of going ahead with a conventional bombing or strategic bombing which would have a significant impact: if not more, a little less than the atomic bomb. The argument is that if he had decided to use conventional bombing or strategic bombing, Japan would not have had to go through dangerous amounts of radiation levels which are still producing abnormalities in birth to this day. Also, revisionists claim that Truman’s decision was motivated by USSR. Historians have argued the claim that Truman had an interest in impressing Stalin, since USSR was about to invade Japan. Japan had already been defeated and its military and air force was exhausted. Another reason for Truman to launch the atomic bombs was to cover for the Manhattan Project. The project was created to build atomic bombs and consumed billions of US dollars. To show, or rather create a faÃ§ade of the progress, the atomic bombs had to be displayed so the Americans would feel that the money was put to good use. This event is seen a brutality towards Japan, and there are not very many historians who would fully agree with the decision Truman made. However in my opinion, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is about what was best for the United States and Japan at the time for the same reasons as Truman presented. At the time of the bombings, the war had stretched on for six long years and it was about time it ended. When Truman decided to use an atomic bomb, rather than a traditional bombing plan, his argument was that it would save many lives, Japanese and American. If the United States had decided to declare war and move ahead with a ground invasion, for argument’s sake, they would have had to mobilize a massive army. Approximately 200 000 people lost their lives in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This number would in fact, be much lower than the death toll a war on land could produce. The man power that would have been required to fight this battle would have been quite high. Truman acted in self-defence and in order to avoid a big loss in terms of cost and men, the atomic bomb seemed to be the best choice. As well, the dropping of the bombs was a very quick way for Japan to surrender to the allies resulting in allied victory. In conclusion, historians claim that Truman had a few reasons for choosing the path of atomic bombs. This reasons included outdoing the USSR with nuclear strength, avoiding any casualties and the deployment of many men, and to ensure the people feel positively and see for themselves the progression and result of the Manhattan Project. Although the historians raise crucial points, I feel that the bombings may have been justified strategically if not morally. Any killing is morally wrong, but in terms of strategy, it was a wiser decision for Truman to choose this path instead of sending out enormous amounts of men to, in the end, create more casualites.