

The debate over a justification of us use of atomic weapons in hiroshima and naga...

[War](#)



I feel it was justified in multiple ways, a few include the fact that even though there was a lot of casualties, war is war, it's not the right way to go but the problem is when it starts, it has to end somehow. So that's when it began, The US. needed to end the war and or cause Japan to The first bomb, dropped on the city of Hiroshima on 6 August 1945, resulted in a death toll of around 135, 000. Then the US dropped another bomb which hit Nagasaki on 9 August, killed at least 50, 000 people - according to some estimates, as many as 74, 000 died. I would also like to point out that since the US had suffered the loss of more than 418, 000 lives, both military and civilian. This would be basically making sure we don't have an invasion and possibly suffer even more loss of lives to the USA. Japan was indeed preparing for an invasion before the nuke. In summary, I feel the USA was indeed justified in these circumstances to bomb Hiroshima, The Japanese were planning and preparing for an attack against the USA at the time, which could have resulted in many and many lives lost and possibly a different outcome in the war. The USA Suffered a loss of more than 418, 000 lives compared to the Hiroshima + Nagasaki bombings which had less lives. Japan is a country that normally has a military that won't stop until the last man, which would've meant a longer lasting war, war has caused a lot of budget problems on countries, this is why sometimes wars only last for a bit or maybe even win after a devastating disaster, in this case, this was the bomb drops of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the bomb caused a lot of damage and it was extremely expensive. Moving onto the next question, which was If nuclear weapons had not been used, approximately how much longer would the war have lasted?

I'll say that the war would have lasted a lot longer as Japan at the time was already planning an attack/invasion on the US and that Japan is known to its military to fight till the last person remaining. Hiroshima and Nagasaki however demonstrated to the world the horrors of atomic warfare. If nuclear weapons weren't used at all, it would also have been used during the Cold War. This would have resulted in far more death and destruction. . Now onto the next question asked. What effects would a more protracted war have had on the U. S. and Japan?

This would be as if the Japan hadn't nuked Japan, I feel that the war could continue and will be worse, not only that other countries might get involved too, which could cause problems for the USA and then start a huge war with other countries that might have nukes. The amount of causality will be very high after that war ends and would likely end with a country either being wiped out, almost wiped out or just surrendering. Not only that, if the USA didn't use nukes, the Japan might even strike back with its nukes, while its programs were underfunded and likely not the highest quality nukes, they might be able to invade and strike the US with a nuke or two along with help from other countries. When the USA nuked Japan, Japan didn't have time to strike back with an invasion or even a nuke or help from other countries, many police stations, military stations were wiped out in the nukes by the US. It caused much panic and confusion to nearby cities and towns which furthermore caused more stress to Japan to just surrender, if the US didn't nuke Japan, that wouldn't have happened, it wouldn't cause more stress to Japan, as Japan's military is to keep fighting till the very last person which could be bad for US troops. At the time, Japan had no air force and no way to

<https://assignbuster.com/the-debate-over-a-justification-of-us-use-of-atomic-weapons-in-hiroshima-and-nagasaki/>

possibly even prevent the US from attacking with a nuke, it was very unexpected and the Japanese didn't see it coming. If the war kept going, Eventually either USA or Japan would have to give up and either surrender or sign a peace treaty. They wouldn't be able to continue and if Japan was nuked, this means that their budget and other resources will be extremely wiped out, The US also would have wiped a lot of its reserves and money out as well. If Japan wasn't nuked, the US may run out of resources as well as Japan. Again, with the possibility of other countries helping out and starting their own wars and causing a larger war.

In conclusion, The USA bombed Japan, more specifically Hiroshima and Nagasaki killing at least 50,000+ people, which resulted in a death toll of around 135,000. The Japanese were planning an invasion/attack on the US prior to USA attacking Japan with the two nukes. Many people died from both sides however the US had a lower amount of causality compared to Japan's. At the time of US attacking Japan with a nuke, the entire country went into amounts of stress and confusion, many government buildings were destroyed in the past along with police stations, fire, military stations and equipment. The Nuke however ended the war quickly and prevented anymore war from the two sides along with the possibility of starting an all out war with multiple other countries that had nukes and other powers. The nuke also serves as a reminder as to why nukes can be very destructive and dangerous and can wipe out entire cities, The US decided to not use nukes for more wars. If the nuke never happened to Japan, more nuking from other countries including the US could continue as there wasn't a reminder as to what happens to cities/countries in nukes, the loss of life and the stress and confusion.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-debate-over-a-justification-of-us-use-of-atomic-weapons-in-hiroshima-and-nagasaki/>