

Overall Position: The United States was not justified in using atomic bombs against Japan in World War II.

<p>Argumentative Claim</p>	<p>Using atomic weapons on Japan was immoral.</p>	<p>The U.S. could have demonstrated the power of atomic weapons to Japan to warn them credibly.</p>	<p>Using atomic bombs on Japan ushered in the nuclear age, which makes the U.S. vulnerable to other countries using nuclear weapons against us.</p>
<p>Evidence A (Summary or Quotation of Text)</p>	<p>"In the combined bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in early August, 1945, about 200,000 people were killed, all with no real warning. Almost all of these people were civilians" (Union of Concerned Scientists, The Bomb, 1996).</p>	<p>America demanded that Japan surrender before dropping the two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the only realistic way to get Japan to surrender would have been a demonstration of the use of the bomb (Terrence Davidson, prof of history, Boston U., Slate, August 5, 2001).</p>	<p>"By being the first country to drop the bomb, the U.S. announced to the rest of the world that (a) their security depends on having nuclear weapons, and (b) the U.S. may use them, so other countries would then have concluded that they have the right to own and use them too. This is extremely dangerous" (New York Times, Feb 21, 1974).</p>
<p>Reasoning (How the Evidence Proves the Claim)</p>	<p>There are three ways that this objective data related our use of atomic weapons demonstrates that it was immoral. (1) The number of people killed; (2) the fact that all those killed were civilians; and (3) the fact that victims received no real warning.</p>	<p>Professor Davidson suggests not only was a demonstration of the power of the atomic bomb categorically different than simply warning Japan of its force, but also that such a demonstration would likely have succeeded in getting Japan to surrender, without the subsequent loss of innocent human life.</p>	<p>The U.S. set a volatile, completely unsafe precedent when it used nuclear weapons on another country. The logic of the message that this use sent is clear, and it has generated an urge to acquire nuclear weapons in countries and even enemy groups (like terrorists) throughout the world since then.</p>
<p>Evidence B (Summary or Quotation of Text)</p>	<p>"The demographics of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during the 1940s were such that a substantial portion of those killed in the atomic blasts (about 65%) were children, and most of the children were under 10 years old" (Annya Lipscomb, Atlantic Monthly, June, 2012).</p>	<p>"The U.S. and Japan were not in regular diplomatic contact by the latter stages of World War II, but nevertheless each side responded to the other side's most vehement, exigent communications. An invitation to a demonstration of atomic destruction would have been such a message. There are reasons to believe it could have worked" (Simona Adarovna, Journal of Military History, Spring, 2001).</p>	
<p>Reasoning (How the Evidence Proves the Claim)</p>	<p>There is a widely-accepted moral restriction against harming, much less killing, children, even in wartime. That the U.S. ran right over this moral rule may be the single clearest indicator that its use of atomic bombs was unjustified.</p>	<p>A demonstration clearly would have been possible. It clearly would have shocked the Japanese with the awesome power of nuclear weapons. They would certainly have had to understand what such devastation would have done to a heavily populated Japanese city. There is no reason to think it wouldn't worked.</p>	