

وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي
MINISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE
ⵎⵓⵍⵓⵔ ⵎⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵉⵏ ⵜⵉⵣⵉⵓⵣⵓ
ⵕⵓⵏⵓⵎⵉⵏ ⵉⵏ ⵜⵉⵣⵉⵓⵣⵓ
ⵕⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵉⵏ ⵜⵉⵣⵉⵓⵣⵓ

UNIVERSITE MOULOUD MAMMERI DE TIZI-OUZOU
FACULTE DES LETTRES ET DES LANGUES
DEPARTEMENT D'ANGLAIS



جامعة مولود معمري - تيزي وزو
كلية الآداب واللغات
قسم الإنجليزية

Domaine : Lettres et Langues Etrangères
Filière : Langue Anglaise
Spécialité : Littérature et Civilisation

Item Number :
Serial Number :

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master in English**

Title

**US Intervention in WWII: An Inquiry for Pearl
Harbor Attack and Hiroshima Bombing.**

Presented by :
Zakarya ABDOU
Kamel ANSEUR

Supervised by:
Dr. Mohamed GARITI

Board of Examiners :

Chair : Dr. Saïd GADA, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou
Supervisor : Dr. Mohamed GARITI, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou
Examiner : Mohamed Amine KHOUDI, MAA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou

Class : July, 2020

TO

My late father and aunt.

My loving mother and brother.

All my friends.

Zakarya ABDOU

To

My parents, family and friends.

Kamel ANSEUR

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor, **Dr. Mohamed Gariti** for his guidance and support. We will be forever grateful to him for his help that enabled us to overcome our methodological shortcomings. We wish to thank all the people whose assistance was a milestone in the completion of this dissertation.

We would also like to offer special thanks to the panel of examiners composed of **Dr. Said GADA** and **Mohamad Lamine KHOUDI** for accepting to examine this dissertation. We address further thanks to our teachers of the English department and the many faculty members who contributed to our study here: we are forever grateful for your support.

Abstract

This dissertation sheds light on the US intervention in the Second World War by highlighting two major events which are the Pearl Harbor attack on December, 7, 1941 and the Hiroshima bombing on August, 6, 1945. Despite the efforts of various researches, studies and investigations, however, the circumstances surrounding the US involvement in World War II remain controversial. It cannot be denied that scholars and historians have often argued that the US role in World War II failed to meet the “jus and bellum” and “jus in bello” criteria set forth in Just War Theory. This dissertation examines the cause and conduct of the US entry into war from the perspective of the just war doctrine. The detailed review and analysis of the history behind reveal that the attack upon Pearl Harbor was a surprised attack and a just cause that propelled America to the Second World War. The Hiroshima bombing, however, failed to meet the “discrimination” and “proportionality”, which are fundamental features of the doctrine of “the just war” and, therefore, must be deemed an immoral act.

Contents

Dedications.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv

I. Introduction 1

Review of the literature.....	2
-------------------------------	---

Issue and working hypothesis.....	4
-----------------------------------	---

Endnotes.....	5
---------------	---

II Methods and materials.....	7
-------------------------------	---

III Results.....	10
------------------	----

Chapter One:

Historical Background: The Outbreak of World War II and the US home Front.

Introduction.....	12
-------------------	----

The Great Depression Pulled the Nation into Isolationism.....	12
---	----

Roosevelt's Domestic Policies.....	14
------------------------------------	----

Isolationism Reached its Peak.....	15
------------------------------------	----

First Neutrality Act and the Worsening European Situation.....	17
--	----

Roosevelt's Re-election 1936.....	18
-----------------------------------	----

Neutrality Act of 1937 as Response to the Spanish Civil War.....	19
--	----

The Break out of the WWII and its Impact on the US. Army.....	19
Roosevelt vs. Willkie: Interventionist or Isolationist?.....	21
Lend-Lease Act (1941) and the Changing American Attitude.....	23
Conclusion.....	24
Endnotes.....	25

Chapter Two:

Investigating Pearl Harbor Attack as Just Cause

Introduction.....	28
Pearl Harbor and the Jus Ad Bellum.....	42
Conclusion.....	44
Endnotes.....	45

Chapter Three:

Hiroshima and the Principles of Just War Doctrine

Introduction.....	49
Hiroshima in the Light of the Just War Theory.....	49
Conclusion.....	57
Endnotes.....	58

General Conclusion..... 61

Bibliography..... 64

Appendix A Franklin Roosevelt’s ‘Day of Infamy’ speech..... 68

Appendix B Harry Truman’s statement..... 70

I) General Introduction:

U.S. military intervention in foreign conflicts has, for years, been a subject of study and research for historians and scholars. From the very beginning of its existence as an independent nation, the US foreign policy was featured by isolationism and neutrality with complete avoidance of alliances that do not serve American interests. However, The United States was involved in various military conflicts, such as World War I in 1917 and World War II in 1941 after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor; an important American Naval base on the island of Oahu. In the following decades, issues arose as there were frequent disagreements between historians over the relationship between the US intervention in World War II and the just war theory. Some historians rightly asked, “why the raid on Pearl Harbor was not anticipated and adequate steps taken to repulse the attack despite the fact that the US crypt-analyst had cracked the Japanese diplomatic code”¹. Some Roosevelt-baiting historians assume that the White House knew what was about to happen but purposely failed to warn the field commanders². While some scholars claim that President Roosevelt and his military chiefs did not wish to forfeit an attack that would facilitate a “backdoor” entry for the United States into the Second World War³.

The judgments of historians regarding the US intervention in World War II were not only devoted to Pearl Harbor attack as a direct cause that dragged America to the war, but also for the atomic bombing of Hiroshima that falls within the just conduct of war. Since the end of the war, Harry Truman’s decision was and has been the subject of much controversy, largely due to the high civilian death toll that resulted from the bombardment. It has, in fact, been argued that Harry Truman made a right decision by dropping an atomic bomb that brought the war in the pacific theatre to its climax. Some critics, however, such as former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Dwight D. Eisenhower decry Truman’s decision claiming that the use of nuclear bombs failed to meet the features of just war theory specifically *jus in bello*.

Therefore, one may argue that the US involvement in the Second World War has been a controversial issue from December,8,1941 when President Franklin Roosevelt declared war on Japan to August,6,1945, a date that witnessed the rise of the atomic age and the destruction of Hiroshima. Between these two dates, many legitimate questions have been raised about how just the US participation in the global conflict was.

The Present dissertation discusses the controversy surrounding the American intervention in the Second World War. Through our study, we will attempt to provide some evidence concerning Pearl Harbor as a just cause that led to the US intervention in World War II. To carry out this task, we will rely on Franklin Delano Roosevelt's speech "Day of Infamy" that was addressed to joint committee of Congress on December,8th,1941. This dissertation is also designed to focus upon the American conduct in the war from the perspective of the just war theory. Taking into consideration Truman's press release on August 6, 1945, we shall argue that the US government failed to meet the criteria of the just war doctrine by dropping nuclear bombs against Japanese city as Harry Truman considered and concluded that Hiroshima bombing was a rational choice that sought to save the lives of American soldiers. In determining whether or not the use of nuclear bombs was a just decision, this research paper examines Truman's order to use atomic weapon in the lights of just war doctrine and concludes that it was an unjust decision.

Review of Literature

It is reported in literature that both F.D.Roosevelt's speech "Day of Infamy" and Harry.S.Truman press release have received ample scholarly consideration. Tiara Kay Foster, for instance, in his dissertation entitled "*Constructing a World War II America: The Rhetorical Craftsmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt*" (2013). Foster maintains an explanation of the rhetorical priming work that Franklin D. Roosevelt employed to overcome isolationism in the United States. He claims that Franklin Roosevelt's leadership through the Banking

crisis and initiation of many domestic policies to keep America great, were the basis upon which he would prime the American people to venture through another foreign conflict. The writer concludes that the generation who would fight in the noble and good war against the evil Nazi regime was still reeling from the Great Depression and the sting of involvement from the First World War. They would need to be rhetorically primed to be moved out of their isolationist slumber⁴.

Moreover, Katie Mettler in his article entitled *75 years later, remembering FDR's day of 'infamy,' a phrase that almost wasn't*(2016).In this work, Mettler sheds light on the language that had been used by FDR as well as his choice of words. The writer highlights the differences between the original speech and its draft. Katie Mettler noted that the path to the “infamy” version began with a meeting between Roosevelt and his closest confidant, Paul M. Sparrow, director of the FDR Presidential Library and Museum, in Hyde Park, N.Y. Therefore, the journalist concludes by saying that Franklin Roosevelt’s phrase is ranked as one of the greatest and most memorable in U.S. history⁵.

Another article written by Robert Lehrman entitled *Rhetoric Revisited: FDR's "Infamy" Speech* (2016). Lehrman tended to give a rhetoric analysis for FDR’s speech by comparing this intervention with the one that was under Wilson’s administration in 1917 and how the radio helped FDR to persuade the majority of the American people as well as the Congress in short time. Lehrman claims that Americans remember about a day “that will live in infamy” as one of the most famous speeches in the US history, though it’s safe to say most Americans remember only that phrase. But on this 75th anniversary of the attack, it’s worth asking: What makes it so famous? He wonders. Lehrman concludes by putting emphasis on how Roosevelt’s 250 words thundered out, set in motion a united and long-lasting response to the threat of Japan and Germany.⁶

Furthermore, in his thesis entitled *The Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima: A reasonable and Just Decision* (2010), Montaniel S. Navarro claims that the bombing of Hiroshima was a reasonable decision. Navarro argues that President Truman considered and concluded that the atomic bombing was a sensible and rational choice and, therefore, reasonable. Navarro elucidates the bombing of Hiroshima from the perspective of Natural Law traditions of the individual's Right to Life and the state's Right to Independence concluding that it was right decision from President Truman⁷.

Lastly, many scholars have been dealing with Truman's press release after the bombing of Hiroshima such as *A "Purely Military" Target? Truman's Changing Language About Hiroshima* (2018) by Alex Wellerstein. Wellerstein claims that Truman was not fully clear about the use of the atomic bomb, as Hiroshima was not, strictly speaking, a military base. He concludes by saying that his interpretation solves some of these tricky questions about why Truman would persist in many ways to label Hiroshima as a "purely military" target. But more usefully, it also explains Truman's sudden change in language after August 8th and 9th, in which he bluntly acknowledges that the atomic bomb was a killer of civilians⁸.

Issue and Working Hypothesis

It follows from our review of the literature that recent studies have extensively focused on rhetorical analysis of Harry Truman and Roosevelt's speeches. One is thus left to wonder what is about the US involvement in the Second World War that demands a revision of these sources. Hence, our dissertation examines the extent to which the US intervention in World War II is justified in the cause and the conduct. This issue will be analyzed in the light of the Just War Theory. It should be noted that revisionist historians(those historians who examine or try to change existing beliefs about how events happened) often argue that Pearl Harbor was not a surprise attack, and that President Roosevelt himself had foreknowledge of the Japanese plot to cripple the Hawaiian fleet but kept it secret. In other words, President

Roosevelt, according to revisionists, purposely left the naval base in Pearl Harbor unprepared in order to subvert the isolationist movement and gain public support so that he could justify US intervention in World War II. Nevertheless, one may ask, did President Roosevelt and his staff actually know about Japan's intention to bomb the Hawaiian fleet at Pearl Harbor?

The answer remains non exhaustive. For this purpose, it would be of interest to learn more about how the Pearl Harbor attack happened since many historians have argued that the attack was a conspiracy that dragged the country to the war. Therefore, our study squares in the need to bridge the gap around the question asked above. To do so, we will argue that the American intervention in the Second World War was justified; however, the conduct of this involvement was unjust. After a deep study of the subject matter, we suppose that, in fact Truman's decision to drop atomic bomb against civilians failed to meet the principles of the just war theory(jus in bello that deals with the conduct in war) and, therefore must be deemed an immoral act.

Endnotes

¹Selig Adler. **The Uncertain Giant: 1921-1941 American Foreign Policy Between Wars** (New York: Macmillan Company,1965),279.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Tiara Kay Foster, **"Constructing a World War II America: The Rhetorical Craftsmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt"**. Master's thesis Syracuse University ,2013.

⁵ Katie Mettler, **75 Years Later, Remembering FDR's Day of 'Infamy,' a phrase that Almost Wasn't** (washingtonpost,2016) URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2016/12/07/75-years-later-remembering-fdrs-day-of-infamy-a-phrase-that-almost-wasnt/>

⁶Robert Lehrman,"**Rhetoric Revisited: FDR's "Infamy" Speech**,American Experience,Dec,2016,URL:<https://medium.com/americanexperiencepbs/rhetoric-revisited-fdrs-infamy-speech-ba12f9970e17>

⁷-Montaniel S. Navarro, **The Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima: A Reasonable and Just Decision**, Master's thesis, (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C, 2010).

⁸Alex Wellerstein, **A "Purely Military" Target? Truman's Changing Language About Hiroshima,"January 19th, 2018,** URL:<http://blog.nuclearsecrecy.com/2018/01/19/purely-military-target/>

II) Methods and Materials

a) Method

To fulfill our established goal, we would suggest that the best framework through which to conduct an analysis of the US intervention in WW II is the Just War Theory. With this study then, the US intercession in the Second World War will be analyzed to determine whether or not the intervention and the conduct in war were morally right to see the extent to which the US intervention was justified in the eyes of the Americans and historians. It can be reasonably argued that the theory of “just war” has always been a crucial feature in studying wars and conflicts between nations in which various conditions must be followed to justify the moral issues surrounding war. In this regard, it is worth bearing in mind that throughout history war and conflicts have been a cause of profound human suffering. Thus, “it is not surprising that the early Church developed an elaborate system of rules to govern the ethics of warfare”.⁹ The Church developed the Just War doctrine to establish the causes that justify war, *jus ad bellum*, and to restrain the use of violence within war, *jus in bello*. Consequently, the Just War doctrine functions as a predicate to international law's proscription of war crimes”¹⁰. In this respect St. Augustine argues:

Just wars are usually defined as those which avenge injuries, when the nation or city against which warlike action is to be directed has neglected either to punish wrongs committed by its own citizens or to restore what has been unjustly taken by it. Further that kind of war is undoubtedly just which God Himself ordains.¹¹

St. Augustine also concluded, “[P]eace is war's purpose, the scope of all military discipline, and the limit at which all just contentions aim”.¹²

It is fair to say that the just war theory deals with the justification of how and why wars are fought. Therefore, all the nations rely on it to legally and morally justify their going to war. The US is no exception to this rule, as the American officials often give consideration to the criteria of just war doctrine before engaging in any foreign conflict. For the US

intervention in the Second World War, it has often been claimed that the American government did not respect the principles of the just war theory as they declared war on Japan. For that reason, our attention will focus on the two principles that constitute the just war theory, namely the “Jus Ad Bellum” that governs conflicts before launching in wars, the “Jus In Bello” that limits the legitimate targets in wars.

b) Materials

Concerning the materials, we assembled out two speeches to be our reliable primary sources in this research. The speeches to be analyzed are: "Day of Infamy"¹³ which is a speech delivered by the American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on December 8, 1941 to ask Congress for war declaration against the Empire of Japan as reaction to the Pearl Harbor attack. Roosevelt's speech aimed to raise morale and create public support for war. Within hours, all the members of congress voted for war declaration against Japan. It can be said that Roosevelt' 'day of infamy' is one of the most famous speeches in the US history.

In addition to “Day of Infamy”, Harry Truman's press release¹⁴ that informed the American people about dropping a nuclear bomb on Hiroshima August 6, 1945, Japan will be analyzed as primary source. Truman sought to justify his decision to drop the atomic bomb, blaming the Japanese for refusing the Potsdam ultimatum that defining terms for unconditional surrender for Japan. Harry Truman also highlighted in his statement how powerful the atomic bomb was and how the US was ready to obliterate any country thanks to nuclear bombs.

These speeches will be used as evidence in our quest to prove that the US intervention had a moral cause that dragged the country to the Second World War under Roosevelt's leadership; however, with the arrival of Harry Truman, his decision to use nuclear bombs had ruined the ethical participation of the US in the conflict.

As for the structure of our dissertation it is organized in the following manner: the first chapter explores the events having taken place before and during the outbreak of the war between 1930 and 1941. A special attention is given to the US home front highlighting the stance of the American people and their government toward what was going on in Europe. This chapter places an emphasis on the rationale for the US neutrality during the same period for the sake of better understanding to the forthcoming intervention on December 8th, 1941 when the US officially joined the Allies.

The second chapter investigates the attack on Pearl Harbor as just cause that brought the US to the Second World War. In doing so, we will try to examine the meaning of this assault that is often reported as the one which ended isolationist feelings in the US home front and the greatest naval disaster the U.S. Army has ever seen. This investigation will go hand in hand with Franklin Delano Roosevelt's speech on December, 8th, 1941. The priority of this part is to argue the legitimacy of the US intervention in the war by introducing the first principle of the Just war theory. It is our belief that Pearl Harbor was a just cause rather than a "back door" to the war as some revisionist historians claim that President Roosevelt had foreknowledge of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The final chapter highlights the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in order to understand whether the bombing was ultimately just. In this part, we put a great emphasis on Truman's address after the nuclear bomb had been used for the first time in the history of warfare. Our analysis relies on the second principle of the Just War Doctrine, which is *jus in bello*, in our quest to provide a clear answer for the question which has baffled many historians- was, they wonder, the US involvement in the Second World War just in its conduct?

Endnotes

⁹ St Augustine, *The City of God* (J. Healey trans.), in *Basic Texts in International Relations* 28 (Evan Guard ed., 1992) [Herein after BASIC TEXTS] (emphasis added), quoted in Alexander C. Linn, “The Just War Doctrine and the Liability for Parliamentary War Crimes,” *34 Ga. J. Int’l & Comp. L.* 619 (2006), 627, URL: <http://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1228&context=gjicl>

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Peter C. Mancall and Gary B. Nash, eds, “The Great Depression and World War II” , **Encyclopedia of American History** , ed. Allan M. Winkler, (New York: facts on file,1961),466.

¹⁴Peter C. Mancall and Gary B. Nash, eds, “The Great Depression and World War II” , **Encyclopedia of American History** , ed. Allan M. Winkler, (New York: facts on file,1961),469-470.

III Results and discussion

a) Results

After analyzing the primary sources, we reached the assumption that the US involvement in World War II had a just cause which was Pearl Harbor attack, as the Hawaiian naval fleet was surprisingly attacked on December, 7, 1941. Therefore, the American participation in the war, after all, was an act of self-defense as Japan had, for years, been planning to cripple the Hawaiian fleet.

Our second assumption is that Roosevelt's administration took into consideration the first principle of the just war theory which is a fundamental step before engaging in any foreign conflict. After considering the six principles of jus ad bellum, or what makes a war just, we have come to realize that America's entry into World War II was justified according to the just war theory.

The third result underlines the dropping of the Atomic bomb on Hiroshima. We argue that it was not necessary as the Japanese were going to surrender to the Allies troops; therefore, our claim is that the bombing did not play a vital role, and Harry Truman made an unwise decision as there had been alternative ways to end the war with Japan. Yet, he had chosen nuclear bombs that killed innocent people, destroyed a civilian city and violated the principles of just war doctrine.

b) Discussion

The US intervention in World War II has been one of the most important and controversial events of the past century. As the war broke out in Europe, the United States, under Franklin Roosevelt's leadership, remained neutral in the conflict due to various reasons such as isolationism and Neutrality Acts. At dawn December 7, 1941, however, Japan launched a surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor dragging the US to World War II. It is a fact of history that America played a vital role in the war by turning the almost defeat of the Allies into victory. The US military power shifted the balance of power during the war, especially with the rise of atomic age in 1945. What came after is that President Truman gave his order to drop the first nuclear bomb in the history of warfare upon Hiroshima. Truman's order brought the war in the Pacific to its end. Since then, many questions have been raised concerning how ethical the US involvement in World War II was? In determining whether the US intervention in the Second World War was just in the cause and conduct, the chapters of this project examine the American involvement in that global conflict through the prism of Just War Theory.

Chapter One

1. Historical Background: The Outbreak of World War II and the US Home Front.

Introduction

The breakout of World War II took place in Europe in 1939 few decades after the end of the Great War. The United States, under the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, nonetheless devoted a lot of effort to domestic policy, and remained officially neutral in the conflict. Simultaneously the majority of the American people concurred that the involvement in World War I was a mistake that should not be repeated. This chapter aims to elucidate how the combination of the Great Depression, Neutrality Acts and isolationism played a vital role in keeping U.S. neutrality toward the war in Europe. In this part we will try to clarify why the American policymakers did not join the conflict from the beginning in 1939 by highlighting the major events that preceded the American involvement in the Second World War.

1.1 The Great Depression Pulled the Nation into Isolationism.

In the 1930s, the United States was in the throes of the greatest economic depression it had ever experienced. It has been claimed, therefore, that the Great Depression had a significant impact on the US foreign policy that was overshadowed by domestic policy during the 1930s. The American policymakers were more concern with matters at home than political tensions abroad.

The Great Depression can be traced back to October 1929 when the stock market crashed, bringing the prosperity of the roaring twenties to its climax and giving birth to the Great Depression. The direct cause of this economic crisis is still unclear in the eyes of historians as the depression was a result of various complex events. The American people,

therefore, faced many hardships in their daily lives. By 1931, nearly eight million Americans were out of work. Unlike unemployed workers in countries such as Germany and Britain they received no government unemployment pay. Many were soon without homes or food and had to live on charity. Millions spent hours shuffling slowly forward in “breadlines” where they received pieces of bread or bowls of soup, paid for by money collected from those who could afford it.¹

The Depression years were also featured by the failure of the banking system as thousands of banks had closed across the country leading to the fall of the industrial production by 60 percent in addition to investment in industry that was as down by 90 percent. In the process President Hoover, reaction against the crisis was not enough in the eyes of historians as Hoover claimed that he could do two things to end the depression. The first was to balance the budget that is to make sure that the government’s spending did not exceed its income. The second was to restore businessmen’s confidence in the future, so they would begin to take on workers again.²

However, the following months proved that Hoover’s words were not transformed into actions as the situation was growing worse with the end of his term as president. Meanwhile the Democrats had already chosen Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be their candidate against Hoover who was seeking second term in office despite his failure in reducing the effects of the Depression that devastated the U.S. economy.

The majority of the American people were saying “In Hoover we trusted, now we are busted” as a result, they gave their voices to F.D.Roosevelt leading him to win election by the largest majority America has ever seen. On March, 4th, 1933 Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the presidential oath in Washington D.C. It is evident that Roosevelt reached the White House

during the worst economic situation in the US history; however, he was able to bring new policies that sought to restore faith, hope and prosperity for the American people.

1.2 Roosevelt's Domestic Policies.

Franklin Roosevelt, who had little experience or interest in international affairs, dedicated himself to save the US economy by introducing new ideas and policies in order to bring about economic relief to a country that had already been paralyzed by the Great Depression. In the process, Roosevelt introduced his New Deal ideas. "The country needs and, unless I mistake its temper, the country demands bold, persistent experimentation." Roosevelt added "It is common sense to take a method and try it: If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all, try something". From the President's first words, it can be felt that he did not give attention to diplomacy or foreign policy, but his primary task was to stop the economic crisis.

The following months witnessed the emergence of various new laws and government agencies to help the nation to recover from the depression. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), for instance, provided jobs to thousand unemployed young men as Roosevelt believed that his most urgent task was to find people work.³It can be clearly seen that the New Deal decreased the effects of the Depression; however, not all Americans supported Roosevelt's New Deal policies. Some said that the country could not afford the money that he was spending. Others said that much of the money was being wasted anyway. What came after is that Roosevelt's new strategy faced some obstacles as in 1935 the court had begun to rule against the New Deal. One year after the Court ruled that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was unconstitutional. The following years were marked by a conflict between the Supreme Court and the executive branch, which is the President.

Overall, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Dealers went beyond this concept of regulated capitalism by insisting that the government not simply respond to social crisis but also take positive steps to avoid them and their social effects. To this end, the New Deal's various benefit programs sought to ensure a minimum level of well-being for all Americans. The New Deal had established basic qualitative standards for labor conditions and public welfare and helped middle-class Americans hold on to their savings, their homes, and their farms. The protection afforded by bank-deposit insurance, unemployment pay, and Social Security pensions would come to be universally accepted as a safeguard against future depressions.⁴

It is widely accepted that the Great Depression and New Deal programs fed the spirit of isolationism in the US home front. Foreign policy leaders of the 1930s had adopted an isolationist attitude toward the rest of the world. American public opinion gave more importance to domestic issues that were featured by the economic crisis rather than foreign problems. Therefore, it is noteworthy to highlight how and why isolationism prevailed in the US home front before and during the outbreak of World War II.

1.3 Isolationism Reached its Peak.

In the fall of 1930, Europe was featured by economic crisis and political extremism that resulted instability and a growing tensions between the European countries. In the US; however, American foreign policy was based under non-interventionism policy that is better known as isolationism. Isolationists sought non-involvement in foreign conflict especially in Europe and Asia. The publication of various works during this time fed the ideology of isolationism in America, *Merchants of Death* by H.C. Engel Brecht, for example, is a book that urged the American people not to go to war and it had a big impact on the public opinion at that time. In 1935, *War Is A Racket* was published for the same aim which was to increase

popular suspicions of wartime profiteering and influence public opinion in the direction of neutrality. Many Americans became determined not to be tricked by banks and industries into making such great sacrifices again. The reality of a worldwide economic depression and the need for increased attention to domestic problems only served to bolster the idea that the United States should isolate itself from troubling events in Europe.⁵

Meanwhile, President Roosevelt was working hard to change the nation's isolationist mood. In 1933, he proposed a Congressional measure that would have granted him the right to consult with other nations to place pressure on aggressors in international conflicts. The bill ran into strong opposition from the leading isolationists in Congress, including progressive politicians such as Senators Hiram Johnson of California, William Borah of Idaho, and Robert La Follette of Wisconsin. In 1935, controversy over U.S. participation in the World Court elicited similar opposition.⁶

The isolationists were a diverse group, including progressives and conservatives, business owners and peace activists, but because they faced no consistent, organized opposition from internationalists, their ideology triumphed time and again. Roosevelt appeared to accept the strength of the isolationist elements in Congress until 1937. In that year, as the situation in Europe continued to grow worse and the Second Sino-Japanese War began in Asia, the President gave a speech in which he likened international aggression to a disease that other nations must work to "quarantine." At that time, however, Americans were still not prepared to risk their lives and livelihoods for peace abroad.⁷

Isolationism was set to become a feature of the 1930s. The American Congress passed several laws that aimed to limit the US involvement in future wars. As a result, the decade that preceded the breakout of World War II was featured by Neutrality Acts that succeeded to keep the US out of foreign conflicts. In what follows, we will shed the light on the first

neutrality act that banned the export of arms from the United States to any foreign nation at war.

1.4 First Neutrality Act and the Worsening European Situation

The events that took place in Europe by the mid-1930s made it obvious that a new global war was about to begin. With the emergence of Adolf Hitler's Third Reich in Germany to the fascism in Italy under the leadership of Benito Mussolini, it was a common belief that the implications of these two new ideologies would put a huge strain on all the nations around the world. Meanwhile, The US witnessed the passing of the first Neutrality Act on August 31, 1935 to enforce U.S. neutrality. This act aimed to prohibit the export of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" from the United States to foreign nations at war and requiring arms manufacturers in the United States to apply for an export license. American citizens traveling in war zones were also advised that they did so at their own risk. President Franklin D. Roosevelt originally opposed the legislation, but relented in the face of strong Congressional and public opinion. On February 29, 1936, Congress renewed the Act until May of 1937 and prohibited Americans from extending any loans to belligerent nations.⁸

From what has been discussed, it can be clearly seen that Franklin Roosevelt wanted from the beginning to give the American people the incentive for the involvement in European affairs as he opposed the neutrality act. However, it was an impossible task as the majority of Americans were still considering the involvement in World War I as a big mistake that should not happen again.

Several months after the passing of the first Neutrality Act, Franklin Roosevelt's first term as President came to its end. Motivated by his New Deal achievements that decreased the effects of the economic crisis, President Roosevelt decided to run for second term against

Republican candidate Alfred M.Landon. The next part of this chapter will highlight the election of 1936.

1.5 Roosevelt's Re-election in 1936

Roosevelt's New Deal policies proved that he put his utmost effort to end the Depression; as a result he became very popular by the end of his first term as President. In the 1936 presidential election, the American people had to choose between F.D. Roosevelt and the Republican candidate Alfred M.Landon. For many historians, Roosevelt's re-election in 1936 was the most certain thing since George Washington's. Despite the fact that he was under attack from the left for not doing enough and from the right for doing too much concerning his reaction toward the depression. Roosevelt won re-election in a landslide, losing only the states of Maine and Vermont. The press did not pick a winner early. They wanted to make it look like an even race even though Roosevelt was far ahead of his opponent. Landon, Roosevelt's opponent, tried to make Roosevelt look like a dictator. Roosevelt, however, did not attack his opponent. This made many people like Roosevelt even more⁹. It may be argued that Roosevelt's popularity was dramatically increasing thanks to his first term achievements that brought back hope for the American people through his New deal policies that had created new job opportunities for the American. A workingman said about Roosevelt "he saved my home, he gave me job. I would be without a roof over my head if it hadn't been for the government loan. God bless Mr. Roosevelt and the democratic party".¹⁰

It is a fact, however, that Roosevelt's second term as President began with an important event, which was the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. As it has been mentioned before, isolationists had the upper hand in the US home front; therefore with such a conflict the Congress passed another law that prevented the US from any

involvement in this conflict. In what follows, we will try to elucidate the neutrality act of 1937 that was passed in the shadow of the Spanish Civil War.

1.6 Neutrality act of 1937 as Response to the Spanish Civil War.

There had been an increasing fear for war eruption in Europe during the 1930s due to the political tensions that prevailed in the continent. In 1936, however, a civil war rather than a world war took place in Spain between those loyal to the newly established Republican government and those who favored a conservative, militaristic system. As a result of this new conflict, Congress promptly passed another Neutrality act in 1937. Under this law, U.S. citizens were forbidden from traveling on belligerent ships, and American merchant ships were prevented from transporting arms to belligerents even if those arms were produced outside of the United States. The Act gave the President the authority to bar all belligerent ships from U.S. waters, and to extend the export embargo to any additional “articles or materials.” Finally, civil wars would also fall under the terms of the Act.¹¹

It should be noted that the US policymakers were fully aware that sooner or later war will erupt in Europe due to the political tension that was growing at an alarming rate. As a result, various laws were passed to prevent the US from any involvement in foreign conflict. The next part of this chapter will deal with the outbreak of World War II and its impact on the U.S. Army.

1.7 The Break Out of WW II and its Impact on the U.S. Army

World War II was the largest and most violent armed conflict in the history of mankind. The beginning of the war can be traced back to 1938 when the German troops had occupied Austria, incorporating it into the Third Reich. Several months later, Hitler’s quest for European dominance began by taking Poland precisely in September, 1939. World War II

had officially begun. The first months of the war proved that the Germans were well prepared comparing to the First World War.

In the spring of 1940, their theories were put to the test as German forces struck against Norway and Denmark in April; invaded the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg in May; and late in the same month broke through a hilly, wooded district in France. Their columns sliced through to the English Channel, cutting off British and French troops in northern France and Belgium. The French Army, plagued by low morale, divided command, and primitive communications, fell apart. The British evacuated their forces from Dunkerque with the loss of most of their equipment. The Germans entered Paris on June 14, and the French government, defeatist and deeply divided politically, sued for an armistice. The success of the German Blitzkrieg(a German method of warfare that sought to achieve a quick victory) forced the remaining combatants to rethink their doctrine and restructure their armies.¹²

It was evident that the Germans were working fast to control the rest Europe, with the fall of France Hitler moved to England launching the Luftwaffe(the aerial warfare branch of the German military forces during WWII) against the airfields and cities of England to pave the way for an invasion. Britain's survival hung by a thread. From July to October 1940, while German landing barges and invasion forces waited on the Channel coasts. Fortunately, the British were able to force Hitler abandoning his plan to invade England¹³. In the Eastern front, the Germans were going deep into Soviet territories. Driving toward Leningrad, Moscow, and Ukraine cutting off entire Soviet armies. Despite tremendous losses, Russian military forces withdrew farther into the country and continued to resist. Nazi expectations of a quick victory evaporated, and the onset of winter caught the Germans unprepared. Thirty

miles short of Moscow their advance ground to a halt, and the Soviets launched massive counterattacks.¹⁴

Simultaneously, in the American home front, government staff concurred that preparation ought to start immediately. George C. Marshall took over as Chief of Staff in 1939, but the Army remained hard pressed simply to carry out its mission of defending the continental United States. Despite the fact that Neutrality acts prevented the US from any overseas intervention, G. Marshall and his staff made plans to expand the Army to 1.5 million men. On August, 27, 1940, Congress approved inducting the National Guard into federal service and calling up the Reserves.

As it can be seen, the outbreak of the war had its impact on the American home front. With such a huge conflict in Europe, Franklin Delano Roosevelt's second term as President ended. The 1940 was a year of Presidential Election where Franklin Delano Roosevelt broke with tradition and ran for a third term in office. However, what features this election is that Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate, was an isolationist, therefore it has often been argued that the most important Presidential election in the US history took place in 1940. In the next part, we will shed light on the race to the White House between Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie in the shadow of World War II.

1.8 Roosevelt vs. Willkie: Interventionist or Isolationist?

It had been a year since the outbreak of the war; Germany controlled Western and Eastern Europe. Simultaneously, Franklin Roosevelt's second term came to its end in a period that was featured by political instability associated with a huge threat to all the nations around the world. The election of 1940 has, therefore, been reported to be crucial in the US history as Franklin D. Roosevelt ran for the third time defying the two-term limit established by George

Washington. Richard Moe, in his book *Roosevelt's Second Act: The Election of 1940 and the Politics of War* calls Roosevelt's decision to seek a third term:

One of the most consequential presidential decisions of the twentieth century, which led to a pivotal moment in American history. Roosevelt's third term not only affected the course of the United States on the eve of the most horrific war in history but also affected how the world would be after it was over.

The race for the White House began as soon as the Republicans nominated Wendell Willkie for the Presidency. Willkie was of German descent and had been a leading opponent of the new deal throughout the thirties. The nomination of Wendell Willkie gave Roosevelt the incentive to run for third term. As a result, The democrats field their own strongest man: "We want Roosevelt" roared the galleries at the democratic convention in Chicago¹⁵. Historians have long known that the election of 1940 was a turning point in the US history due to the different outlooks between the two candidates as Roosevelt was neutral but he was in the side of the Allies, while Willkie was an isolationist who disliked the US involvement in foreign conflict.

Across the Atlantic the election was being watched very closely. Adolf Hitler, from one hand, detested Roosevelt and knew he would be a difficult adversary. He feared America's industrial strength. Therefore, an isolationist in the White House would make his plans to conquer Britain, and the world, much easier. Winston Churchill, on the other hand, was terrified of the possibility that Roosevelt might lose the election. He believed that the fate of the British Empire and indeed the fate of the free world were at stake. He later wrote that he had followed the election "with profound anxiety" and that "No newcomer into power could possess or soon acquire the knowledge and experience of Franklin Roosevelt. None could equal his commanding gifts." (Churchill: "Their Finest Hour").¹⁶

It has been reported that both the Axis and Allies were impatiently waiting for the 1940 election; if Wendell Willkie had won the election, The US would have never engaged in

the war due to his isolationist outlook, whereas, the best candidate for the Allies was F.D.Roosevelt who always favored the protection of democracy in the world. By Election Day, Nov. 5, 1940, Roosevelt had built a comfortable lead, and won the election by five million votes, with 54.8 percent of the popular vote and 84.5 percent of the Electoral College. While this was the smallest of his victory margins, it was none-the-less a significant victory. A majority of citizens voted for experience at a time of crisis. Roosevelt spent the next year preparing the American public for the inevitable war with the Axis powers and transforming the industrial base to become the arsenal of democracy¹⁷

It can be assumed that this election was a turning point in the American home front, as the race for the White House was more between isolationists and internationalists than republican and democrat candidates. The results of the election, however, were clearly on the side of those who advocated the idea that America as superpower must take action against what was going on in Europe, from this point the US position began to shift gradually from neutrality to the war. Meanwhile, Lend-Lease act was passed by the congress giving the President and his staff the right to lend or lease war supplies to countries that their defense can serve the American national security. In the following part of this chapter, we will argue that due to this act the US foreign policy was being shifted from neutrality and isolationism to war.

1.9 Lend-Lease Act (1941) and the Changing American Attitude.

Franklin.D.Roosevelt's third term as president began in the most difficult times in the world's History. The US home front, that was far away from the war theatre, had officially become threatened. With Germany as superpower in Europe and the emergence of Japan militarism in the Far East, America is now in danger more than it had ever been. Across the Atlantic, the war had its impact on Britain that was exhausted and short of weapon pushing

Winston Churchill to request help from President Roosevelt. Roosevelt responded by exchanging 50 destroyers for 99-year leases on British bases in the Caribbean and Newfoundland. As a result, a major foreign policy debate erupted over whether the United States should aid Great Britain or maintain strict neutrality.¹⁸ This was the first action taken by F.D. Roosevelt and his staff in the way to the war. In January 1941, following up on his campaign pledge and the prime minister's appeal for arms, Roosevelt proposed to Congress a new military aid bill.¹⁹

What came after is that Congress did not immediately accept the President proposal for a new military act. However, following two months of debate, Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act, meeting Great Britain's deep need for supplies and allowing the United States to prepare for war while remaining officially neutral.²⁰ By passing this Law, F.D. Roosevelt was able to help in country that was in danger, especially those countries whose defense was considered necessary to the safety of the United States. From this perspective, American guns, food, and aircrafts crossed the Atlantic Ocean in large quantities. They played a vital part in helping Britain to continue to fight against Hitler. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, Roosevelt used the Land lease scheme to send aid to the Russians, too.²¹

The lend Lease act proved that sooner or later The US will be driven to the conflict despite the fact that some isolationists were working hard so that the mistake of 1917 shall not happen again. However, the act seemed like an undeclared war against the Axis power as Roosevelt's staff had been sending guns and food for the Allies. Therefore, it was here that the US stance began to shift away from isolation and neutrality to war.

Conclusion

Drawing from the above discussion, it seems apparent that the events that took place before the outbreak of the Second World War have a crucial importance in the US history.

The arrival of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932, for instance, was associated with the Great Depression; therefore, the President gave much importance to end the economic crisis through his New Deal policy. The combination of the Great Depression and New Deal policy pushed the American public opinion toward isolationism policy that sought non-involvement in world affairs. Meanwhile, Congress enacted new laws that supported isolationism and prevent the US from any future involvement in foreign conflicts.

It is important to note that with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, the US government remained neutral due to the Neutrality Acts; however, President Roosevelt had been cajoling Congress to suspend the neutrality laws so that he would be able to help Britain. The latter needed more war supplies to defeat the Germans as Winston Churchill wrote to Roosevelt in 1941 “give us the tools, and we will finish the job.” Few months after, Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act that allowed the US government to send military supplies to Britain and the Soviet Union.

It cannot be denied that the US neutrality toward the war in Europe began to shift as the Lend-Lease Act seemed like an undeclared war toward Germany, Italy and Japan, historically known as the Axis. It was evident that the US would sooner or later be involved in the conflict despite the fact that the American people were still opposing the war. On December, 7th, 1941, Japan launched a surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor that had radically altered the situation. The next day, the US declared war against Japan and became officially involved in the Second World War. In the next chapter, we will shed some light on the controversy over whether Pearl Harbor attack was a “back door” or a “just cause” that brought America to World War II.

Endnotes

¹ Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990),521.

² Ibid,522

³ Bryn O’Callaghan. **Illustrated History of the USA**.(England: Longman group,1990) , 102.

⁴ George B. Tindall and David E. Shi. **America: A Narrative History**. Sec Ed. New York (W. W. Norton & Company, April 1, 1988) ,1137.

⁵“**American Isolationism in the 1930s**”. Office of the Historian.
<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/american-isolationism>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ “**The Neutrality Acts, 1930s**”. Office of the Historian.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/neutrality-acts>

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990),544.

¹¹Ibid,544.

¹²“**The Neutrality Acts, 1930s**”. Office of the Historian.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/neutrality-acts>

¹³ **United States Army in World War II**. (Washington, D.C: Center of Military History: United StatesArmy, 1992), 5.

¹⁴ Ibid, 6.

¹⁵ Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990),558-559

¹⁶ Paul M. Sparrow, “**The Most Important Presidential Election in History**”, fdr.blogs, November 2, 2015, <https://fdr.blogs.archives.gov/2015/11/02/the-most-important-presidential-election-in-history/>

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸“**Lend-Lease Act (1941).**” Ourdocuments, <https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=71>

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid. Bryn O’Callaghan. **Illustrated History of the USA.** (England: Longman group, 1990) , 104.

Chapter Two:

2. Investigating Pearl Harbor Attack as a Just Cause.

Introduction

This chapter will be devoted to the attack upon Pearl Harbor by the Empire of Japan. It is undeniable that the Japanese Navy air attack on the Hawaiian island of Oahu on Sunday December 7th, 1941, was the event that brought the United States into World War II. However, it has been claimed that Pearl Harbor was a failure of intelligence that led to the greatest naval disaster in American history rather than a justified cause that ended the US neutrality in a world that had already been at war. Some revisionist historians argue that President Roosevelt and his staff had a previous knowledge about the attack that had never been a surprise according to them.

Relying on Franklin Delano Roosevelt's speech "Day of Infamy", we will try to give the facts that the American fleet in Hawaii was caught by a surprise attack that made the US intervention in the war justified. In doing so, jus ad bellum, which is the first principle of the just war theory, will be introduced as evidence through our investigation.

2.1. Pearl Harbor as a Surprise Military Strike

For decades, Japan had been planning to cripple the American fleet in Hawaii. At 7:58 a.m. on Sunday December 7th, 1941, a radio warning was broadcast to all ships in Pearl Harbor. "Air raid, Pearl Harbor!" the radio screeched. "This is no drill! This is no drill!" Three minutes before, Japanese warplanes had come in over the great naval base at Oahu, launching their first torpedoes and dropping their first bombs¹, turning the harbor into an underwater cemetery.

On December 8th, 1941, President Roosevelt officially declared war on Japan ,as it was expected, dragging America to a new foreign conflict. The President started his speech by saying: “Yesterday, December 7th, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan”. For Roosevelt and his staff, war with Japan was imminent, yet no one expected that the target was Pearl Harbor ,as one day before the attack, precisely on December 7, 1941, thanks to the brilliance of their cryptograph in cracking Axis codes, the Americans were able to decipher and read the Japanese government’s latest orders to its envoys in Washington before the envoys themselves could do so².

These orders showed that something was going to happen immediately. All the signs were that the Japanese were preparing an attack to the South³. This was the first warning that drew attention to the fact that the Japanese were about to take military action against the US; yet it consisted no threats to the home front as the army and navy staff, unconvinced by General MacArthur’s belief that he could successfully defend his command, the Philippines, thought that the enemy would strike first there; accordingly the chief of staff, General George Marshall, flashed a warning to MacArthur⁴. From this point, the warning, that the Japanese were planning some sort of surprise attack at 1.p.m, Washington time, was also sent to other American forces, such as the ships of the Pacific Fleet in their base at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Island of Oahu⁵.

However, despite this warning, the American home front was “suddenly and deliberately attacked” at Pearl Harbor as President Roosevelt said because the message that was sent to the Navy base in Hawaii did not carry a priority classification and was not marked urgent. As it is known, December the seven was a Sunday, when (as the Japanese well knew) by long tradition the American services in peacetime took life easily, so much so that their

telegraphic network closed down for the day and even General Marshall could not reactivate it in time⁶.

It is generally acknowledged that the Pearl Harbor assault was a pure surprise for the US as officials in Washington could not notify the military bases across the country by phone as that might reveal to the Japanese that their code had been broken. In the circumstances, it was thought best to send the message by the commercial network, Western Union. Unfortunately, although Marshall's telegram reached Honolulu with twenty-seven minutes to spare, the only means of getting it to naval headquarters was by entrusting it to a messenger boy on a bicycle. He did not prove speedy enough⁷. That is why Japan's surprise was complete, and the American forces could only offer ineffectual resistance.

President Roosevelt also said in his speech after the attack on Pearl Harbor "The United States was at peace with that nation, and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific." It may be regarded as certain that Japan's imperialism had been a fundamental drawback for the American neutrality since the outbreak of World War II. Therefore, the US government claimed that the relationship with Japan needed to be discussed by persuading them that for their benefits a friendly relation should be developed with the United States and other countries as well. On March 8, 1941, Admiral Nomura became Japan's Ambassador to the US, with his arrival negotiations between the two governments looking toward a settlement of the issues between the United States and Japan increased dramatically.

On May 11, 1941 Cordell Hull, U.S. Secretary of State told Ambassador Nomura that if Japan really desired a settlement of the Pacific situation on a basis of peace and friendliness, there should be no serious difficulty⁸. Ambassador Nomura said that it would be "an

incalculable loss to both Japan and the United States, as well as to civilization, if our two countries should become engaged in war⁹”.

It is generally conceded that the Japanese had always kept diplomatic lines open with the United States as President Roosevelt described those negotiations were “looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.” However, on July, 22, 1941 Japanese troops occupied Southern Indochina, such Japan’s imperial dream that was described by President Roosevelt as “South Indochina was being undertaken by Japan for the purpose of further offense”¹⁰. As reaction to the Japanese aggression policy, on the afternoon of that same day, July 24, 1941, President Roosevelt received the Japanese Ambassador. The President told the Ambassador that the new move by Japan in Indochina created an exceedingly serious problem for the United States¹¹. It can be presumed that President Roosevelt’s aimed to the neutralization of South Indochina, yet on August 6, 1941 Japanese Ambassador presented a counter-proposal, according to which his Government would undertake not further to station its troops in the southwestern Pacific areas, except French Indochina¹². It seemed that Japan’s domination in the Pacific had become a serious problem for the US; on August 8, 1941 Cordell Hull the American Secretary of State informed the Japanese Ambassador that Japan's counter-proposal could not be considered as responsive to the President's proposal. The Ambassador then inquired whether it might be possible to arrange for a meeting of the responsible heads of the two governments to discuss means of adjusting relations between the two countries¹³.

On August 17, President Roosevelt and his Secretary of State met with Ambassador Nomura and handed him a document stating that before renewal of the conversations or proceeding with plans for a meeting of the heads of the two governments, it would be helpful if the Japanese government would furnish a clearer statement of its present attitude and plans. The President said to the Ambassador that "we could not think of reopening the conversations" if the Japanese government continued its movement of force and conquest¹⁴”.

On September 6, 1941, the Japanese Ambassador handed to the Secretary of State a revised proposal. In that proposal it was stated that: Japan would not make any military advance from French Indochina against any adjoining areas, and likewise would not, "without any justifiable reason", resort to military action against any regions lying south of Japan¹⁵.

The reply of the United States to the Japanese proposal of September 6, 1941 was contained in a statement made by Secretary Hull to the Japanese Ambassador on October 2. After reviewing the progress of the course of the conversations thus far, the Secretary stated that a clear-cut manifestation of Japan's intention in regard to the withdrawal of Japanese troops from China and French Indochina would be most helpful in making known Japan's peaceful intentions and Japan's desire to follow courses calculated to establish a sound basis for future stability and progress in the Pacific area¹⁶.

On November, 26, 1941 The American State Department called Ambassador Nomura to be handed what historians now refer to as the "Hull Note", the proposals he submitted to Japan were as follows:

- 1) The government of the United States and the government of Japan will endeavor to conclude a multilateral nonaggression pact among the British Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Thailand, and the United States.
- 2) Both governments will endeavor to conclude among the American, British, Chinese, Japanese, the Netherlands, and Thai governments an agreement where under each of the governments would pledge itself to respect the territorial integrity of French Indo-China and, in the event that there should develop a threat to the territorial integrity of Indo-China, to enter into immediate consultation with a view to taking such measures as may be deemed necessary and advisable to meet the threat in question. Such agreement would provide also that each of the governments party to the agreement would not seek or accept preferential treatment in its trade or economic relations with Indo-China and would use its

influence to obtain for each of the signatories equality of treatment in trade and commerce with French Indo-China.

- 3) The government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and from Indo-China.
- 4) The government of the United States and the government of Japan will not support-militarily, politically, economically-any government or regime in China other than the national government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking.
- 5) Both governments will give up all extraterritorial rights in China, including rights and interests in and with regard to international settlements and concessions, and rights under the Boxer Protocol of 1901. Both governments will endeavor to obtain the agreement of the British and other governments to give up extraterritorial rights in China, including rights in international settlements and in concession and under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.
- 6) The government of the United States and the government of Japan will enter into negotiations for the conclusion between the United States and Japan of a trade agreement, based upon reciprocal most favored nation treatment and reduction of trade barriers by both countries, including an undertaking by the United States to bind raw silk on the free list.
- 7) The government of the United States and the government of Japan will, respectively, remove the freezing restrictions on Japanese funds in the United States and on American funds in Japan.
- 8) Both governments will agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate, with the allocation of funds adequate for this purpose, half to be supplied by Japan and half by the United States.
- 9) Both governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area.

10) Both governments will use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to and to give practical application to the basic political and economic principles set forth in this agreement¹⁷.

For the Japanese government, Secretary Hull's conditions were considered to be as ultimatum. Therefore, Japan did not send any reply to the White House claiming that war had to be declared. As a matter of fact, the countdown to Pearl Harbor attack had already started and war between the two nations was inevitable.

Japan's reply for Secretary Hull took place on December, 7, 1941 after they bombed Pearl Harbor as President Roosevelt highlighted in his speech "Indeed, one hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in the American island of Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to our Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. And, while this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or of armed attack". It can be assumed that Japan had purposely mistaken the US with false statement of peace so as they would be able to achieve their surprise attack, and it can be clearly seen in the course of this reply, as Japanese government said:

Whereas the American government ... objects to Japanese attempts to settle international issues through military pressure, it is exercising in conjunction with Great Britain and other nations pressure by economic power. Recourse to such pressure as a means of dealing with international relations should be condemned, as it is at times more inhumane than military pressure¹⁸.

They added:

It is impossible not to reach, the conclusion that the American government desires to maintain and strengthen, in coalition with Great Britain and other powers, its dominant position it has hitherto occupied not only in China but in other areas of East Asia. It is a fact of history that the countries of East Asia for the last hundred years or more have been compelled to observe the status quo under the Anglo-American policy of

imperialist exploitation and to sacrifice themselves to the prosperity of the two nations. The Japanese government cannot tolerate the perpetuation of such a situation since it directly runs counter to Japan's fundamental policy to enable all nations to enjoy each its proper place in the world...¹⁹.

The Japanese government concluded by saying:

Obviously, it is the intention of the American government to conspire with Great Britain and other countries to obstruct Japan's effort toward the establishment of peace through the creation of a new order in East Asia" and especially to preserve Anglo-American rights and interests by keeping Japan and China at war. This intention has been revealed clearly during the course of present negotiations. Thus, the earnest hope of the Japanese government to adjust Japanese-American relations and to preserve and promote the peace of the Pacific through co-operation with the American government has finally been lost.²⁰

The Japanese government regrets to have to notify hereby the American government that in view of the attitude of the American government it cannot but consider that it is impossible to reach an agreement through further negotiations²¹.

At this point, it can be said that the relationship between the United States and Japan had deteriorated as the Japanese had purposely mistaken the American government with series of peace negotiations that sought to ease the political tensions between the two countries. However, Japan, at the same time had been planning for a surprise attack that was eventually accomplished on December, 7, 1941 as President Roosevelt said "the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace."

To develop further, President Franklin Roosevelt highlighted in his speech that Japan had been planning to strike the US home front since the breakout of World War II in 1939 as he said "It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago". Therefore, it is important to note that had the Japanese had been planning to hit Pearl Harbor since August, 1939, when

Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto became commander in chief of Japan's Combined Fleet. Yamamoto spent several months preparing a surprise attack against the US; the only enemy for Japan in the Pacific.

From the beginning, Yamamoto devoted himself to cripple the American fleet in Hawaii as he said "we will have no hope of winning unless the US fleet in Hawaiian waters is destroyed²²". It was at this point that Japan started the preparation for the forthcoming assault at Pearl Harbor. Therefore, as early as March 1940, Yamamoto first considered an aerial strike on the US Pacific Fleet, and his thoughts quickly concentrated on Pearl Harbor when the Pacific Fleet moved there in May. Yamamoto first publicly declared his plan in January 1941 when he sent a letter to Navy Minister Admiral Koshiro Oikawa stating that war with the United States had become inevitable and that Japan should "attack and destroy the U.S. main fleet at the outset of the war" and that the attack should be at Pearl Harbor²³.

Yamamoto's energy and enthusiasm to bomb Hawaii pushed him not to wait for permission from the Navy Ministry but began gathering the best aviation and naval minds he could to plan the attack. He asked Rear Admiral Takijiro Onishi, Chief of Staff, 11th Air Fleet and a trusted friend, to study the idea²⁴. Onishi knew that such an attack must be well planned, therefore he asked for Commander Minoru Genda; an experienced pilot and planner who was smart, innovative, and fearless²⁵. These qualifications made Genda the perfect planner that Onishi needed. Onishi briefed Genda on Yamamoto's concept and asked him to study the feasibility and to draft a report. Genda studied the concept for 10 days and determined the plan was feasible, given nine conditions²⁶:

1. The attack had to be a complete surprise.
2. The main objective should be the US aircraft carriers.
3. US land-based aircraft had to be destroyed to gain air superiority.

4. Every available Japanese aircraft carrier should participate.
5. All types of aircraft (torpedo, dive, high-level, fighter) should be used.
6. Fighters had to play an active role.
7. The attack had to be a daylight attack.
8. Japanese ships had to refuel at sea.
9. Attack planning had to be done in strict secrecy.

It can be argued that President Roosevelt was fully aware that Japan prepared the attack several weeks ago as he described the attack to be “planned many days or even weeks ago”. Throughout summer 1941 the Japanese First Air Fleet continued a vigorous training program with aircrews flying numerous missions at Ariake Bay on Kyushu, the southernmost of Japan’s four main islands, which remarkably resembled Pearl Harbor. The ships continued maneuvering together, learning to sail and operate as a fleet while the tankers rehearsed their critical operations. The staff continued to refine the plan based on updated intelligence and changing circumstances²⁷.

In August, Japan’s war planning increased as the military leaders realized that war with the United States would sooner or later erupt. On August, 6, 1941 Yamamoto decided the time was right to brief the naval general staff on the Pearl Harbor attack plan. The naval general staff was considering moving the annual naval exercises from late November to September, and Yamamoto thought the exercise would be a great opportunity to rehearse the Pearl Harbor attack with exercise umpires, which would allow for a general after-action review of the plan²⁸. By late September, the plans that were being prepared to attack Pearl Harbor were given the name “Operation HAWAII” that had six first-line aircraft carriers and 27 of Japan’s 63 submarines.

During early November Japanese preparations accelerated as war became certain. Fuchida (captain of the Japanese Imperial Navy Air Service during WWII) and the air planners completed their plan based on the war games. On November 2, Nagumo briefed all of the senior commanders (ship captains and carrier air group commanders) on the plan to attack the US fleet in Pearl Harbor²⁹.

On December 1st the cabinet met with the emperor in the Imperial Palace, and the decision was made that Japan had to declare war on the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands. The naval general staff informed Yamamoto, and on December 2nd, he gave a warning order to all of his subordinate fleet commanders telling them the exact date and time of their attacks would be sent on a later date. On December 2nd, Yamamoto received a message from the naval general staff, "Climb Mount Niitaka 1208." The coded message meant the war would begin on December 8 (7 December Hawaiian time). Diplomacy had failed and Japan would attack the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands³⁰. As a result, the Japanese achieved their surprised attack on the Hawaiian fleet at Pearl Harbor causing several damages to the American Navy.

Additionally, when President Roosevelt went before Congress on December 8 to denounce the "day that will live in infamy" he demonstrated the huge casualties that were caused by this surprise assault in Hawaii by saying "The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. I regret to tell you that very many American lives have been lost. In addition, American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu."

It has been reported that the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred over two hours on December, 7, 1941. The Japanese attacked six major military installations all across Oahu that morning, leaving death and destruction for the Hawaiian fleet that used to be the proud of the

American navy. Many Americans lost their lives in Pearl Harbor as over 3400 American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines were killed or wounded, in addition, 188 Army, Navy, and Marine Corps aircraft were damaged or destroyed, as well as 18 ships assigned to the Pacific Fleet³¹. Three battleships were sunk (West Virginia, Arizona, and California) one capsized called Oklahoma, others were severely damaged. Some battleships were damaged but still afloat the “Pennsylvania,” “Maryland,” and “Tennessee”; three light cruisers, the “Helena,” “Honolulu,” and “Raleigh,” and the seaplane tender “Curtiss³².”

The severe damages that President Roosevelt highlighted in his speech were also in Honolulu Island. It is has, in fact, been estimated that several people (civilians) were killed on the streets of the city or elsewhere, and several buildings were destroyed. All the losses resulted from bombs being jettisoned by planes before their return to their carriers³³.

When President Roosevelt appeared before Congress and made his speech asking for a war declaration against the Japanese, he depicted Japan as an aggressor nation as he said “Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya.” After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor incapacitated the US Pacific Fleet in December 1941, Japan was able to pursue its other military objectives in the Pacific free of American interference. These objectives included Malaya and Singapore, the regional home of the Royal Navy on the southern tip of the Malay Peninsula³⁴.

President Roosevelt added “Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong”. Hong Kong was a British colony while The Japanese began their attack from the Chinese mainland early on December 8, 1941, taking maximum advantage of the confusion sowed by their attack on Pearl Harbor the previous day³⁵. The British troops were outnumbered by the Japanese troops; therefore, by December 9 the Allied defenders had been forced back to the

'Gindrillers Line' on the Kowloon Peninsula. The next day they were forced to retreat even further, to Hong Kong Island³⁶.

“Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam” said Roosevelt in his message to Congress calling for a declaration of war. The Pacific island of Guam, which until then had been in possession of the United States, had fallen to the Japanese. The attack started on Dec. 8, when Japan sent two waves of planes to bomb the American territory, resulting in numerous casualties, among which was U.S. Naval Reserve Ensign R.G. White³⁷.

President Roosevelt added that “Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.” Early on the morning of December 8, the U.S. forces in the Philippines were notified that a state of war existed and a full war alert was ordered. On the same day the first Japanese aerial attack on the Philippines took place. This was followed by others and on December, 10 enemy landings were made on Luzon. Expecting an early victory, the Japanese sent a large force, but it was not until May, 6 1942 that the Japanese were able to conquer the Philippines³⁸.”

“Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island.” The President highlighted in his speech the attack on Wake Island, the latter was a U.S. Navy air station and submarine base at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack. Japanese air raids on Wake commenced on December, 8 and destroyed most of VMF-211’s aircraft on the ground, along with much of Wake’s infrastructure. A Japanese landing attempt on December 11 was repulsed but with heavy losses to shore defenses and the surviving VMF-211 aircraft. Follow-on Japanese air attacks and a second amphibious assault on December, 23 were more successful. The outnumbered U.S. defenders surrendered later that day³⁹.

President Roosevelt highlighted in his speech the last Japanese attack on the morning of December, 8, 1941 as he said “And this morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.”

The Japanese shelled Midway Island on December 7, 1941, with two destroyers Sazanami and Ushio, and damaged the U.S. Marine Corps base before retiring. It was noticed that during the attack, First Lieutenant George H. Cannon, USMC, remained at his post until all of his wounded men were evacuated, though severely wounded himself. Despite the courage and dedication to his men, Cannon lost his own life due to loss of blood from his wounds. For his distinguished conduct in the line of his profession," Cannon was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor⁴⁰.

It has been a common knowledge that since the outbreak of World War II, a debate had raged the length and breadth of America over going to war or staying out. It was bitterly fought in Congress, in the newspapers, over the radio, in public forums, in private homes, by propagandists, by politicians, and by the plain people⁴¹. The isolationist tradition in America, as it was manifested from 1939 to 1941, was based on two fundamental doctrines: avoidance of war in Europe and unimpaired freedom of action. Isolationist and pacifist opponents of American entry agreed on one basic premise: participation in war would weaken the United States⁴². However, after the Pearl Harbor assault, isolationism had vanished as the American people agreed that war should be declared against Japan as President Roosevelt stated in his speech” The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our nation.” The President made it clear that isolationism and pacifism of so many, the hesitations of so many more, were swept aside by this unprovoked attack (the Pearl Harbor attack he meant) of an aggressor power⁴³.

One isolationist Senator advised the President to attack Japan by saying,” Lick the hell out of them”

War had officially replaced neutrality and isolationist ideas as it became the settled purpose of mightiest nation in the world to destroy the Japanese Empire root, trunk, branch

and twig⁴⁴. Most important of all, the majority of the American people were united to win the war, and they were resolved never again to be caught by such surprise attack in the future as President Roosevelt noted in his speech “I believe that I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us.”

2.2. Pearl Harbor and the Jus Ad Bellum

The jus ad bellum, or justification for going to war, involves six distinct conditions: (1) the cause must be just, (2) a right authority must make the decision to go to war, (3) groups going to war must do so with a right intention, (4) war must be undertaken only as a last resort,. Each of these conditions must be met independently prior to a decision that it is just to go to war⁴⁵.

The just war tradition maintains that aggression is impermissible and that a war is justly undertaken in response to aggression. A use or threat of force by one state against the political sovereignty or territorial integrity of another constitutes aggression. Self-defense is the obvious rationale for going to war. But the principle of just cause has been extended to cover defense of another state against aggression, intervention to protect potential victims of massacre, assisting secessionists, and even preemptive strikes against potential aggressors. As can be seen, Pearl Harbor was a just cause for the US government as they were surprisingly attacked on December, 7, 1941 in Hawaii and Wake Island, the latter was an American navy base, therefore declaring war against Japan was an expected step for the US to respond the aggression of the home front.

In addition to the just cause, right authority claims that war should be declared by legitimate decision makers of government. This has included, in varying contexts, heads of state, rulers, monarchs, presidents, generals, prime ministers, legislative bodies, and so on. The American intervention in the Second World War was featured by the principle of right

authority. On December 8th, 1941 Capitol Hill witnessed the second declaration of war by the right authorities. Roosevelt addressed a joint session of Congress by saying: “I ask that the congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan On Sunday, December 7, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.” Hours later, the majority of congressmen voted for the war on Japan, interpreting the wish of the President and that of the American people.

Moreover, the third aspect of jus ad bellum is right intention that refers to the will to right the wrong of aggression and to bring about peace. Intending revenge, domination, harm, cruelty, or personal or national self-interest are always wrong. It was evident that Japan had caused severe damage to the US home front, however President Roosevelt declaration of war did not consist any hint of revenge as he spoke about the defense of the American territory which was in danger by saying “There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger.” It can be assumed that President Roosevelt had a right intention toward the war even before Pearl Harbor as he said on December 29, 1940 “We must be the great arsenal of democracy’ he added “We have no excuse for defeatism. We have every good reason for hope-hope for peace, hope for the defense of our civilization and for the building of a better civilization in the future.⁴⁶”

“We are going to win” said the President in a Fireside Chat “and we are going to win the peace that follows.” For Franklin Roosevelt, the American intervention in the Second World War was a new crusade to make the world safe for democracy⁴⁷.

Finally, for the Just war doctrine, war must be undertaken only as a last resort. US government did not react against Japan’s imperialism in the Pacific with any military actions. Diplomacy and talks for peace had been the only strategy for the American government. President Roosevelt highlighted this in his speech after Pearl Harbor attack “The United

States was at peace with that nation, and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.” It can be presumed that war was the last resort for the US as all the all non-violent options were exhausted before the use of force was declared by President Roosevelt on December,8,1941.

Conclusion

From what has been reiterated all along this chapter, one has to be aware that the surprise Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 was an event of surpassing importance in American history. But beyond that, we reached the conclusion that Pearl Harbor was a just cause that led to the US involvement in World War II rather than a “back door” as some revisionist historians often claim. It was evident that Japan launched a sneak attack under the cover of negotiations to avert war between the two nations. For the American government, therefore, it would have been difficult to anticipate military action from a country that was seeking peace. However, it turned out that those negotiations for peace were only a cover for forthcoming surprise aggression against the US home front. On the basis of all information in this chapter, President Roosevelt did not know and was as surprised by the bombing of Pearl Harbor as any American citizen.

It should be remembered that Japan accomplished one of the most surprising attacks in the history of warfare as they hit Hawaii while the US government, based on their intelligence, was expecting attack in Philippines that is how the Japanese achieved the element of surprise at war; they attacked where nobody expected them.

Before December 7, 1941, isolationist and pacifist had the upper hand in the US home front; however, the Japanese assault outraged the entire nation, isolationism was dead and the American people were united to win the war.

For the ethics of war, we have found that the US government respected the principles of just war doctrine. As shown above, the bombing of Pearl Harbor was a just cause for the American government that led President Roosevelt for war declaration against Japan and their allies Germany and Italy. From this point, it can be said that the US intervention in the war was featured by the principle of the just war theory, namely right intention, right authority and last resort.

On the whole, On December, 7, 1941 the history of the world took an unexpected way as the last day of peace was come to the end in the US that was officially brought to the war. Isoroku Yamamoto Admiral of the Imperial Japanese Navy said after he was told about the success of Pearl Harbor attack “I fear all we have done is to awaken a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve.” Therefore, the last chapter of our dissertation will be devoted to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. We will shine a light on Harry Truman’s decision to use a nuclear bomb from the perspective of the just war theory.

Endnotes:

¹ George Morgenstern, **Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War**, (New York, Devin-Adair Publishing Company, 1947) 3.

² Hugh Broogan, **The Penguin History of the United States of America**, 2nd ed. (New York: Penguin books, 1990), 546.

³ Ibid, 564.

⁴ Ibid 564.

⁵ Ibid, 564.

⁶ Ibid, 564.

⁷ Ibid, 565.

⁸ U.S., Department of State, Publication 1983, **Peace and War: United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941** (Washington, D.C.: U.S., Government Printing Office, 1943), pp.118-149.

⁹Ibid,118-149.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷George Morgenstern,**Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War**, (New York,Devin-Adair Publishing Company,1947)160.

¹⁸Ibid ,165.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰Ibid, 166.

²¹Ibid.

²²Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990),564.

²³ Jeffrey J. Gudmens, **Staff Ride Handbook for the Attack on Pearl Harbor, 7 December 1941: A Study of Defending America**, (Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press) 51

²⁴ Ibid, 51-52.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid, 55.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid ,60

²⁹ Ibid, 61.

³⁰ Mark Stille, **Tora! Tora! Tora!: PearlHarbor1941**,(Oxford: Osprey Publishing,2011)pp,69-70.

³¹ Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990) 565.

³² Ibid 565.

³³ Homer N Wallin, **Pearl Harbor: Why, How, Fleet Salvage and Final Appraisal**,(Washington: government printing office,1968)105.

³⁴**Fall of Singapore and Malaya, .bbc.co.uk,**
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a1122391.shtml>

³⁵**Fall of Hong Kong, .bbc.co.uk,**
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a1122355.shtml>

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷Kimberly Willig, **Guam Taken by The Japanese**, blogs.shu.ed, Dec 15, 1941,
<https://blogs.shu.edu/ww2-0/1941/12/15/guam-taken-by-japanese/>

³⁸**Attacks on the Philippines, Guam, and Wake**,.history.navy.mil,
<https://www.history.navy.mil/browse-by-topic/wars-conflicts-and-operations/world-war-ii/1941/philippines.html>

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰**Japanese Attack on Midway Island**, .history.navy.mil,
<https://www.history.navy.mil/content/history/museums/nmusn/explore/photography/wwii/wwii-pacific/us-entry-into-wwii-japanese-offensive/1941-december-7-japanese-attack-midway-island.html>

⁴¹ George Morgenstern,**Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War**, (New York,Devin-Adair Publishing Company,1947)

⁴²Justus D.Doenecke, **American Isolationism, 1939-1941**, The Journal of Libertarian Studies,1(1982):210.

⁴³Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990) 566.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 566.

⁴⁵Donald A. Wells, **An Encyclopedia of War and Ethics**,(New York, Greenwood Press,1996)

⁴⁶ Radio Address Delivered by President Roosevelt from Washington, December 29, 1940,
<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/WorldWar2/arsenal.htm>

⁴⁷Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990) 566.

Chapter Three

3. Hiroshima and the Principles of the Just War Doctrine.

Introduction:

The atomic bombing of Hiroshima has been an issue that baffled many historians and writers who can be grouped into two opposing camps: those who concur that the Harry Truman (1945-1953) made a good decision by dropping the bomb on Hiroshima, defending the decision on the grounds that there was no other way to force Japan into surrender. While , those who opposed him often believe that it was an unwise order from the head of state to use such a bomb, claiming that there were, in fact, alternative proposals to end the war with Japan. It is our purpose in the present chapter to argue that Harry Truman made the US involvement in the war unjust as the decision to obliterate Hiroshima failed to meet the features set forth in Just War Theory. Our investigation will rely on Truman's press release that informed the American people about the use of Atomic bomb for the first time in the history of warfare.

3.1. Hiroshima in the Light of Just War Theory:

After the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt on April, 12, 1945, Harry Truman sworn in to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States as President. Few days after, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War wrote to Truman:

I think it is very important that I should have a talk with you as soon as possible on a highly secret matter. I mentioned it to you shortly after you took office but have not urged it since on account of the pressure you have been under. It, however, has such a bearing on our present foreign relations and ought such an important effect upon all my thinking in this field that I think you ought to know about it without much further delay¹.

From Henry Stimson's words, it becomes very clear that he would inform Truman about the underway development of the Atomic bomb, and it was only a matter of time before the President would have to decide whether to use it or not.

On August, 1945 Harry Truman was still confused about whether to use the Atomic bomb against Japan or let his soldiers completing their invasion as Tokyo was about to fall in the hands of the U.S.Army.

Less than a week later, however, precisely on August 6, 1945, Harry Truman made his final decision to use the Atomic Bomb. Hours later, a B-29 bomber attached to the 509th Composite Group took off from Tinian Island and headed north by northwest toward the Japanese Islands over 1,500 miles away. Its primary target was Hiroshima, an important military and communications center with a population of nearly 300,000 located in the deltas of southwestern Honshu Island facing the Inland Sea. The Enola Gay, piloted by Colonel Paul Tibbets, flew at low altitude on automatic pilot.²At approximately 8:15 a.m. Hiroshima time. Tibbets immediately dove away to avoid the anticipated shockwaves of the blast. Forty-three seconds later a huge explosion lit the morning sky as Little Boy detonated 1900 feet above the city, directly over a parade field where the Japanese Second Army was doing calisthenics. Though already eleven and a half miles away, the Enola Gay was rocked by the blast. At first Tibbets thought he was taking flak. After a second shockwave hit the plane, the crew looked back at Hiroshima. "The city was hidden by that awful cloud boiling up, mushrooming, terrible and incredibly tall,³"

After the dropping of the bomb, President Harry Truman addressed the nation through a press release that sought to justify one of the most momentous decisions in the U.S history. However, it can be argued that Truman's decision failed to meet the "discrimination" and

“proportionality; two major features of the Just War Theory (Jus in Bello) and, therefore, his decision must be considered as immoral act.

Discrimination means that military force must be applied only against the political leadership and military forces of the state. Every effort must be made to discriminate between combatants and noncombatants, soldiers and civilians, to minimize civilian casualties. Direct attacks against civilian targets, such as neighborhoods, hospitals, and schools, are morally impermissible. Indiscriminate destruction of cities is similarly impermissible.

President Truman started his press release by saying “Sixteen hours ago an American airplane dropped one bomb on Hiroshima, an important Japanese Army base” However, it has been a common knowledge that Hiroshima was a city that consisted military base, many civilians were living there too, as a result the bomb had killed 70.000 people and by the end of 1945 the number increased to 14.000 as radiation-sickness deaths mounted. Five years later the total reached 200.000. The bomb caused total devastation for five square miles, with almost all the buildings in the city either destroyed or damaged⁴.

Further evidence of this can be seen in Raymond G. Wilson’s book entitled *Nuclear War: Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and a Workable Moral Strategy for Achieving and Preserving World Peace*. Wilson states that “the bomb destroyed the city of Hiroshima, Japan, directly affecting 350,000 people, and killing well more than 140,000 of them⁵”. Wilson added “Estimates are on that first day alone in Hiroshima, some 60 - 70,000 people were blasted and burned to death, most everyone else, blast injured, burned, or irradiated; another 70,000 destined to more slowly die by Dec 31, 1945”⁶. It can be clearly seen that Truman’s decision to drop an atomic bomb had taken the lives of innocent men, women and children proving that Hiroshima was not a pure military base.

President Truman said that “The Japanese began the war from the air at Pearl Harbor. They have been repaid many fold. And the end is not yet” It seemed from the President’s words that using the Atomic bomb against Japan was revenge to Pearl Harbor attack. However, we argue here, that it was President Roosevelt himself who responded to Pearl Harbor with a surprise bombing of Tokyo on April, 12, 1942; historically known as “Doolittle’s raiders”.

Lieutenant Colonel James Doolittle led a group of sixteen B-25 bombers in the first air strike on Tokyo. The retaliatory attack required 71 officers and 131 enlisted men from the United States Army Air Forces⁵. The bombers arrived over Japan in daylight but suffered little damage from enemy action. Almost all succeeded in bombing Japanese targets, most in Tokyo but also in Kobe, Yokosuka, and Osaka⁷.

It may be argued that Harry Truman’s decision to use Atomic bomb failed to meet the morality of Just war doctrine due to his thoughts against Japan as he said “I know that Japan is a terribly cruel and uncivilized nation’, he wrote to Senator Richard Russell on August,9.⁸” Truman added about Japan. “The only language they seem to understand is the one we have been using to bombard them. When you have to deal with a beast you have to treat him as a beast. It is most regrettable but nevertheless true.⁹”

Moreover, the Atomic bomb was an awful weapon in the eyes of various military men due to its capability of mass destruction as President Truman noted in his press release on August, 6, 1945 “We are now prepared to obliterate more rapidly and completely every productive enterprise the Japanese have above ground in any city”. From this point, it can be presumed that using such a nuclear weapon was morally wrong as Marine Sgt. Joe O'Donnell who was photographer of Hiroshima and Nagasaki said about the bomb “I believe it was wrong; morally wrong. Just as wrong as the holocaust. It was a crime not just against history

but against humanity.¹⁰ “O’Donnell added” I walked in the ashes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and photographed the children, the women, the elderly, the mutilated and disfigured. The victims who suffered and died like no other people in the history of the world...¹¹” In addition to Joe O’Donnell, Admiral William E. Leahy, President Truman’s Chief of Staff, in his memoirs” “It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender.¹²” Leahy added “My own feeling was that in being the first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. I was taught not to make war in that fashion, and wars cannot be won by destroying women and children¹³”

Leo Szilard, a scientist who played a decisive role in building up the Atomic Bomb, argued that Truman and his staff had a double standard as they would have condemned as immoral the use of Atomic bomb by any adversary¹⁴. Szilard claimed “if the German had dropped atomic bombs on cities instead of us, we would have defined the dropping of atomic bombs on cities as war crime.¹⁵” for Leo Szilard “the US government would have sentenced the Germans who were guilty of this crimes to death at Nuremberg and hanged them¹⁶”

Further, acknowledgment must be made of the fact that Hiroshima bombing was not necessary. Many critics point out that by 1945 Japan was military defeated. “In April we knew they were beginning to try to surrender. They were already defeated in every sense¹⁷,” says historian Gar Alperovitz, who added, “We were bombing their cities without any opposition. The Japanese were making airplane gasoline out of acorns. So we knew that they were on their last legs¹⁸”. General Dwight Eisenhower, the Supreme commander of the Allies forces in Europe, had a similar view as he said “ The Japanese were ready to surrender and it

wasn't necessary to hit them with that awful thing¹⁹," he said in 1963 interview with *Newsweek*.

In addition to Eisenhower, some U.S Navy leaders did not support the use of nuclear bomb. Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, for instance, commander in chief of the Pacific fleet on numerous occasions stated that "The Japanese had, in fact, already sued for peace before the atomic age was announced to the world with the destruction of Hiroshima and before the Russian entry into the war.²⁰" It is our understanding that Truman and his advisors had a previous knowledge on Japan's desperate situation and its desire to drop out of the war, but still decided to use the bomb.

For Harry Truman dropping the Atomic bomb aimed to end the war and save the lives of thousands of U.S soldiers. However, it has been often claimed that an Allied blockade would eventually have led Japan to surrender. By any objective standard, Japan should have surrendered: it was isolated without any ally since the fall of Germany; forty of industry and most urban areas were destroyed; raw materials were depleted; civilian morale and health were low; and the army was short of food and supplies²¹.

To develop further, it is generally agreed that the Hiroshima bombing falls within the ambit of American political and military conduct during war, therefore Harry Truman decision failed to meet "proportionality" which is the second principle of the just war doctrine. Proportionality claims that the destruction inflicted by military forces in war must be proportional to the goals they are seeking to realize. An indiscriminate war of attrition that seeks to eliminate the enemy altogether is not morally justified. The goal should be to use the minimum level of violence to achieve the limited aims of a war.

For Truman's administration this principle was totally ignored due to the destruction ability of the Atomic bomb that was described by Truman himself "That bomb had more power than 20,000 tons of T.N.T. It had more than two thousand times the blast power of the British "Grand Slam" which is the largest bomb ever yet used in the history of warfare." It is a common sense that the bomb was a powerful weapon from the beginning. On July 16, 1945 the bomb was tested for the first time giving birth to the atomic era. Scientists who were responsible for building up this nuclear weapon watched anxiously, the device exploded over the New Mexico desert, vaporizing the tower and turning asphalt around the base of the tower to green sand. The bomb released approximately 18.6 kilotons of power, and New Mexico sky was suddenly brighter than many suns²². Some observers suffered temporary blindness even though they looked at the brilliant light through smoked glass. Seconds after the explosion came a huge blast, sending heat across the desert and knocking some observers to the ground²³. This is how President Truman was fully aware about the atomic bomb that had "more power than 20,000 tons of T.N.T" and "It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe".

Using such a bomb cannot be considered the minimum level of violence as the doctrine of the just war requires especially against innocent civilians. Former President Herbert Hoover stated in a September 1945 interview "Despite any sophistries its major use is not to kill fighting men, but to kill women, children, and civilian men of whole cities as a pressure on governments undoubtedly failing the discrimination criteria in jus in bello."²⁴

Edgar R. Smothers, a Jesuit, wrote in *An Opinion on Hiroshima*, that atomic weapons may only be used if it is "necessary to a just defense, to the exclusion of means which of their nature exceed the limit of a just defense"²⁵ For Smothers, using the Atomic bomb against

Hiroshima did not sake defense, therefore, From his scholarly perspective, the Hiroshima bombing was clearly disproportionate.

Lastly, it is often asserted that Harry Truman's decision to drop the Atomic bomb upon Hiroshima was a diplomatic act rather than a military one. By the early summer of 1945, fire in Europe was ceased; the collapse of the Third Reich brought the conflict to its climax. In the Pacific theatre, however, Japan was still fighting the US. In these circumstances, President Truman went to Berlin on July, 1945, to discuss the participation of Russia in the far Eastern conflict. It has been claimed that the US policy makers were against the Russian involvement in the Pacific as they would expend their influence in the Far East. In 1948, the British physicist and Nobel laureate P. M. S. Blackett, a pro-Soviet Marxist who gave Hiroshima revisionism another talismanic slogan.

Blackett proclaimed that "the dropping of the atomic bomb was not so much the last military act of the second World War, as the first major operation of the cold diplomatic war with the Russians now in progress."²⁶ Historian Ronald Takaki wrote the book *Hiroshima: Why American dropped the bomb* in 1996 and has a very strong opinion as to why the US used nuclear weapons. According to Takaki "the bomb was dropped not to end the war with Japan but to control Russia."²⁷ Leslie Groves, the director of the Manhattan Project, said also "there was never from about two weeks from the time I took charge of this Project any illusion on my part but that Russia was our enemy and the project was conducted on that basis"²⁸

Some historians claim that racism played a crucial role in Truman's decision to obliterate Hiroshima. After the dropping of "little boy" as the bomb nicknamed, President Truman said that "The force from which the sun draws its power has been loosed against those who brought war to the Far East". Historian J. Samuel Walker argued that racism played a role in the use of the atomic bomb. In his 2005 book *Prompt & Utter Destruction* Walker

theorizes that “the United States government fueled the hatred that the people felt for Japan²⁹”. It is well known that during the 1940s, there were more than 100,000 people of Japanese American descent lived in the United States. These Japanese Americans were either “Issei” those born in Japan or “Nisei” American born Japanese³⁰. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, white Americans began to see every Japanese Americans as potential spy or saboteur. Both Issei and Nisei were treated badly. Shops refused to sell them food³¹. The 1994 book *By the Bomb's Early Light* by Paul Boyer the author highlighted that “The American public was angry with Japan and seemed not to be too alarmed at the fact nuclear weapons were used³².” Boyer added” There was actually boasting and pride that the United States was the first to use such extreme measures³³” Further on Boyer maintains that racism was a vital feature in the Hiroshima bombing as he noted “Even the fact that 100,000 Japanese had died seemed incidental.³⁴” Newspapers came out with headings that read “Hiroshima disemboweled”and“Greatest Scientific Developments in the History of Man.”Some stores had“atomic”sales³⁵. From Boyer’s perspective, it may be argued that that racism toward Japan was a major contributor in using the atomic bomb.

Conclusion:

From what has been inferred all through this chapter, we reached the conclusion that the rise of the Atomic age had completely changed the balance of power in the world. The US was able to build up a bomb that differs from the previous ones due to its capability of mass destruction. The achievement that was brought by Manhattan Project (research undertaking during World War II that produced the first nuclear weapon) had ended in few seconds years of conflict in the Pacific theatre. It has been argued that the decision to drop the atomic bomb on Japan was only Truman’s decision to make, therefore it can be said that Harry Truman had violated the principles of Just war theory as his decision failed to meet “discrimination” and “proportionality”.

The atomic bomb was the worst tragedy our world has ever seen, yet Harry Truman did not regret using it against civilians who were not guilty for the war or for Pearl Harbor attack as he said “It was a terrible decision, but I made it to save 250,000 boys from the United States, and I’d make it again under similar circumstances”. Truman’s words were weird as they came from the Head of a State that went to war to be “The Great Arsenal of Democracy” as the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt described the US involvement in the war. However, the use of nuclear bombs against unarmed people made it obvious that democracy was being established in the world by atomic bombs that did not distinguish between innocent and military targets as the just war doctrine requires.

On the whole, Hiroshima bombing has always been considered to be the best example of unjust conduct in war as a hundred thousand people perished in the attack most of them were civilians, in addition to the destruction of infrastructures instead of military targets. With this in mind, the conclusion arrived at here, specifically, that Harry Truman’s decision to drop the bomb against Hiroshima must be deemed an immoral act.

Endnotes

¹ Letter from Secretary of War Henry Stimson to President Harry S. Truman, April 24, 1945, <https://www.archives.gov/historical-docs/todays-doc/index.html?dod-date=424>

² F. G. Goslin, **The Manhattan Project: Making The Atomic Bomb**, (Washington, D.C, Simon & Schuster, 2010)96

³Ibid, 96.

⁴Ibid.

⁵ Raymond G. Wilson, **Nuclear War: Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and a Workable Moral Strategy for Achieving and Preserving World Peace**,(Illinois, Author house,2014)13

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ William S Phillips, **The Giant Begins to Stir**, (The Greenwich workshop, 1983).

⁸ Harry S Truman’s Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb, Harry S Truman National Historic Site, <https://www.nps.gov/articles/trumanatomicbomb.htm>

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Raymond G. Wilson, **Nuclear War: Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and a Workable Moral Strategy for Achieving and Preserving World Peace**,(Illinois, Author house,2014) 170.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² **Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki Barbaric Tactic or Quick Way to End the War?**, North Mason School District, Oct,11,2008. URL:
<https://www.nmsd.wednet.edu/userfiles/-4/my%20files/kaufman.pdf?id=634>

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Melissa G. Thiel, **The Dropping of the Atomic Bomb**, Texas Woman's University. URL:
<https://twu.edu/media/documents/history-government/The-Dropping-of-the-Atomic-Bomb-Ibid.-Volume-8-Spring-2015.pdf>

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ **Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki Barbaric Tactic or Quick Way to End the War?**, North Mason School District, Oct,11,2008. URL:
<https://www.nmsd.wednet.edu/userfiles/-4/my%20files/kaufman.pdf?id=634>

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Richard Rice, **Thank God for the Atom Bomb**,
<https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/iakh/HIS1300MET/v12/undervisningsmateriale/Fussel%20-%20thank%20god%20for%20the%20atom%20bomb.pdf>

²² F. G. Goslin, **The Manhattan Project: Making The Atomic Bomb**, (Washington, D.C, Simon & Schuster, 2010)91.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ **Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki Barbaric Tactic or Quick Way to End the War?**, North Mason School District, Oct,11,2008. URL:
<https://www.nmsd.wednet.edu/userfiles/-4/my%20files/kaufman.pdf?id=634>

²⁵ Montaniel S. Navarro, **The Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima : A Reasonable and Just Decision**, Master's thesis, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C,2010.

²⁶ Michael Kort, **The Historiography of Hiroshima: The Rise and Fall of Revisionism**,
http://theamericanpresident.us/images/truman_bomb.pdf

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Melissa G. Thiel, **The Dropping of the Atomic Bomb**, Texas Woman's University. URL: <https://twu.edu/media/documents/history-government/The-Dropping-of-the-Atomic-Bomb-Ibid.-Volume-8-Spring-2015.pdf>

³⁰ Bryn O'Callaghan. **Illustrated History of the USA.**(England: Longman group,1990)104.

³¹ Ibid, 104.

³² Melissa G. Thiel, **The Dropping of the Atomic Bomb**, Texas Woman's University. URL: <https://twu.edu/media/documents/history-government/The-Dropping-of-the-Atomic-Bomb-Ibid.-Volume-8-Spring-2015.pdf>

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

IV General Conclusion

On the basis of our analysis of the American intervention in World War II, it can be inferred that Pearl Harbor is a crucial chapter in the US history. It was evident that isolationists had the upper hand in the US home front from the 1930s to 1941; they were hindering President Roosevelt from any foreign involvement in addition to the Neutrality Acts that were passed during the same period leading the US foreign policy to adopt an isolationist outlook.

However, On December 7th, 1941, the Imperial Japanese Navy launched a surprise aerial assault on the US Pacific fleet at Hawaii that achieved what Roosevelt had been dreaming of; a just cause that would be used as an argument against those who were opposing the American participation in the good war.

The US involvement in the war did not prevent the critics from blaming Roosevelt for the incident. Some revisionist historians claim that the President and some members from his staff had a previous knowledge about the bombing and yet they did nothing to prevent it so that it would be their back door to the war. While isolationists argue that Roosevelt provoked Japan to attack the US home front. Thus, through our investigation, we reached the conclusion that President Roosevelt did not have any previous knowledge about Japanese intention to attack the American soil due to the ongoing peace talks between Japanese diplomats and the US representatives in Washington D.C. It would have been difficult to anticipate military attack from a country that was seeking peace.

Despite the warnings and events that preceded December 7th, 1941, one may consider that Pearl Harbor attack was a surprise for the fleet as the warning of possible attack reached Hawaii after the disaster. Furthermore, the American naval base in Hawaii had always been considered the stumbling rock for Japan's imperialism in the Pacific. As a result, they did what they had to do for the aim of destroying it once and for all.

More important, Pearl Harbor has always been associated with the just cause that led the American nation toward the war. It can be assumed that the American government had respected all the principles of Just War Doctrine in the reaction against the Japanese empire attack on Pearl Harbor. The latter was an aggression at the first place that made self-defense to be the rational for going to war for the Americans. In other words, the US participation, after all, was an act of self-defense.

However, the United State entry into World War II shifted the balance of power in Europe as the Allies became more powerful. Meanwhile, science laboratories were working hard to build up a new weapon that can obliterate various countries in few minutes. Manhattan project ,for instance, gave birth to the first Atomic bomb that led US to win the race for nuclear warfare while the Germans were trying to create a similar bomb. For the Americans, the Atomic bomb was built to be used against Japan as reaction to Pearl Harbor assuming that it would be a legitimate weapon of war to be used if needed.

On August, 6,1945, President Truman gave his order to drop the Bomb on Hiroshima a Japanese military base according to the commander in chief. Questions about the righteousness of this bombing emerged whether or not it was justified decision. As a matter of interest, we have found that President Truman did not respect the principles of just war theory mainly discrimination and proportionality.

It was evident that Hiroshima was a city with civilian population, yet Truman made the decision to bomb it showing no mercy. He said “When you have to deal with a beast you have to treat him as a beast”. It seemed that the President was ready to remove Japan from the world’s map in retaliation to the Pearl Harbor attack.

It is our claim that Japan was on the verge of defeat and ready to surrender after the collapse of Nazi Germany; the American soldiers in the pacific theatre were about to take

Tokyo as many military leaders noted. Therefore, the use of the Atomic bomb against the country that was going to hoist the white flag was an unwise decision that cannot under any circumstances be justified by the moral guidelines for conduct in war.

All in all, it can be argued that the American intervention in the Second World War had a just cause which was the Pearl Harbor attack; however, the conduct of this war by nuclear bombs was totally unjust as various alternative ways to defeat Japan were available without using such a devastating weapon.

The research that has been undertaken for this dissertation has highlighted a number of topics on which further research would be beneficial. It is a fact that the Atomic bomb brought World War II to its climax. However, Harry Truman's decision to use it was and still an issue that had been debated in the past, discussed today, and no doubt will be argued in the future. Further studies might, for example, discuss the Soviet-American arms race that was a legacy of World War II.

Bibliography

- **Primary Sources:**

- Franklin Delano Roosevelt “Day of Infamy,” December,8,1941, Encyclopedia of American History, Gray B. Nash, (New York: facts on file,1961).
- President Truman’s Announcement of the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima, 1945, Encyclopedia of American History, Gray B. Nash, (New York: facts on file,1961).

- **Secondary Sources**

- A. **Cited Books:**

- Selig Adler. **The Uncertain Giant: 1921-1941 American Foreign Policy Between Wars** (New York: Macmillan Company,1965)
- Hugh Broogan.**The Penguin History of the United States of America**,2nd ed. (New York:Penguin books,1990)
- Bryn O’Callaghan. **Illustrated History of the USA.**(England: Longman group,1990).
- George B. Tindall and David E. Shi. **America: A Narrative History.** Sec Ed. New York (W. W. Norton & Company, April 1, 1988)
- **United States Army in World War II.** (Washington, D.C: Center of Military History: United States Army, 1992).
- U.S., Department of State, Publication 1983, **Peace and War: United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941** (Washington, D.C.: U.S., Government Printing Office, 1943)
- George Morgenstern,**Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War,** (New York,Devin-Adair Publishing Company,1947).

- Jeffrey J. Gudmens, **Staff Ride Handbook for the Attack on Pearl Harbor, 7 December 1941: A Study of Defending America**, (Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press)
- Mark Stille, **Tora! Tora! Tora!: Pearl Harbor 1941**,(Oxford:Osprey Publishing,2011).
- Homer N Wallin, **Pearl Harbor: Why, How, Fleet Salvage and Final Appraisal**,(Washington: government printing office,1968).
- Donald A. Wells, **An Encyclopedia of War and Ethics**,(New York, Greenwood Press,1996).
- Justus D.Doenecke, **American Isolationism, 1939-1941**, The Journal of Libertarian Studies,1(1982)
- F. G. Goslin, **The Manhattan Project: Making The Atomic Bomb**, (Washington, D.C, Simon & Schuster, 2010).
- Raymond G. Wilson, **Nuclear War: Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and a Workable Moral Strategy for Achieving and Preserving World Peace**,(Illinois, Author house,2014
- William S Phillips, **The Giant Begins to Stir**, (The Greenwich workshop, 1983).

B. Material from Online Database

- Katie Mettler, **75 years later, remembering FDR's day of 'infamy,' a phrase that almost wasn't** (washingtonpost,2016) URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2016/12/07/75-years-later-remembering-fdrs-day-of-infamy-a-phrase-that-almost-wasnt/>
- Robert Lehrman,“**Rhetoric Revisited: FDR's “Infamy” Speech**,American Experience,Dec,2016,URL:<https://medium.com/americanexperiencepbs/rhetoric-revisited-fdrs-infamy-speech-ba12f9970e17>

- Alex Wellerstein, A “purely military” target? Truman’s changing language about Hiroshima,” January 19th, 2018, URL:<http://blog.nuclearsecrecy.com/2018/01/19/purely-military-target/>

-American Isolationism in the 1930s”. Office of the Historian.
<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/american-isolationism>

- The Neutrality Acts, 1930s”. Office of the Historian.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/neutrality-acts>

- Paul M. Sparrow, “The Most Important Presidential Election in History”, fdr.blogs, November 2, 2015, <https://fdr.blogs.archives.gov/2015/11/02/the-most-important-presidential-election-in-history/>

-Lend-Lease Act (1941).” Ourdocuments,
<https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=71>

- Fall of Singapore and Malaya, .bbc.co.uk,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a1122391.shtml>

- Fall of Hong Kong, .bbc.co.uk,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a1122355.shtml>

- Kimberly Willig, Guam Taken by The Japanese, blogs.shu.ed, Dec 15, 1941,
<https://blogs.shu.edu/ww2-0/1941/12/15/guam-taken-by-japanese/>

-Attacks on the Philippines, Guam, and Wake,.history.navy.mil,
<https://www.history.navy.mil/browse-by-topic/wars-conflicts-and-operations/world-war-ii/1941/philippines.html>

-Japanese Attack on Midway Island, .history.navy.mil,
<https://www.history.navy.mil/content/history/museums/nmusn/explore/photography/wwii/wwii-pacific/us-entry-into-wwii-japanese-offensive/1941-december-7-japanese-attack-midway-island.html>

- Radio Address Delivered by President Roosevelt from Washington, December 29, 1940,
<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/WorldWar2/arsenal.htm>

- Letter from Secretary of War Henry Stimson to President Harry S. Truman, April 24, 1945, <https://www.archives.gov/historical-docs/todays-doc/index.html?dod-date=424>
- Harry S Truman's Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb, Harry S Truman National Historic Site, <https://www.nps.gov/articles/trumanatomicbomb.htm>
- **Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki Barbaric Tactic or Quick Way to End the War?** North Mason School District, Oct,11,2008. URL: <https://www.nmsd.wednet.edu/userfiles/-4/my%20files/kaufman.pdf?id=634>
- Melissa G. Thiel, **The Dropping of the Atomic Bomb**, Texas Woman's University. URL: <https://twu.edu/media/documents/history-government/The-Dropping-of-the-Atomic-Bomb-Ibid.-Volume-8-Spring-2015.pdf>
- Richard Rice, **Thank God for the Atom Bomb**, <https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/iakh/HIS1300MET/v12/undervisningsmateriale/Fussel%20-%20thank%20god%20for%20the%20atom%20bomb.pdf>
- Michael Kort, **The Historiography of Hiroshima: The Rise and Fall of Revisionism**, http://theamericanpresident.us/images/truman_bomb.pdf

Dissertations and theses:

- Tiara Kay Foster, “**Constructing a World War II America: The Rhetorical Craftsmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt**”. Master’s thesis Syracuse University, 2013.)
- Montaniel S. Navarro, **The Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima : A Reasonable and Just Decision**, Master’s thesis, (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C,2010.)

Appendix A

Yesterday, December 7, 1941 — a date which will live in infamy — the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation, and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

Indeed, one hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in the American island of Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to our Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. And, while this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or of armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. I regret to tell you that very many American lives have been lost. In addition, American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam.

Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.

Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island.

And this morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

Japan has therefore undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday and today speak for themselves. The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our nation.

As Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense, that always will our whole nation remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people, in their righteous might, will win through to absolute victory.

I believe that I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

Speech delivered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt on December, 8th, 1941

Appendix B

Sixteen hours ago, an American airplane dropped one bomb on Hiroshima and destroyed its usefulness to the enemy. That bomb had more power than 20,000 tons of TNT. It had more than two thousand times the blast power of the British "Grand Slam" which is the largest bomb ever yet used in the history of warfare.

The Japanese began the war from the air at Pearl Harbor. They have been repaid many fold. And the end is not yet. With this bomb we have now added a new and revolutionary increase in destruction to supplement the growing power of our armed forces. In their present form these bombs are now in production and even more powerful forms are in development.

It is an atomic bomb. It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe. The force from which the sun draws its power has been loosed against those who brought war to the Far East.

Before 1939, it was the accepted belief of scientists that it was theoretically possible to release atomic energy. But no one knew any practical method of doing it. By 1942, however, we knew that the Germans were working feverishly to find a way to add atomic energy to the other engines of war with which they hoped to enslave the world. But they failed. We may be grateful to Providence that the Germans got the V-1's and V-2's¹ late and in limited quantities and even more grateful that they did not get the atomic bomb at all.

The battle of the laboratories held fateful risks for us as well as the battles of the air, land, and sea, and we have now won the battle of the laboratories as we have won the other battles.

Beginning in 1940, before Pearl Harbor, scientific knowledge useful in war was pooled between the United States and Great Britain, and many priceless helps to our victories have come from that arrangement. Under that general policy the research on the atomic bomb was begun. With American and British scientists working together we entered the race of discovery against the Germans.

The United States had available the large number of scientists of distinction in the many needed areas of knowledge. It had the tremendous industrial and financial resources necessary for the project and they could be devoted to it without undue impairment of other vital war work. In the United States the laboratory work and the production plants, on which a substantial start had already been made, would be out of reach of enemy bombing, while at that time Britain was exposed to constant air attack and was still threatened with the possibility of invasion. For these reasons Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt agreed that it was wise to carry on the project here.

We now have two great plants and many lesser works devoted to the production of atomic power. Employment during peak construction numbered 125,000 and over

65,000 individuals are even now engaged in operating the plants. Many have worked there for two and a half years. Few know what they have been producing. They see great quantities of material going in and they see nothing coming out of these plants, for the physical size of the explosive charge is exceedingly small. We have spent two billion dollars on the greatest scientific gamble in history – and won.

But the greatest marvel is not the size of the enterprise, its secrecy, nor its cost, but the achievement of scientific brains in putting together infinitely complex pieces of knowledge held by many men in different fields of science into a workable plan. And hardly less marvelous has been the capacity of industry to design and of labor to operate, the machines and methods to do things never done before so that the brainchild of many minds came forth in physical shape and performed as it was supposed to do. Both science and industry worked under the direction of the United States Army, which achieved a unique success in managing so diverse a problem in the advancement of knowledge in an amazingly short time. It is doubtful if such another combination could be got together in the world. What has been done is the greatest achievement of organized science in history. It was done under pressure and without failure.

We are now prepared to obliterate more rapidly and completely every productive enterprise the Japanese have above ground in any city. We shall destroy their docks, their factories, and their communications. Let there be no mistake; we shall completely destroy Japan's power to make war.

It was to spare the Japanese people from utter destruction that the ultimatum of July 26 was issued at Potsdam.² Their leaders promptly rejected that ultimatum. If they do not now accept our terms they may expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on this earth. Behind this air attack will follow sea and land forces in such number and power as they have not yet seen and with the fighting skill of which they are already well aware.

The Secretary of War, who has kept in personal touch with all phases of the project, will immediately make public a statement giving further details.

His statement will give facts concerning the sites at Oak Ridge near Knoxville, Tennessee, and at Richland, near Pasco, Washington, and an installation near Santa Fe, New Mexico. Although the workers at the sites have been making materials to be used producing the greatest destructive force in history they have not themselves been in danger beyond that of many other occupations, for the utmost care has been taken of their safety.³

The fact that we can release atomic energy ushers in a new era in man's understanding of nature's forces. Atomic energy may in the future supplement the power that now comes from coal, oil, and falling water, but at present it cannot be produced on a basis to compete with them commercially. Before that comes there must be a long period of intensive research. It has never been the habit of the scientists of this country or the policy of this government to withhold from the world

scientific knowledge. Normally, therefore, everything about the work with atomic energy would be made public.

But under the present circumstances it is not intended to divulge the technical processes of production or all the military applications, pending further examination of possible methods of protecting us and the rest of the world from the danger of sudden destruction.

I shall recommend that the Congress of the United States consider promptly the establishment of an appropriate commission to control the production and use of atomic power within the United States. I shall give further consideration and make further recommendations to the Congress as to how atomic power can become a powerful and forceful influence towards the maintenance of world peace.

Statement by President Harry Truman on August, 6th, 1945