

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Scott E. Swartz for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Speech Communication and History presented on May 20, 2002.

Title: American Ideology and The Atomic Bomb.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved

✓

William M. Keith

On August 6, 1945 the United States of America dropped an atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima, Japan. Three days later another atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki, Japan. The events that led up to the United States' decision to drop the atomic bombs on Japanese cities is extensive, historical and political. President Roosevelt died, and Harry S. Truman took his place as President of the United States in April. The atomic bombs were being developed at this time as well, and in July the first one was successfully tested.

It was necessary for the United States to publicly justify its use of the atomic bombs. Secretary of war, Henry L. Stimson, was chosen to write the article. In February 1947 the article, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," was published in Harper's Magazine. Stimson constructed the article in a manner that would be consistent with American ideology and could be morally accepted by the American readers.

Ideology provided the framework of the selected authors for analysis of Stimson's article. The specific ideology focused on is the ideology of post World War II America. This is the ideology in which Stimson's article "lived" in, and influenced his choice of rhetoric; the main focus of the analysis is Stimson's rhetoric.

Identifying the elements of the text of the article and the ideological character of that text is key to understanding Stimson's choice of rhetoric. He asked this audience to accept certain points in order to justify the United States' use of the atomic bombs. He centered the article on themes such as American dominance, leadership, and moral and intellectual superiority; he used specific words and phrases to bring these themes to light.

While Stimson's article was, and is, an important source of information there were many facts and events that he excluded from it to formulate the desired version of the justification. Possibly, the most prominent of Stimson's justifications for the use of the atomic bomb was this number of American lives saved.

The analysis of this article and its findings are relevant in our understanding of political reporting of important events. The importance of understanding how and why Stimson used certain rhetoric to play to American ideological standards can help Americans today and in the future to better understand the portrayals of present day media coverage and political rhetoric.

©Copyright by Scott E. Swartz
May 20, 2002
All Rights Reserved

American Ideology and The Atomic Bomb

by
Scott E. Swartz

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Presented May 20, 2002
Commencement June 2003

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies thesis of Scott E. Swartz presented on May 20, 2002.

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Major Professor, representing Speech Communication

Redacted for Privacy

Committee Member, representing Speech Communication

Redacted for Privacy

Committee Member, representing History

Redacted for Privacy

Chair of the Department of Speech Communication

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Redacted for Privacy

Scott E. Swartz, Author

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
1 A Brief History Of The Decision To Drop The Bomb.....	5
1.1 Evolution Of The Bombing Policy	5
1.2 The Politics That Lead To The Bombs' Use.....	7
1.3 The Beginnings Of The Cold War.....	12
2 Overview Of The Article	15
2.1 Birth Of The Article.....	15
2.2 Stimson's Background.....	17
2.3 Harper's Magazine.....	18
2.4 "Plans And Preparations..."	19
2.5 "U.S. Policy Toward Japan..." And "The Use Of The Bomb"	22
2.6 "A Personal Summary"	24
3 Literature Review And Methods.....	26
3.1 Ideological Critique.....	26
3.2 Philip Wander.....	27
3.3 Michael McGee.....	28
3.4 Alan O'Connor.....	31
3.5 James W. Hikins.....	32
3.6 Ideology And Rhetoric.....	35
3.7 Methodology.....	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED) PAGE 2

	<u>Page</u>
4 Analyzing The Text.....	40
4.1 Stimson's Intended Audience.....	40
4.2 Stimson's Main Points.....	40
4.3 Stimson's Arguments And Justifications.....	41
4.4 Characteristics, Roles, Actions And Viewpoints Commended By Stimson.....	43
4.5 Positive Values And General Perceptions.....	48
4.6 Negative Values And General Perceptions.....	49
5 Ideological Character Of The Text.....	52
5.1 The Dominant Ideology.....	52
5.2 Voices Of Interest.....	52
5.3 Unexpressed, Oppressed Or Unrepresented Interests In The Ideology.....	53
5.4 Rhetorical Features In Support Of The Dominant Ideology.....	54
6 Criticisms Of Stimson	58
6.1 Introduction.....	58
6.2 American Values.....	58
6.3 Japanese Strength And Morale.....	59
6.4 Bomb Targeting Decisions.....	63
6.5 The Impact Of The Soviet Union.....	67
6.6 Casualties Exaggerated.....	69

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED) PAGE 3

	<u>Page</u>
Conclusion.....	72
Bibliography.....	77

AMERICAN IDEOLOGY AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

INTRODUCTION

On the morning of August 6, 1945, the United States of America made an infamous mark on history when it opened the nuclear age by dropping an atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima, Japan. Just three days later, on August 9, 1945, another atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki, Japan. These bombs resulted in the deaths of over two hundred thousand Japanese citizens, both instantaneously as well as in the days and weeks to come. Many would suffer and die from cancer brought on by the radiation effects produced by the bombs. This decision to introduce the unknown potential of atomic warfare was the first step into an era when the human species, for the first time in history, had the ability to destroy itself in a single day. The use of the world's first atomic weapons against the Empire of Japan was a choice that will forever be scrutinized by every culture of the world, but none so closely as our own. Whether the decision was just has been the topic of an endless quantity of research which continues to this day. The confused triumph felt by the American people led to a need for understanding the events and reasoning that led up to, during and after the bombing.

Although much information is available to us on this subject now, the American public was not aware of many of the crucial facts of what went on at the time. The only information available to them came from the government-regulated news media. Even though this information was often limited and censored it was accepted by the American public. President Truman himself addressed the public

via radio broadcasts, and there were printed accounts and justifications published in national magazines and newspapers. Later a television series with Truman was designed to help the American people deal with this type of mixed-feeling victory. The most significant article of this type at the time appeared in the February 1947 issue of Harper's Magazine. It was titled, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," and was written by Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. This article is typical of the types of information offered to the public, and was written by an authority on the subject of the atomic bomb decision process. Unfortunately for the American policy makers during World War II, in light of the wealth of new knowledge that has been developed over the last fifty years, this piece has fallen under scrutiny. This thesis will attempt to uncover the article's meaning.

Three questions will be addressed in this analysis. First, what did Stimson need to accomplish by writing his article? Second, what strategies and tactics did he use to accomplish his task? Third, what did Stimson leave out of his account, and why did he do so?

The rhetorical situation of the article emerges from the historical and political context as outlined in Chapters 1 and 2. The climate of the times is introduced in Chapter 1 through a brief history of the events leading up to the decision to drop the atomic bombs. Chapter 2 gives an overview of Stimson's article; describing how it came about and why there was a need for it. This chapter also mentions how the author and magazine were chosen, and summarizes their backgrounds. Chapter 2 also summarizes the main concepts of Stimson's article.

The rhetorical strategies and tactics emerge in Chapters 3 through 6. Chapter 3 begins with a brief description of the history of ideological critique. Then the chapter discusses different views of ideology and rhetoric of selected prominent authors within the field of Communication. These particular views were used to shape the analysis of Stimson's article. Next this chapter discusses ideology and Stimson's rhetoric. Specifically, the ideology of post World War II America is described as the dominant ideology that Stimson's writing reflected; this chapter also discusses why he used specific rhetoric within this ideological hegemony. Chapter 4 focuses on the text of the article, and chapter 5 comments on the ideological character of the text. In chapter 4 the following areas are discussed: 1) Stimson's intended audience, 2) beliefs, assumptions and feelings that the audience was asked to accept, 3) Stimson's arguments and justifications, 4) characteristics, roles, actions, and viewpoints commended by Stimson, 5) values and general perceptions mentioned in a positive way by Stimson, and 6) values and general perceptions mentioned in a negative way by Stimson. The following topics are commented on in chapter 5: 1) the nature of the dominant ideology of Stimson's article, 2) the voices of interest of the article, 3) the voices that are unexpressed or oppressed in Stimson's article, and 4) the rhetorical features that Stimson used to support the dominant ideology.

Stimson's rhetorical exclusions are discussed at length in Chapter 6. While the title, "Criticisms of Stimson," conjured an image of negativity, the chapter criticized Stimson's exclusions in both a positive and negative way. Some ideas

were not consistent with the ideology Stimson was writing within. The ideology constrained him to be selectively honest about these events. Chapter 6 addresses the question of why Stimson must leave these specifics out.

This analysis will conclude with an application of the themes that emerged from the rhetoric of this article. It will discuss the significance and importance of performing this analysis. Hopefully, the analysis will shed some light on this event, which has been veiled with doubt and hazy mystery since it took place.

CHAPTER 1: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DECISION TO DROP THE BOMB

1.1 EVOLUTION OF THE BOMBING POLICY

Many key political and military events led up to the atomic strikes in August 1945. The war in the Pacific began to escalate as the war in the European Theatre was grinding to a halt. The United States, in coordination with France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, would decide the fate of Europe, and most importantly, that of the fallen Nazi Germany. With the war against the Nazis ending, the United States, and the rest of the involved Allies, began to focus most of their military attention on defeating Japan.

To truly be effective in an Allied attack on Japan, the United States needed to insure that they had airfields that allowed the Americans' newly developed B-29 Superfortress bombers to reach mainland Japan. On July 18, 1944 the United States took control of Japan's main line of communication, the Mariana Islands. Taking the Marianas cost 31,000 of the 32,000 Japanese soldiers, and 22,000 civilians were also killed. The United States casualties were high as well, losing 3,426 Marines and GIs. (Nobile, 1995, p.14)

The B-29 bombers were then able to fly several successful missions over Japan, although several planes were lost because there were no emergency landing strips within their range. This resulted in the Allied High Command's decision to take the Pacific Island of Iwo Jima, which was located halfway between the

Marianas and Japan. Iwo Jima was also only 750 miles from Tokyo, and if the Allies could take Iwo Jima, it would be a major defeat for the Japanese Empire.

The Allies raided and bombarded Iwo Jima almost daily for months before the invasion, but the attacks seemed to have no effect on the Japanese. Their answer to the attack was to build underground fortifications. On February 19, 1945, General Harry Schmidt's 5th Amphibious Corps landed on Iwo Jima. The 70,000 Marines met savage resistance from the Japanese troops under the command of Lt. General Tadamichi Kuribayashi. On March 26, after leaving only 200 of the 20,700 man strong Japanese garrison still alive, the Allies finally controlled Iwo Jima. The battle cost more than 6,800 Marines with 20,000 wounded, but now the B-29's had a base to strike the Japanese mainland even harder. (Nobile, 1995, p.6)

On the night of March 9-10, 1945, General Curtis E. LeMay ordered firebombing raids on the Japanese capital city of Tokyo. This type of military bombing tactic became an accepted evil during World War II. The firebombs were directed into the heart of the civilian population. Contrary to the unwritten or presumed laws of war, Germany, Japan, Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union often targeted civilians during the war. World War II firebombing was symbolic of the growing disregard of morals in military decision-making. It is important to note that Roosevelt was still in the White House, and had come to find this type of immoral bombing an acceptable tactic to achieve "total victory." Flying in three 400-mile long streams, 334 B-29 bombers bombed Tokyo for close

to three hours. This one night of destruction burned out 16 square miles of the city, killed an estimate of up to 100,000 and left one million Japanese homeless. This raid marked the single most devastating non-nuclear strike in military history. (Udall, 1994, p.60) The casualty results of the two-day firebombing of Tokyo were comparable to the numbers left dead by the later use of the atomic bombs. The large number of dead, however, would be no surprise because military personnel had estimated civilian casualties before the raid with surprising accuracy. (Nobile, 1995, p.14) The Tokyo raid marked the beginning of a five month-long incendiary bombing campaign. By August of that year, the firebombing had resulted in the total destruction of “one half [of] the total area of 66 urban centers-burning 460 square kilometers (180 square miles) to the ground” and “probably took more civilian lives than the half million killed during the five years of Allied bombing of Germany.” (Nobile, 1995, p.14)

1.2 THE POLITICS THAT LED TO THE BOMBS' USE

Less than a month after the start of the raids on Tokyo, the almost three month-long brutal Battle of Okinawa broke out on April 1. The Joint Chiefs of Staff decided to invade Okinawa as the next hurdle in the march towards Tokyo, and what would eventually be the last great military land campaign of World War II. Okinawa was located only about 400 miles south of Japan in the Ryukyu Island chain. The island was very close to the southern Japanese home island Kyushu, and it would provide an excellent base for future military operations in China and eventually against the mainland of Japan. On April 1, the Army and Marine troops

under the command of General Simon B. Buckner Jr. invaded the island, initially meeting little resistance. The Japanese troops, however, had dug themselves into the northern portion of the island. When the Allied troops ran into the Japanese forces, they met heavy resistance.

By June 21 the Japanese resistance had ended. Lost with the battle was the Japanese soldiers' confidence in the cause. The Japanese military lost over 70,000 men, and at least 80,000 civilians perished in the crossfire. (Nobile, 1995, p.7) The American losses were also very costly, with the United States losing over 12,500 men and leaving 35,500 wounded. Okinawa marked the first battle in which the Japanese realized defeat might be inevitable. 10,000 Japanese soldiers, the largest number to this date, would surrender. (Nobile, 1995, p.6) This battle was symbolic of the type of future battles the Allies felt they might face as they moved through Japan.

Okinawa was a killing field. In the 82 days of battle for that island, an average of 2,500 people died every day. Under those conditions, with dead everywhere, I seemed to have gone into a sort of trance. [A description by Peter Milo, an American soldier on Okinawa in 1945.]

(Nobile, 1995, p.7)

This battle was significant for three major reasons. First, on May 8 Germany surrendered to the Allies, leaving the war in the Pacific as the only major military matter to be settled. Second, the Battle of Okinawa would be the final major land battle of the war, and the Allied Forces finally began to break the morale of the Japanese people. Third, the Japanese realized that defeat might be inevitable, as mentioned above.

During this same period of fighting, there were some major political developments brewing as well. On April 12, United States' President Roosevelt died while serving an unprecedented fourth term as President. Vice President Harry S. Truman would take Roosevelt's place, and was sworn in the same day. Thirteen days later Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and General Leslie Groves gave the new president his first briefing about the \$2 billion Manhattan Project. Truman had no prior knowledge of the experimental race to build an atomic bomb which had been initiated with a recommendation letter to President Roosevelt from Albert Einstein in 1939. (Walker, 1997, Chronology)

On June 8, 1945 Emperor Hirohito decided to hold for an all-out resistance to an Allied invasion of Japan. This prompted a June 18 White House meeting between Truman and his key advisors, Army Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall and Secretary of War Stimson. They convinced Truman to authorize an invasion of the Island of Kyushu set for November 1945. Truman wanted to minimize what could turn into a drawn out bloody war. There was also growing pressure for a second invasion at Honshu in March 1946, which would have been proportionately more violent. (Walker, 1997, Chronology)

Then on June 22, in response to the sagging morale of the Japanese military after the Okinawa defeat, Hirohito agreed to send out peace feelers to Stalin and the Soviet Union's top leaders. During this time, and the previous months leading up to this point, Japan began to prepare the entire country for an all-out Allied invasion. The country's leaders began to stockpile aircraft, amassed a giant

conscripted military force, and commenced the creation of a civilian army who swore total allegiance to the emperor. One example of what Truman and his advisors anticipated from the Japanese during an Allied invasion was what was commonly referred to as Sherman Carpets. These carpets, Sherman symbolizing the name of the top American tank, were children with dynamite strapped to their bodies and trained to throw themselves under American tanks. (Walker, 1997, Chronology)

In July of 1945, as the climax of the war in the Pacific appeared to be taking shape, the final stages of the development of the secret atomic device for war was coming together in New Mexico. At the same time the leaders of the major Allied powers were convening just outside of Berlin, Germany at the Potsdam Conference on July 17. Truman had delayed the conference so that it would take place at the same time the atomic device was going to be tested. Truman is presumed to have believed that, as his influential Secretary of State James Brynes hoped, that use of the bomb might well “put the United States in a position ‘to dictate our own terms at the end of the war.’” (Udall, 1994, p.79) This advantage would have given the United States the upper hand in the negotiations for the settlement of post-war Europe. The possibility of an atomic weapon would also allow the Allies to issue an ultimatum that Truman desired, calling for the unconditional surrender of the Japanese.

On July 16, while Truman and Stimson were at Potsdam, the news came to Stimson in coded telegrams that the test of an atomic device in a remote section of

the Alamogordo Air Base, New Mexico was successful. The atomic test, as the Manhattan Project Chief General Leslie Groves wrote, in a detailed report received at Potsdam on July 21, “was successful beyond the most optimistic expectations of anyone.” (Farrell, 1996, p.15)

On July 24, Truman decided to approach the Soviet leader Stalin and mention that the United States had “a new weapon of unusual destructive force.” It did not appear as if Stalin had understood the President’s statement, and merely replied that he hoped the United States made “good use of it against the Japanese.” (Nobile, 1995, p.51) In Truman’s diary entry on the next day he wrote, “it is certainly a good thing for the world that Hitler’s crowd or Stalin’s did not discover this atomic bomb.” (Farrell, 1996, p.31) Ironically, unbeknownst to Truman, Soviet spying within the Manhattan Project allowed Stalin to gain knowledge of the bomb well before Truman’s initial briefing in April 1945.

On July 17, Stalin agreed that the Soviets would enter the war with Japan by August 15, but in Truman’s diary entry a day later he wrote, “[I] Believe Japs will fold up before Russia comes in. I am sure they will when Manhattan [atomic bomb] appears over their homeland.” (Farrell, 1996, p.30) With the addition of the atomic bomb, many of Truman’s advisors felt that any form of Soviet intervention in the Pacific was no longer desirable.

The Potsdam Proclamation ultimatum was issued to Japan on July 26 by the three largest Allied powers already at war in the Pacific, the United States, Great Britain, and China. The proclamation was an ultimatum for the Japanese Empire

calling for surrender at once or they would face “prompt and utter destruction.”

However, Secretary of State Brynes eliminated any reference to the retention of Emperor Hirohito, the atomic bomb, or Soviet entry into the war from the ultimatum. These changes, brought on by political opposition in the United States toward concessions or modifications to “unconditional surrender,” eliminated any effectiveness and resulted in Japanese Prime Minister Kantaro Suzuki announcing on July 28 “that his government would ignore (*“mokusatu”*) the Proclamation.” (Nobile, 1995, p.53) On August 2, the Potsdam Conference ended and the stage was now set for the United States to unleash the force of the still experimental atomic weapons on Japanese cities.

1.3 THE BEGINNINGS OF THE COLD WAR

On August 6, 1945, after being strategically left off the United Allied Air Force’s targeting lists, the Japanese City of Hiroshima would be the first target. At 2:34 a.m., the B-29 bomber the “Enola Gay” took off from Tinian Island in the Central Pacific accompanied by two other B-29s “The Great Artiste” and “Number 91” destined to detonate the “Little Boy” uranium gun bomb over the Japanese City of Hiroshima. Less than six hours later the city would be in ruins, and this new weapon of unconceivable force would shock the world. By November 1945 “as many as 130,000 individuals [had] lost their lives as a direct result” from the use of the bomb against Hiroshima. (Nobile, 1995, pp.83-85, 107-108)

Then on August 9, after being forced by smoke and haze to abort their primary target of Kokura, the “Fat Man” plutonium implosion bomb was used

against the city of Nagasaki. The result, as reported in a survey by Nagasaki officials, estimated that the final death toll was between 60,000 and 70,000. (Nobile, 1995, p.94,108) This would be the final bomb used and would be the final military act of aggression by the United States against the Japanese Empire. Truman ordered, during discussions of the surrender, that no more atomic bombs were to be dropped without his consent, specifically the next plutonium bomb that would have been ready for a mission by around August 24, 1945. (Nobile, 1995, p.119)

On the night of August 7 Stalin, although aware of the successful test weeks earlier, reacted in shock to the atomic attack on Hiroshima. Fearing that the war might be over before the Soviets could get their cut of the pie, he ordered an attack on the Japanese Army in north China the day before the Nagasaki attack. Just prior to the attack their Japanese ambassador was given the Soviet declaration of war. The entry of the Soviets signaled sure defeat for the Japanese, and raised questions of the United States' justification for the second bomb, since Japanese surrender seemed a foregone conclusion. On August 10, the United States received a transmitted message that Japan desired to surrender. On August 15, Emperor Hirohito began broadcasting on the radio for the first time, sending the message to the Japanese people that Japan had lost the war. On September 2, the documents of surrender were signed on the United States' USS Missouri and officially ended World War II.

The main justification for the use of the atomic bombs was that it would bring about a quick end to the war and save up to one million American lives.

Whatever the real justification may have been, which is discussed in later chapters, the effect of the bombing was to force Soviet dictator Stalin to create his own bomb. He directed his chief nuclear scientist and Munitions Minister to do so in

August of that year saying,

A single demand of you, comrades, [is to] provide us with atomic weapons in the shortest possible time. You know that Hiroshima has shaken the whole world. The equilibrium has been destroyed. Provide the bomb – it will remove a great danger from us.

(Nobile, 1995, p.120)

This signaled the beginning of what would become the nuclear arms race and developed into the Cold War, as Great Britain, France, and communist China would all follow the Soviet Union's lead starting atomic bomb projects of their own. In just twenty years following the first two bombs used on Japan, the number grew from two bombs to tens of thousands of bombs by the 1960's.

CHAPTER 2: OVERVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

2.1 BIRTH OF THE ARTICLE

In September 1946, James Conant, President of Harvard University, who also served as a major advisor of the Manhattan Project, recognized the problem emerging from the literature of dissent of the bomb. Barton J. Bernstein's "The Struggle Over History" which appeared as a chapter in Phillip Nobile's 1995 book Judgment at the Smithsonian the "Uncensored script of the Smithsonian's 50th Anniversary Exhibit of the Enola Gay." (Nobile, 1995, cover) In the chapter Bernstein cited the following literature in support of the growing dissent and condemnation of the use of the atomic bombs on Japanese cities.

In early 1946 the Federal Council of Churches condemned the use of the bombs on mainly civilian targets having stated that the "moral cost was too high" and unnecessary to win the war. (Nobile, 1995, p. 133) The problem

... was that the criticisms were not coming just from 'professional pacifists and...certain religious leaders,' but from others including 'non-religious groups and people taking up the same theme.'
(Nobile, 1995, p.137)

Michael J. Yavenditti's "American Reactions to the Use of the Atomic Bombs" cited U.S. News editor David Lawrence, a pronounced conservative, who "Questioned the need for the use of the A-Bombs, and concluded that Japan had already been defeated and was trying to surrender." Yavenditti also stated that the right wing Chicago Tribune disagreed with the bombs' use as well. (Nobile, 1995, p.134) Even the triumphant U.S. commander in the Pacific, General Douglas

MacArthur, said that, “neither the atomic bombing nor the entry of the Soviet Union into the war forced Japan’s unconditional surrender.” (James, 1975, p.775)

In the June 15, 1946 edition of the Saturday Review of Literature, Norman Cousins and Thomas K. Finletter, published “A Plea for Sanity” in which the men conveyed that the U.S. avoided any demonstration of the bomb and hurried to use the bomb in order to affect the postwar peace process and the future relationship with the Soviet Union. (Noblie, 1995, p.135) In the September 14, 1946 edition Cousins would publish the “The Literacy of Survival” which appeared as an expansion of his criticism of the bombs’ use, citing the harsher rhetoric of the “crime of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.” (Nobile, 1995, p.136)

Cousin’s second essay was motivated by an article that appeared in the August 31, 1946 edition of the New Yorker titled “Hiroshima” by John Hersey. This article revolved around stories of people involved in the bombings and gave the reader real feeling for the horror of the events. This article “was widely reprinted, read in four special half-hour broadcasts on one of the radio networks, and then issued as a book, quickly becoming a best seller.” (Nobile, 1995, p.135)

In an effort to quell this dissent, Conant spoke to Harvey Bundy, a prominent attorney and special assistant to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, and explained,

We are in danger of repeating the fallacy which occurred after World War I [when] it became accepted doctrine among a group of so-called intellectuals who taught in our schools and colleges that the United States made a great error in entering World War I.... A small minority, if it represents the type of person who is both

sentimental and verbally minded and in contact with youth, may result in a distortion of history.

(Nobile, 1995, p.137)

Conant and Bundy knew that an “official version” of the history of Hiroshima should be written, and more importantly, stressed that it should be one that would not be challenged. Harvey’s son, McGeorge Bundy, was working closely with Stimson to write his memoirs, and naturally Harvey knew there would have to be a section devoted to the subject. Conant proposed that a version of this section be published in some prestigious, distinguished magazine, and that Stimson would be the perfect choice for its author since he had had such an important role and the American people were aware of this fact. (Nobile, 1995, p.138) In order to gain more prestige, the article did not mention that Stimson had a co-author in the venture. All members involved thought this would detract from the impact of the article, however important Bundy’s contribution may have been.

2.2 STIMSON’S BACKGROUND

The decision to attach Stimson’s name and figure to this important document was obvious. When he died in 1950, only three years after publishing the article, he was regarded internationally as one of the most impressive statesmen of the twentieth century. (Udall, 1994, p.72) A prominent figure in the American political establishment for over four decades, he served directly under five Presidents. Stimson formerly served as Secretary of War for President William Taft, Governor of the Philippines for President Calvin Coolidge, and Secretary of State for President Herbert Hoover. Even though Stimson had previously been a

lifelong Republican, Roosevelt persuaded him to take over as his Secretary of War in 1940. The Roosevelt administration would call upon Stimson's war experience to help guide them through the urgent military buildup responding to the Nazi victories in Europe.

Disregarding his age of 88 and declining health, Stimson remained in the same role under newly sworn-in President Harry S. Truman. But, as Stuart L. Udall states in his book, The Myths of August, "the laurel that distinguished Stimson from his peers was the honor he conferred on his country by his performance as a self-appointed guardian of America's moral ideals." (Udall, 1994, p.72) Stimson said of his responsibilities,

I was directly connected with all major decisions of policy on the development and use of atomic energy, and from May 1, 1943 until my resignation as Secretary of War on September 21, 1945, I was directly responsible to the President for the administration for the entire undertaking; my chief advisers in this period were General Marshall, Dr. Bush, Dr. Conant, and Major General Leslie R. Groves, the officer in charge of the project. At the same time I was the President's senior adviser on the military employment of atomic energy.

(Stimson, 1947, 97)

Stimson's past record and accomplishments made him a credible choice as the author to write an informative article regarding the atomic bomb decision.

2.3 HARPER'S MAGAZINE

In February 1947, Stimson wrote the article and titled it, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb." With such a distinguished author, the article needed an equally distinguished publication outlet. Harper's Magazine, indeed, was a fine

choice in which to showcase the article. Founded in New York City in 1850, Harper's was significant because it was, and is, the nation's oldest continuously published monthly magazine, and it commanded a large base of readers. Fifty years after the Stimson report Harper's still publishes reports, essays, criticism, fiction, poetry, art, humor, and argument; today the combined circulation by subscription and on newsstands is more than 215,000. The magazine has also been the recipient of eleven National Magazine Awards, among its many other journalistic and literary honors. The magazine is now owned and published by the Harper's Magazine Foundation. (Harper's Online, 2001)

2.4 "PLANS AND PREPARATIONS..."

Within the article, Stimson gave his account of the events surrounding the decision to use the atomic bomb. His general argument was the justification for its use and the lack of better alternatives. He started his account in the Fall of 1941, talking of "plans and preparations" with regard to atomic energy and its possible use. (Stimson, 1947, 97) Next he discussed the United States' policy toward Japan in 1945. Then he outlined the use of the bomb. Finally, he ended with his own personal summary of the situation and its outcome including his own commentary.

Stimson began his article by noting the growing commentary about the decision to "use atomic bombs in attacks on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki." (Stimson, 1947, 97) He decided to print what was an "exact description of our thoughts and actions as I find them in the records and in my clear

recollection.” (Stimson, 1947, 97) He entered into the eleven page narrative with what he subtitled the “Plans and Preparations, September 1941-June 1945.”

(Stimson, 1947, 97) He briefly noted the people involved in the atomic process and just what his role was.

Stimson’s story begins by dating back to 1938 when atomic fission was first discovered by Germany. By 1941 and 1942 the Germans were believed to be ahead of the United States and Stimson stressed the importance of developing an atomic weapon first. What the weapon would be, exactly, was not clear, but as time went on it seemed obvious that it would not be ready in time to use against the Nazis.

Stimson presented a diary entry from March 15, 1945 covering the last meeting Stimson had with Roosevelt before FDR’s death. (Stimson, 1947, 98) The most important aspect of their meeting were the three questions raised regarding the eventual development of an atomic weapon. The first question was how to suppress the doubt about being able to complete the Manhattan Project. Second, was the question of drafting of a statement to be presented after the use of the first atomic weapon. Third, and most important, was how to deal with the dramatic effects the bomb would have on America and the post-war world.

The article then moved to the death of Roosevelt and the task of having to brief the new President, Harry Truman, on the history of the Manhattan Project. He laid out the issues discussed with Truman by offering the readers the official memorandum discussed with Truman on April 25, 1945. This memorandum

included nine important points. Among these was the probability of having the weapon in the next four months, the knowledge that certain scientists held, the future of atomic warfare and its possible acquisition by small rogue nations, an atomic control committee, deciding whether to share the weapon or not, the moral responsibility for future acts, and the hope that proper use could force the world into peace.

Stimson, as chairman of the Presidential advising committee, took the “next step” by appointing members of the Interim Committee, which was charged with advising the President on the atomic weapons. (Stimson, 1947, 100) This committee recommended the use of any atomic bombs against Japan, and it also had the responsibility of drafting an after statement for the world.

On June 1, 1945 the Interim Committee met with the Scientific Panel and finalized their unanimous conclusion that the bomb should be used against Japan. They also developed the policy of use, and decided that the bomb should be used on a military installation with no prior warning. The use of any alternative targets would not be likely to be compelling enough to force a Japanese surrender.

Stimson then quoted a few paragraphs out of a memorandum from a group of scientists questioning the use of the bomb. The discussion that followed dealt with the reasoning of the committee to suggest the policy of the atomic bomb. Stimson stated, however, that the committee could only be there to advise the President, and that Stimson had the ultimate responsibility of suggesting a course of action to him.

2.5 “U.S. POLICY TOWARD JAPAN...” AND “THE USE OF THE BOMB”

Stimson then explained the reportedly weakened state of the Japanese military by July 1945, and the Japanese reliance upon the Kamikaze death missions that inflicted serious damage on the American forces. He briefly outlined the plans for a future invasion of the mainland at Kyushu, Japan on November 1. This invasion was planned, however, on the premise that they would not have any atomic weapons ready by that time. If this invasion had taken place there would have been, as Stimson quoted his now famous estimate, over “a million casualties, to American forces alone,” with even more casualties estimated from the Allied forces. (Stimson, 1947, 102) He raised the question of whether this type of action would be enough to induce a Japanese surrender.

Stimson next provided his July 2, 1945 memorandum for the President’s, “Proposed Program for Japan,” which was accepted by the Interim Committee on June 18. (Stimson, 1947, 102) This proposal advised Truman that any invasion of Japan would be extremely long and costly. The military resistance and large area to overcome were similar to, but far larger than, either Iwo Jima or Okinawa. He covered the memorandum’s proposal of a prior warning to the Japanese, that they were facing insurmountable odds. Stimson stated that there was a probability that the Japanese were intelligent enough to listen to the warning and possibly surrender in the face of this hopeless situation. There was the possibility that in time the United States could “enter into mutually advantageous trade relations with her.” (Stimson, 1947, 104)

The warning was two-fold because if Japan did not comply it would be assured destruction, however, there would be a definite hope if it surrendered. He also noted that the bomb was not mentioned because of national secrecy, and in fact it had not been successfully tested at that time. The atomic bomb remained the best possible future sanction if the warning were rejected by Japan. Later in July after a successful atomic test, the U.S. sent the Potsdam Ultimatum as an official warning and ultimatum of surrender to Japan.

Stimson then directed his focus to the atomic bombs' targeting, their use of them, and Japan's surrender; he analyzed the military importance of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and even the ancient Japanese capital of Kyoto. He then recounted the details of the surrender of Japan, and the effect that the atomic bombs had on the Japanese finally giving up.

If the war had continued, he predicted, even more firebombing raids and atomic bombs would have preceded the November 1 invasion. (Stimson, however, did mention that the brutal bombing raids on Tokyo in March 1945 created a massive firestorm.) He contended that another firebombing would have destroyed more, but the atomic bombs had a greater "psychological effect." (Stimson, 1947, 104) He stated that as far as the Japanese knew the United States had an "unlimited" ability to drop atomic bombs, which allowed the Japanese disarmament to be finished with unprecedented ease.

2.6 “A PERSONAL SUMMARY”

Stimson finished his article with “A Personal Summary.” He told the readers that he had “tried to give an accurate account of my own personal observations of the circumstances which led up to the use of the atomic bomb and the reasons which underlay our use of it.” (Stimson, 1947, 106) He said that he couldn’t see any other course of action and once again said that the “enemy armies still unbeaten had the strength to cost us a million more” casualties. Stimson called the bomb the “ultimate instrument” for forcing the Japanese Emperor to agree to surrender and shorten the war. Stimson then went further to say that he did not feel that anyone in that “position and subject to our responsibilities” could have failed to use such a weapon and “looked his countrymen in the face.” (Stimson, 1947, 106)

Stimson concluded his article on “The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb,” by saying that “the face of war is the face of death” and the decision to drop the bomb on Japan led to just that. (Stimson, 1947, 107) He said that the “premeditated destruction was our only abhorrent choice.” Stimson claimed that war had become steadily more barbaric now that man had the ability to destroy himself, though he hoped there would be a way to find lasting peace after the atomic age had begun, and that “there is no other choice” for the world. (Stimson, 1947, 107)

The editors of Harper’s Magazine justified the importance of Stimson’s article, at the time of publishing, by printing the following statement. “In view of

the exceptional public importance of this article, permission is given to any newspaper or magazine to reprint it, in part or (preferably, since its effect is cumulative) in full, with credit to Harper's Magazine but without charge." (Harper Editors, 1947, p.107)

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

3.1 IDEOLOGICAL CRITIQUE

In researching literature for the background of the ideology and rhetoric that applied to the Stimson article several viewpoints came to the forefront. The following is a brief history of ideological critique, and a summary of various viewpoints on ideology and rhetoric. The basis of the critique of Stimson's article will be the ideas of Philip Wander, Michael McGee, Alan O'Connor, James Hikins, and Sonja Foss. Their views will provide a framework for analyzing the way that Stimson's rhetoric shaped the presentation of the United States' decision to use the atomic bombs.

Ideology as defined by the International Encyclopedia of Communication is the "patterns of ideas, belief systems, or interpretive schemes found in a society or among specific social groups." (Hall, 1989, pp.307) During the years following the first U.S. mass communications research of the 1940s ideology was "diffused into the looser concept of values." (Hall, 1989, pp.309) The definition of ideology and specifically the American ideology within Stimson's article can be further understood by focusing on the "political upheavals of the 1960's and the theoretical developments of the 1970's." (Hall, 1989, pp.310) These periods of change in mainstream empirical mass communication theory and research,

prompted a renewed interest in (1) the influence on audience behavior, attitudes, and belief in the 'pictures of the world' that the media circulate; (2) the question of which representations of the situation prevailed, and thus the links among the media, power, and social conflict; and (3) the role of media-circulated images and ideas

in legitimation, securing consent to social order, and the exercise of social and symbolic control by powerful or dominant groups over subordinate, marginal, or so-called deviant groups. This opened the door to a renewed concern with ideology within media research.

(Hall, 1989, pp.310)

The following is a review of selected works of the authors mentioned above who have contributed to the different schools of thought regarding ideology. This specifically helped to identify and analyze how Stimson used rhetorical techniques to play to the American ideology without regard for how they may have distorted, falsified, or biased American public thinking.

3.2 PHILIP WANDER

In his essay, “The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy,” Philip Wander claims “like any other body of stock phrases or standardized code of expression, the rhetoric of American foreign policy protects us against reality, that is, against the claim on our attention that any event or fact makes by virtue of its existence.” (Wander, 1994, p.389) Hence rhetoric protects the American people from the reality that they may not want to understand. “The rhetoric of American foreign policy lends itself to cynical and bitter commentaries on lies, half-truths, and macabre scenarios.” (Wander, 1994, p.410)

Wander’s essay discusses the term “prophetic dualism,” which divides the world into two conflicting camps: “one side acts in accord with all that is good, decent, and at one with God’s will. The other acts in direct opposition. Conflict between them is resolved only through the total victory of one side over the other.” (Wander, 1994, p.393) Wander is saying specifically that American ideology plays

itself as the good side against those that oppose her will. During the Second World War “America’s ‘mission,’ her moral and spiritual superiority, became an official part of the war effort, themes absorbed in and recapitulated in a thousand different ways through popular culture.” (Wander, 1994, p.393) Wander shows that during times of national crisis American patriotism virtually became “law, criticism of government policies grounds for censorship, public protest evidence if not of treason then some lesser form of un-American.” (Wander, 1994, p.393)

During the Eisenhower-Dulles administration, Wander argues, prophetic dualism invoked a “God who presided over the founding of America, the God abhorred by Atheists and loathed by communist slavery. It was the God who had been America’s co-pilot during World War II.” (Wander, 1994, p.395) Prophetic dualism stifles any debate, since it poses a life and death, good versus evil struggle that “encourages a heightened dependence on the established order.” (Wander, 1994, p.396)

3.3 MICHAEL MCGEE

Michael McGee’s “Not Men, But Measures” (1978) is a study of early English politics that explains how political ideology has evolved. McGee found that in the early age of England the common people wanted their leaders to focus on the issues of the common people’s views and wants, which McGee finds impractical. Instead, McGee claims, government must create and maintain the ideology for the people. Meaning that while government has control and makes necessary decisions, it leads the common people to believe that they have a hand in

what is happening. In this way the common people are satisfied that their views and wants are fulfilled and the government is able to run the country the way it wants.

To McGee the idea of government is an ideology in itself, and it projects a certain image to its people based partly on what the people want to hear, and more importantly what they need to hear. Most people do not think too much about government until times of election or war, which bring the people into the government. Government still appeared to the people as “a mystery, a web of mythic images which suggests power and wealth, romance and majesty, fear and love.” (McGee, 1978, 51) Therefore the government has the power to portray an ideology that the people can follow and believe in because of this appearance.

McGee focuses largely on the “issues” versus the “images” of government, but the relationship that he outlines between the people and government is relevant to understanding the dominant ideology of a country. The people want to stick to specific political issues and have government make decisions based upon them, but sticking to only issues is impractical; the people do not and cannot know and understand all that goes into decision and policy-making. To McGee the relationship between people and government is a more complex process than just the issues. The notion of the insider versus the outsider applies with this view of government. In our case, the insider was a person like Stimson and the outsider was a typical American citizen.

To McGee government however, can, should, and apparently does handle itself so that the people feel satisfied that the “issues” are the main reasoning/facts that the government’s decisions are based upon. In this regard McGee concurs with Wander’s view that governmental rhetoric and ideology are there to protect the people against reality.

In the February 1980 Quarterly Journal of Speech, McGee’s essay “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology” proposes that ideology and myth are really not opposites, they are just different ways of thinking. He says that we as human beings think differently when we are by ourselves than when we are with others, and hence scholars assume that if a group appears to think and behave collectively, then the people must have somehow been tricked or manipulated.

He lists two groups that are operating within human society that explain why people behave alike. The first group, Symbolists whose view is a kind of “transcendence, a voluntary agreement to believe in and to participate in a myth.” Secondly, Materialists whose view is a “form of lie, a self-perpetuating system of beliefs and interpretations foisted on all numbers of the community by the ruling class.” (McGee, 1980, 2) With both groups there was a sense of falsity of some type going on.

McGee created a model that integrated both groups. He states that the falsity of ideology is specifically rhetorical; the political language falsifies and complicates the simple decision making involved. Ideology therefore is a political language used to dictate decision-making and control public belief and behavior.

(McGee, 1980, 5) The language is a series of slogans, which McGee calls “ideographs,” examples are phrases like “liberty” or “freedom of speech.” (McGee, 1980, 6-7) These slogans carry many meanings, symbols, and images that change depending on the context in which they are used. McGee stresses though, that we can’t think of our government as a power elite who forces the ideologies onto people. He claims that ideology is transcendent and has “as much influence on the belief and behavior of the ruler as on the ruled.” (McGee, 1980, 5)

The ideographs and their particular usage, as well as whom they are used by, shape the ideology and thus become our reality. Therefore the ideographs are for the most part culture-specific. McGee’s example is, “Such terms as ‘liberty,’ in other words, constitute by our very usage of them in political discourse an ideology that governs or ‘dominates our consciousness.’” (McGee, 1980, 15)

3.4 ALAN O’CONNOR

Understanding that the link between rhetoric and ideology are culture-specific Alan O’Connor goes further by looking at culture’s rhetoric to help understand the role it plays in society. In Questioning the Media: A Critical Introduction, O’Connor’s chapter “Culture and Communication,” he says that “culture plays a role as social cement, helping to maintain the boundaries and definition of a group, usually a nation-state, and thus is connected to the maintenance of social order and political power.” (O’Connor, 1990, p.27) Culture as a word has many different meanings and usages. It is the understanding of its meanings that allows politics in our country to thrive. The meanings of culture

change as our society changes and evolves. O'Connor uses a few examples to show how culture changes over time and across different nations. First, Britain's 1800's culture was made up of art and traditions. Then the United States culture of the 19th century was dictated by the upper class of people who had certain ideals and intelligence. By the 1950's the culture in the United States became termed popular culture. Meanings of culture vary from culture as art or culture as a nation, as in the Japanese culture. The anthropologist view is that culture is everything that we do in our everyday lives.

The study of cultural patterns, called semiology, "examines underlying patterns in culture and communication rather than specific content or messages..." (O'Connor, 1990, p.34) Studying these patterns reveals the values, history, and politics of a specific society.

O'Connor gives the example of bad versus good in old American western movies. The Indians were portrayed as bad and the cowboys were good. What this reveals is America's particular cultural value system at the time. It tells us about racial oppression in the United States. (O'Connor, 1990, p.35) The value system that the United States' culture had following World War II produced a climate that allowed for racial prejudice. This type of prejudice may have made it easier for American culture to accept the mass bombing of the Japanese.

3.5 JAMES W. HIKINS

James W. Hinks' essay "The Rhetoric of 'Unconditional Surrender' and the Decision to Drop the Atomic Bomb," (1983) examines the theory that the rhetoric

of Franklin Roosevelt's phrase "unconditional surrender" was used to constrain U.S. policy makers. Hikins argues that the phrase was needed for the best interest of the nation and was followed through with the best interest of the American people in mind.

The mood of the nation in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor embodied just the predisposition for unity and the desire for retribution which could be captured and utilized by a government armed with a propaganda slogan like the one [unconditional surrender] announced at Casablanca.

(Hikins, 1983, 387)

Hikins argues that this slogan would be irreversible by the time Truman was in office and formulated how to handle the Japanese surrender.

Hikins states,

By weaving partial truths and falsities into the fabric of his or her choice, the propagandist can construct just the reality required to suit a particular political/social need. By this process unconditional surrender *qua* propaganda and *qua* slogan attained both its salience and its power to influence action.

(Hikins, 1983, 389)

Hikins believes that the American public perceived a "social reality" that "remained consistent with the actions of the American government and this allowed the country to accept the bombings without much protest." (Hikins, 1983, 390)

Hikins outlines the history of the Japanese surrender to the United States, and highlights a few interesting points while he makes his case about the rhetoric of the policy makers. He quotes Stimson's comments on the unconditional surrender terms from a memo to Truman in July 1945, "I personally think that if in saying this we should add that we do not exclude a constitutional monarchy under

her present dynasty, it would substantially add to the chances of acceptance” [by the Japanese]. (Hikins, 1983, 393) Hikins also mentions the Suzuki Cabinet that “took office on April 7, 1945, charged by the [Japanese] Emperor to secure peace on ‘any terms.’” (Hikins, 1983, 398) He claims that this cabinet came to the agreement that any United States’ “terms which would allow the Japanese to save face and surrender ‘honorably’ would be accepted.” (Hikins, 1983, 398)

Unfortunately, Truman did not relent on unconditional surrender until August 14. This disallowed the Japanese the opportunity to save face until it was already too late to save Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The decision by the Emperor, which broke the deadlock in the Supreme Council, was conditioned upon assurance that the United States “guarantee[d] the survival of dynasty and the Emperor.” (Hikins, 1983, 398)

Hikins presents the case that the slogan may have

remained an obstacle to peace in the wake of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the Soviet declaration of war- until the United States government offered the necessary [albeit veiled] assurance that neither Emperor nor throne would be destroyed-suggests the possibility...which Stimson later recognized, that *neither* [atomic] bomb may have been necessary; and certainly the second one was not.

(Hikins, 1983, 399)

Hikins’ essay proves the power that the rhetoric of “unconditional surrender” carried from the day Roosevelt declared it until the time that Truman appeared to be binded to follow through with it.

3.6 IDEOLOGY AND RHETORIC

Having looked at Stimson's article and relevant scholarly literature to help understand the context of the analysis, it is time to take a closer look at the rhetoric of the document. In order to better understand how Stimson's article was written it was important to understand that he chose rhetoric that would not contradict the American ideology of the time. However, before beginning that journey the ideology this rhetoric "lives" in must be understood. The following is a brief summary of the type of ideology focused on, and specifically the ideology of post World War II America. The climate of the nation at the time made it easy to see how Stimson needed to formulate the article's rhetoric carefully so that his justification would have been accepted as the correct, moral and only answer.

According to Sonja Foss, author of Rhetorical Criticism, "An ideology is a pattern or set of ideas, assumptions, beliefs, values, or interpretations of the world by which a culture or group operates." (Foss, 1996, p.291) While there are many different theories of ideology, the one most pertinent to this discussion is the concept of hegemony.

Hegemony is the privileging of the ideology of one group over that of other groups; it thus constitutes a kind of social control, a means of symbolic coercion, or a form of domination of the more powerful groups over the ideologies of those with less power.

(Foss, 1996, p.294)

In other words, a larger or more powerful group's ideas come to the forefront and squeeze out any lesser group's ideas leaving its own as the norm. In effect the larger groups' ideologies become the accepted reality of all groups.

The United States Government, with the aid of news media in many forms, operates as the more powerful dominant group in American society. It portrays its own ideology of America as the norm or as the generally accepted notion. These have become so ingrained that we view all others as wrong or unnatural. "Resistance to the dominant ideology is muted or contained – its impact is limited – by a variety of sophisticated rhetorical strategies." (Foss, 1996, p.295) For example, in war, an enemy nation is often depicted as less than human or labeled terrorists by the opposing country. This tactic helps to thwart or minimize any sympathy toward them, and promotes acceptance for any actions taken to defeat the enemy, even horrific ones. In this way, as well as by controlling information released to the public, over many years, options to the dominant ideology become less visible and less acceptable. "Ideological forms are more than ideas, beliefs, and values; they have a material existence and are embodied in cultural institutions such as schools, churches...[and so forth.]" (Foss, 1996, pp.292-293)

As a result of the European Allied countries' devastated state and the political differences between the communist Soviet Union, during the closing of World War II America began to believe the power was in the hands of the United States to stop the war. The United States had many options for ending the war, but the one they chose had many terrible and destructive consequences. It is true that because of our country's decision to use the atomic bombs over 200,000 Japanese people were killed, as well as many thousands more in the firebombing raids prior

to that. The American government had to be very careful in its reporting of these events; some truths were bent or left out of reports in order to keep American pride high and dissent unlikely. Therefore, the American public's support of the government's decision became a crucial element for the United States' future success.

"The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," by Henry L. Stimson, is a carefully written piece intended to give the American people the explanation and justification that it needed and, in the general sense, wanted. It is important to note the strong ideology in America as the isolationist nation came out of the Great Depression, united through the events of World War II, and emerged as a very strong global power. Stimson was careful to use rhetoric that played to the American ideology. He needed to justify to the American public that there was no other viable alternative than to use the atomic bombs.

3.7 METHODOLOGY

Sonja Foss explains the structure of ideological criticism and the role that ideology plays in communication, building on the ideas of Philip Wander, Michael McGee, Alan O'Connor, James Hixson, Raymie E. McKerrow, Janice Hocker Rushing, Thomas S. Frentz, Lawrence Grossberg, and Celeste M. Condit, the most relevant of whom we have reviewed in this chapter. According to Foss, "these scholars have been influenced by a number of different perspectives and philosophies in their creation of an ideological approach to criticism." (Foss, 1996,

p.292) Foss' main focal point for an ideological critic is to discover the ideologies inherent and/or suppressed in an artifact.

Foss' method for ideological research and analysis of a rhetorical artifact consists of four steps. These four steps work together to obtain the critical analyst's original goal. The first step is to formulate a research question and select an artifact. This can be done in three different ways, 1) select the research question first, then find an artifact to fit the question, 2) select the artifact then examine it to determine a research question, and 3) select an artifact that simultaneously suggests a research question. The second step is to select a unit of analysis "that can help the critic answer the research question." (Foss, 1996, p.296) There are many different types of analysis within the study of communication, and the critic must choose or invent the best method. For example, the method used in this analysis is ideological criticism, which obviously focuses on ideology. Other types include fantasy-theme criticism, feminist criticism, metaphoric criticism, narrative criticism, generic criticism, and others, each focusing on the subject in its title. The third step is analyzing the artifact. Foss describes three separate areas containing questions related to the method of analysis. The areas are 1) identification of the nature of ideology, 2) identification of the interests included, and 3) identification of strategies in support of the ideology. The fourth step is writing the critical essay, which has five parts: "(1) an introduction..., (2) description of the artifact and its context, (3) description of the unit of analysis..., (4) report of the findings of the

analysis..., and (5) discussion of the contribution the analysis makes to answering the research question.” (Foss, 1996, p.298)

The next two chapters will uncover the findings of the analysis of the article. The method of analysis is formulated from the key ideas of the authors reviewed in this chapter. However, not all of the authors’ methodologies were used; only those pertaining to the goal of analyzing Stimson’s article. The analysis will explain how Stimson focused the rhetoric of the article to accomplish the goal of having left the American reader with no doubt that the United States’ only morally just option was to use the bombs. His rhetoric was streamlined to appeal to the American ideology that was held by the article’s targeted audience, the American public. First, chapter 4 reports the findings of the analysis of the text of the article. Specifically focusing on the article’s intended audience, Stimson’s main points, his arguments and justifications, roles and actions that he commended, and positive and negative values portrayed in the article. Second, the results of the analysis of the ideological character of the text are reported in chapter 5. This chapter focuses on the dominant ideology, the voices of interest heard in the article, the voices of interest suppressed in the article, and the rhetorical features of the article that support the dominant ideology.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYZING THE TEXT

4.1 STIMSON'S INTENDED AUDIENCE

Stimson claimed that no “single individual” could have hoped to know everything that took place before, during, or after this difficult decision was made, but his article was “an exact description of our thoughts and actions as I find them in the records and in my clear recollection.” (Stimson, 1947, 97) He opened the article mentioning the following:

There has been much comment about the decision to use atomic bombs in attacks on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. ...It is entirely proper that it should be widely discussed. I have therefore decided to record for all who may be interested my understanding of the events...

(Stimson, 1947, 97)

Since Stimson chose to publish his article in Harper's Magazine, the intended readers, those “who may be interested,” appeared to be the average, educated post-war American. These readers had no access to the decisions made inside closed government and military circles. This audience lived in the reality of the ideology that Stimson was trying to uphold, and therefore should have had no reason to question the article's validity within that ideology.

4.2 STIMSON'S MAIN POINTS

In his article, Stimson implicitly asked his audience to accept certain points. First, the government had no other choice than to drop two atomic bombs on Japan and in no way was Truman, Stimson, or the United States at fault for having used the atomic bombs. Second, they believed that Japan would have fought to the

death rather than surrender. Third, using the atomic bombs saved as many as one million American lives. Fourth, that Britain and the rest of the Allied Nations had little involvement in the process. Fifth, because of the completely different ideological viewpoints of Stalin's communist Soviet Union and the capitalist United States, the Soviets could not be included in the process. Sixth, that by ousting the "terrorist" leaders that ran the government of the Japanese Empire, some good could come from a post war Japan. Seventh, that a fair and just warning was issued in sufficient time to the Japanese government, but was hastily ignored by the Japanese Premier Minister Suzuki. Eighth, that the targeted cities were selected strictly because of the great military importance to the Japanese leaders. Ninth, that the surrender of Japan was due solely to the use of the atomic bombs.

4.3 STIMSON'S ARGUMENTS AND JUSTIFICATIONS

Stimson made several arguments in his article that asked the readers to believe the United States had no other choice than to be the first to develop an atomic weapon and to use it to end the war. He argued for the justness and correctness of using the atomic bombs by explaining Japan's unwillingness to surrender and the number of casualties that could have resulted had the war continued. Stimson asked the reader to understand the situation as a quick means to an end that saved many lives. He also argued for the initial development of the bombs by noting Germany's simultaneous development of the weapon. He defended the secrecy of the entire Manhattan Project by stating what would happen should information fall into enemy hands, or should lack of confidence at certain

stages become public, since a lack of American resolve would hinder the project's success. He showed that the cities targeted were justifiable, legitimate choices by stating the military characteristics of each. Stimson proclaimed that the people of Japan had the potential to become "a peaceful and useful member of the future Pacific community." (Stimson, 1947, 103) He then argued for the usefulness and honor of sending a warning to the Japanese Empire, to allow them time to surrender prior to any major attack; this showed to the American people the fairness of their government.

Stimson also justified the United States' decision about the choice of targeted cities in an interesting way. "I [Stimson] approved four other targets including the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki... These two cities were active working parts of the Japanese war effort." (Stimson, 1947, 105) He went on to say the United States "...believed that our attacks had struck cities which must certainly be important to the Japanese military leaders, both Army and Navy...." (Stimson, 1947, 105) These statements made by Stimson suggested that targets were chosen for their military capacity alone.

Stimson justified the decision to drop the atomic bombs when he said that the bombs saved America from entering into an invasion of mainland Japan that would have been a larger version of the Battle of Okinawa. He was referring to the large, and generally unacceptable, number of American casualties that resulted from that battle. He used the Battle of Okinawa as a symbol for the anticipated "fight to a finish." (Stimson, 1947, 106)

James Hikins' study of how slogans shape government policy and ideology, more specifically his study of Roosevelt's phrase "unconditional surrender," can be applied to Stimson's use of the phrase "over a million casualties." (Stimson, 1947, 102) Hikins argued that Roosevelt's rhetoric shaped the United States' military policy during World War II, and greatly influenced the decision to use the bomb. In Stimson's article, however, his use of the rhetoric of "...the 'over a million' number skillfully helped to legitimize the use of the bomb and to foreclose debate." (Nobile, 1995, p.140) Stimson's statement was, and with much debate, has remained, the leading argument for the justification of the bombs' use.

4.4 CHARACTERISTICS, ROLES, ACTIONS AND VIEWPOINTS COMMENDED BY STIMSON

Stimson commended America's implied superiority throughout the article; his case relied on it. This superiority included American military and American intelligence, as well as the "great moral superiority through being the victim of her [Japan's] first sneak attack." (Stimson, 1947, 107) The attack Stimson referred to was Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. This attack was significant because it was the first foreign attack on the United States in the modern era. The attack ended America's isolationism and strengthened American resolve and pride. There was also a definite feeling of American confidence in the ability to succeed in both the culmination of the Manhattan Project and the defeat of the Japanese forces. As the Potsdam Ultimatum stated to the Japanese that "the full

application of our military power, backed by our resolve, will mean the inevitable and complete destruction of the Japanese armed forces and just as inevitably the utter devastation of the Japanese homeland.” (Stimson, 1947, 105) The confidence that Stimson’s article portrayed is an example of the original philosophy of Manifest Destiny in America; a feeling that the United States had a rightful destiny to succeed and expand.

In his description of the Interim Committee’s recommendation that Truman should issue the ultimatum, Stimson commended his own role of appealing to American fairness. “It is therefore my conclusion that a carefully timed warning be given to Japan by the chief representatives of the United States, Great Britain, China, and, if then a belligerent, Russia...” (Stimson, 1947, 103) In this statement Stimson also showed confidence in America and the other Allied nations. In Stimson’s original memorandum discussed with Truman he said, “our leadership in the war and in the development of this weapon has placed a certain moral responsibility upon us, which we cannot shirk without very serious responsibility for any disaster to civilization which it would further.” (Stimson, 1947, 99) Stimson’s appeal to American leadership and responsibility here became important roles for the United States.

The bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended a war. They also made it wholly clear that we must never have another war. This is the lesson men and leaders everywhere must learn, and I believe that when they learn it they will find a way to lasting peace.
(Stimson, 1947, 107)

Stimson commended the United States' heroism in the ability to end the war and save so many soldiers' lives.

Within the article it became clear that there was an insider/outsider role-relationship. The outsiders were the American public who would have read Stimson's article. The insiders were members of the United States' government, specifically former President Roosevelt, President Truman, Stimson himself, the Interim Advisory Committee, and to an extent, the United States' government as a whole. Stimson gave the insiders heroic roles and statures. He portrayed Roosevelt as the farsighted father figure who understood the importance and the need of an atomic weapon. "The policy adopted and steadily pursued by President Roosevelt and his advisors was a simple one. It was to spare no effort in securing the earliest possible successful development of an atomic weapon." (Stimson, 1947, 98) Roosevelt exemplified the dominant ideology; strengths are fairness, justice, and leadership. The next role was played by Truman, as the fearless leader who courageously took charge of the war-time responsibilities before him without letting the war effort or the development of the bomb miss a beat.

Now he was President and Commander-in-Chief, and the final responsibility in this as in so many other matters must be his. President Truman accepted this responsibility with the same fine spirit that Senator Truman had shown before in accepting our refusal to inform him [of the atomic bomb].

(Stimson, 1947, 99)

Stimson, in his own writing, portrayed himself as the man in charge of the entire war-time affairs; he was the Secretary of War and was the Chairman of the President's Interim Committee.

...I was directly connected with all major decisions of policy on the development and use of atomic energy, and...I was directly responsible to the President for the administration of the entire undertaking...

(Stimson, 1947, 97)

The Interim Committee, as Stimson explains, "...was charged with the function of advising the President on the various questions raised by our apparently imminent success in developing an atomic weapon." (Stimson, 1947, 100) Stimson's statements solidified the role of the committee to the reader as a well-informed authority or insider in the atomic decisions. With the formation of the Interim Committee the United States' government now represented the role of the world's leader in atomic weapons and moral protector of their use.

Although we have shared its development with the U.K., physically the U.S. is at present in the position of controlling the resources with which to construct and use it and no other nation could reach this position for some years. ... Furthermore, in the light of our present position with reference to this weapon, the question of sharing it with other nations and, if so shared, upon what terms, becomes a primary question of our foreign relations. Also our leadership in the war and in the development of this weapon has placed a certain moral responsibility upon us....

(Stimson, 1947, 99)

Stimson's statements portrayed the leaders of the United States as having to decide the moral future with the atomic affairs of the world. The United States' self-appointed position as caretaker of the atomic future, complied perfectly with the portrayed superior American ideology of the time.

Actions speak louder than words, and so the actions of those in command of our country became shining beacons of commendability in Stimson's account. He mentioned several frequently. In the article he mentioned the warning given to

Japan prior to the attack often and with much explanation. Stimson outlined the planned warning with great detail, giving seven paragraphs of information about it.

Stimson stated in his July 2, 1945 memorandum for the President:

I am inclined to think that there is enough such chance to make it well worth while our giving them a warning of what is to come and a definite opportunity to capitulate...it should be tried that the actual forceful occupation of the homeland islands is begun and furthermore the warning should be given in ample time to permit a national reaction to set in.

(Stimson, 1947, 103)

This was rhetorically important because it was clear that Stimson wanted the reader to see that America was the morally right, “good side,” consistent with the ideology of United States’ superiority. Stimson directly implied to the reader that he and President Truman felt a sense of compassion toward the Japanese people, since they decided to remove the city of Kyoto from the final list of possible atomic bomb targets. “With President Truman’s warm support I struck off the list of suggested targets the city of Kyoto. Although it was a target of considerable military importance, it had been the ancient capital of Japan and was a shrine of Japanese art and culture. We determined that it should be spared.” (Stimson, 1947, 105) Stimson showed America’s highly intelligent action in the morally just decision that he and Truman made, when he pointed this out to the reader.

Throughout the article, Stimson urged the reader to understand the number of casualties risked by prolonging the war. The most historically famous claim reflected in the portrayed ideology was Stimson’s claim that the decision to drop the atomic bombs did in fact save lives, American as well as Japanese.

Enemy armies still unbeaten had the strength to cost us [United States] a million more. As long as the Japanese government refused to surrender, we should be forced to take and hold the ground, and smash the Japanese ground armies, by close-in fighting of the same desperate and costly kind that we had faced in the Pacific Islands for nearly four years.

(Stimson, 1947, 106)

The alternative to taking more actions of this kind was to drop the atomic bombs.

4.5 POSITIVE VALUES AND GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

Throughout the article Stimson portrayed American virtues and democratic values in a positive light. The development of the atomic weapons ahead of Nazi Germany was presented as a race between good and evil. The American priority in the war by 1941 was the development of an atomic weapon, since the United States should win. Stimson states, “In 1941 and 1942 they [Nazi Germany] were believed to be ahead of us, and it was vital that they should not be the first to bring atomic weapons into the field of battle.” (Stimson, 1947, 98) This urgency was a high priority, most obviously because of the fact that Germany was the “bad side,” and having a weapon of that magnitude would ensure victory for the “bad guy.” While under American democratic control atomic weapons would bring about quick and lasting peace. Stimson’s article did not argue that the United States should be the nation in control, but his statements played to an American audience that would have accepted that the only safe, moral control and regulation of the atomic bomb would have come from American control. This peace would be gained and maintained by the United States’ ability to control and regulate the use of atomic energy, “...atomic energy could not be considered simply in terms of military

weapons but must also be considered in terms of a new relationship of man to the universe.” (Stimson, 1947, 100) Stimson’s article portrayed American values and decision making in a way that appealed to the democratic American reader. He never directly argued for a superior ideology, but wrote the article from a viewpoint in which the reader would have never questioned American control based on the United States’ superior values.

4.6 NEGATIVE VALUES AND GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

While Stimson implied American superiority, he also portrayed Japanese values and principles in a negative light throughout the article. An example that followed from the differences in the two countries’ values mentioned is Japan’s willingness to fight to the death compared to America’s struggle to end the war quickly with a minimum of casualties. Instead of surrendering after repeated high casualty attacks by the United States’ Air Force, such as the infamous firebombing of Tokyo in March of 1945, the allegedly fanatical Japanese still refused to show signs of defeat. This refusal was attributed to their cultural and religious beliefs, and only became stronger where the Emperor was concerned. (Stimson, 1947, 97-107) In Japan, the Emperor had a god-like persona, and his people followed his leadership almost unquestioningly. Stimson recognized this when explaining their terms for surrender,

We held two cards to assist us in such an effort. One was the traditional veneration in which the Japanese Emperor was held by his subjects and the power which was thus vested in him over his loyal troops. It was for this reason that I suggested in my

memorandum of July 2 that his dynasty should be continued.
(Stimson, 1947, 106)

According to Stimson's account, the Potsdam Ultimatum was received and rejected with contempt by Japan, but the rejection might have been avoided if the people of Japan could have kept the image of their Emperor as leader/god. As a result of Japan's rejection, Stimson claimed the United States felt they had no other choice than to make the unfavorable decision to use atomic bombs on Japan. Up to this point nothing else seemed that it would induce the Japanese into surrender because of their beliefs and values.

Stimson also gave a negative portrayal of the Soviet Union when he mentioned the prospect of allowing Soviet intervention in the conflict with Japan. While the Soviets had been allies with the United States against Germany, they still could not be trusted, as readers gathered from Stimson's rhetoric in regard to Stalin. Therefore it was not possible to depend on the help of what Stimson described as the "ominous threat of Russia" (Stimson, 1947, 103) in defeating the Japanese. "If Russia is a part of the threat, the Russian attack, if actual, must not have progressed too far." (Stimson, 1947, 104) Stimson may have intended to lead the readers to believe that the Soviet Union was an opposition to America's idea of world peace.

Stimson's article was formulated to portray the ideal of American superiority when being faced with a decision such as how to control the atomic bomb. From analysis of the article the ideological character that the piece was intended to convey becomes clear. The article was developed to justify the bombs'

use with a clear cut American ideology that the post-war American readers more than likely wanted to believe in.

CHAPTER 5: IDEOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF THE TEXT

5.1 THE DOMINANT IDEOLOGY

After analyzing the article, “The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb,” it became obvious that Stimson clearly played to the ideology of the United States’ superiority to justify the decision to drop the atomic bombs. He was upholding the reality of the “American Dream” - the ideology that a victorious America was a powerful nation run by honest men and women who made strong, just decisions, and upheld good, moral values. According to Alan O’Connor, in the review of his work in Chapter 4, cultural patterns reveal and shape ideology. This can be seen in the dominance of Stimson’s postwar American ideology, which was considered by Americans to be the normal way of life. This ideology was shaped by the drive of the citizens to uphold the nation’s continued success.

5.2 VOICES OF INTEREST

The United States’ interests were a primary factor involved in making the decisions regarding war and using the bombs. After examination of Stimson’s rhetoric used in his article it became obvious that the article was a tool for explaining that the decision to drop the bombs was the only practical option. The United States’ government needed the American people to accept that explanation. The government as a whole, the President, and his top advisors, whom formulated the policies of the government and the military’s actions, were the main voices that we hear behind Stimson’s words. By keeping his explanation within the ideology,

Stimson was acting in the best interest of the government and the people of the United States. Any doubt in the American people's minds needed to be answered in order for the United States to maintain its level of success.

5.3 UNEXPRESSED, OPPRESSED OR UNREPRESENTED INTERESTS IN THE IDEOLOGY

Stimson's focus in the article was to justify the United States' actions to its own people. Therefore the article was written within the American ideology, and did not directly attack any specific ideologies. However, the article just simply excluded all ideologies that did not embody the desired dominant American ideology.

Thus the reader of the article was never allowed to stray into thinking from the "enemy" perspective, meaning Japan. There was no mention of international complaints regarding the use of the bomb or of the United States' actions during the war. Nor was there any mention of domestic complaints, for that matter. There were surely peoples, both foreign and domestic, that did not agree with the actions taken by this country no matter how many justifications were put before them. For example, the Japanese-Americans placed in internment camps during the war must have had some unfavorable views of America, yet those are not mentioned. It is almost implied then, that these other viewpoints do not exist, or are so insignificant as to not be bothered with.

For most Americans, in later years, "the nature of the recent past seemed relatively settled and the use of the bomb was generally understood...to have been

reasonable, necessary, and just.” (Nobile, 1995, p.154) Clearly, the American ideology, by nature of its dominance, pushed any negative thoughts or ideas to the back of most American’s minds. Consequently, with heavy reliance on American values, Stimson’s article indirectly succeeded in suppressing undesirable viewpoints. This result coincided with Phillip Wander’s main idea of prophetic dualism discussed in Chapter 3. In this case the good side was the American ideology that Stimson was writing within. The other side or bad side was any ideology in opposition to Stimson’s portrayed good side. Wander’s main point with regard to prophetic dualism was that rhetoric protected people from a reality that they may not have wanted to understand. This was exactly what Stimson accomplished, his rhetoric protected the American readers. It protected the reader’s from some hard facts regarding the decision. In Wander’s viewpoint these facts might have led to a reality that might not have been in the American people or the nation’s best interest for the readers to understand.

5.4 RHETORICAL FEATURES IN SUPPORT OF THE DOMINANT IDEOLOGY

Stimson’s article was centered on several major themes. Included in these were the implied ideological premises of American dominance, leadership, and moral and intellectual superiority. However, as previously stated,

Much of the article shrewdly emphasizes the themes of saving American lives, of there being no practical alternative to the use of the bomb, and that the decision had been ‘carefully considered.’ ...He [Stimson] emphasized that speedy victory, not use or avoidance of use of the weapon, had been the controlling factor.
(Nobile, 1995, p.140)

To support these themes Stimson used certain words, phrases, key elements, and excluded some key points all together. While the exclusions will be analyzed in the next chapter, the other methods of using rhetoric will be examined here.

Specifically, the terms “moral” and “superiority,” which were used throughout the article, will be examined within the contexts of American ideology. These words conjure up a specific image in the reader’s mind, especially when paired with other words of strength. According to Michael McGee these words carried many meanings, symbols, and images, and shape the ideology and can become the reader’s reality.

Stimson repeatedly points out the United States’ moral and intellectual superiority throughout the article. When Stimson discussed the targeting of cities, he mentioned removing the city of Kyoto. “With President Truman’s warm support I struck off the list of suggested targets the city of Kyoto. ...It had been the ancient capital of Japan and was a shrine of Japanese art and culture. We determined that it should be spared.” (Stimson, 1947, 105) This comment implied an authority of the United States to make such a decision with a calculated intelligence and compassion toward the enemy. This same intelligence and moral respect for the Japanese people is portrayed by Stimson when he suggested that the Japanese dynasty “should be continued.” (Stimson, 1947, 106)

Stimson’s ability to enter moral values and considerations, as opposed to strategic and manipulative ones, into his portrayal of American military decisions further reflected the implied theme of American military dominance in the article.

Stimson stated from the Potsdam Ultimatum that, "...the full application of our military power, backed by our resolve, will mean the inevitable and complete destruction of the Japanese armed forces and just as inevitable the utter devastation of the Japanese homeland." (Stimson, 1947, 105) This statement left the reader with no conceivable doubt of the United States' military superiority. "Our great objective was thus achieved, and all the evidence I [Stimson] have seen indicates that the controlling factor in the final Japanese decision to accept our terms of surrender was the atomic bomb." (Stimson, 1947, 105) This statement not only glorified the entire Manhattan Project objective, but also justified any doubts surrounding the use of the bombs.

In Stimson's article the United States is not only portrayed as militarily dominant, but also as the world's leader. This leadership not only involved ending the war, but also the responsibility for the world's atomic future. Stimson stated that, "...our leadership in the war and in the development of this weapon has placed a certain moral responsibility upon us which we cannot shirk without very serious responsibility for any disaster to civilization which it would further." (Stimson, 1947, 99) He furthered the United States' role as world leader by having suggested that the development of the bomb could bring about world peace. Stimson said, "...if the problem of the proper use of this weapon can be solved, we would have the opportunity to bring the world into a pattern in which the peace of the world and our civilization can be saved." (Stimson, 1947, 99-100)

Stimson ended his article with a closing statement that implied that the world should learn the lesson from the United States, that while it had no other choice than to use atomic weapons, it "...made it wholly clear that we must never have another war. This is the lesson men and leaders everywhere must learn, and I [Stimson] believe that when they learn it they will find a way to lasting peace." (Stimson, 1947, 107) Stimson's statements and portrayal legitimized the ideology through his chosen rhetoric.

CHAPTER 6: CRITICISMS OF STIMSON

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Stimson's article accomplished the purpose of portraying the dominant ideology to the American reader and suppressed any doubts surrounding the bombs' use. However, there were many facts and events that Stimson excluded from the article. The majority of these exclusions would have given the reader a very different understanding of the decision to use the atomic bombs. This was "evidence [that] might have both enriched understanding and raised unsettling questions." (Nobile, 1995, p.140)

The article's reliance on Stimson's personal authority and the exclusion of any mention of Harvey Bundy's draft and his son McGeorge Bundy's co-authorship "...helped guarantee that the article achieved its hidden purpose: ratifying the official version of the Hiroshima narrative." (Nobile, 1995, p.141)

6.2 AMERICAN VALUES

Stimson's portrayal of the United States' decision to drop the atomic bomb relied heavily on the theme of superior American values. The most prominent of these values were the political difference between the imperial rule of Japan and the democratic government of the United States. The two countries not only have racial differences, but the religions upon which each government was founded could not be more different. With these cultural and religious differences in mind it was easy to see, as world history has shown more often than not, that each culture

will feel superior to the other. As Roderick P. Hart stated when commenting on American ideals and beliefs,

...few Americans, if asked, would deny that the United States has been chosen by God for special duty, that its people embrace Judeo-Christian principles, or that its system of government precludes theocracy. The hard, cold, nonreified facts in the case, of course, are quite to the contrary: Americans have prospered because of their technology, not solely because of their heavenly benefactors. Americans have endorsed massive violations of Judeo-Christian principles in both their domestic and in their international policies.
(Hart, 1982, 376)

Stimson followed right along with this trend when he implied that American superiority has the ability to help Japan return to its former state of living a “reasonably responsible and respectable international life.” (Stimson, 1947, 103)

6.3 JAPANESE STRENGTH AND MORALE

Stimson also excluded the facts about the actual state of the Japanese country. He mentioned the country’s ability to “fight to the death” as the only real gauge for the nation’s morale. Stimson does mention the firebombing of Tokyo, but fails to inform the reader about the systematic bombing that took place over most of Japan. Finally, Stimson uses careful wording to dodge the fact that the United States never directly offered to continue the Imperial dynasty until after the bombs were used. The omission of these key elements left the reader with the idea that Japan would not surrender at all, as if the United States has no choice.

Stimson excluded other key possibilities known at the time. It was possible that Japan had not intended to “fight to the death” as Stimson argued. A large pool of official government information argued against the necessity of using atomic

weapons in a direct attack, and furthermore argued against even the need to mount another invasion on Japan. One year prior to the publishing of Stimson's article, on July 1, 1946, the United States Strategic Bombing Survey stated the following in their Summary Report of the Pacific War:

Based on a detailed investigation of all the facts, and supported by the testimony of the surviving Japanese leaders involved, it is the Survey's opinion that certainly prior to 31 December 1945, and in all probability prior to 1 November 1945, Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated.

(Merrill, 1995, p.26)

Moreover, the United States Strategic Bombing Survey stated on June 30, 1946 in its report on The Effects of the Atomic Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki that, "The decision to seek ways and means to terminate the war, influenced in part by knowledge of the low state of popular morale, had been taken in May 1945 by the [Japanese] Supreme War Guidance Council." (Merrill, 1995, p.22) Based upon the factual statements that surrounded the state of the Japanese Empire, the theory that the Japanese would not have been able to fight on became more and more valid. The inability for the Japanese to continue in the war against the United States as supported by the United States own Strategic Bombing Survey, lead to the great possibility of having been able to reach the same surrender results without the use of any atomic weapon.

While Stimson discussed the merits of having saved so many lives by using the atomic bombs, he neglected to discuss the massive number of civilian casualties that the United States' decision to inflict incendiary raids upon Japanese urban

areas produced. Because of the American public's knowledge of it, Stimson was forced to include mention of the firebombing raid that took place over Tokyo in March of 1945. Stimson stated, "In this raid more damage was done and more casualties were inflicted than was the case at Hiroshima." (Stimson, 1947, 105) This was all that Stimson chose to inform the reader about the "terror bombing" that the United States participated in during the final months of the war. In fact, others saw it differently; the Toyko attack was the "most destructive single air raid ever carried out by any nation." (Udall, 1994, p.59) Stimson's treatment of this situation protected the American public from the reality of the United States' role in the war since these facts do not represent the moral and heroic American image. However, the United States' firebombing policy was not mentioned in the article, even though it played a key role in ending the war with Japan and ultimately the use of the atomic bombs.

In his article, Stimson failed to report that throughout the months leading up to the decision to use the atomic bomb, the United States' air force (under the command of General Curtis E. LeMay) had begun to systematically bomb Japanese cities. According to Stuart A. Udall, Secretary of the Interior during Lynden B. Johnson's and John F. Kennedy's terms, Stimson's exclusions included the American "creation of a civilian death toll that exceeded the number of Japanese soldiers killed in all of World War II..." (Udall, 1994, p.61) In Stimson's personal diary entry on June 6, 1945 he included that General LeMay "is complaining that there is nothing left for his bombers but 'garbage can targets.'" (Udall, 1994, p.75)

The actual figures of the death and destruction were impossible to precisely calculate because of the cremation of bodies that the inferno created, and so the U.S.A.F. resorted to using square mileage in their calculations, "...the incineration list included 56.3 square miles of Tokyo, 12.4 in Nagoya, 8.8 in Kobe, 15.6 in Osaka, 8.9 in Yokohama, and 3.6 in Kawasaki." (Udall, 1994, p.60) The death toll roughly estimated from Tokyo alone ranges from 34,000 to 100,000 people. (Udall, 1994, p.60)

Stimson claimed that the Battle of Okinawa was symbolic of the high number of deaths that would have occurred in an invasion of mainland Japan. While the battle was unquestionably brutal and led to mass carnage for both nations, as well as a high number of civilian deaths, some aspects of the battle could have also been interpreted as a symbol of the sagging morale of the Japanese Empire. At the end of this American victory, for the first time in the war against Japan, there were a large number of Japanese troops willing to surrender. "Over 10,000 [Japanese] surrendered" despite the fact that "Japanese officers and NCOs often shot those attempting to give up." (Nobile, 1995, p.6) With the largest number of Japanese troops to surrender to date, Stimson chose not to point out the growing possibility of ending the war without the bomb's use. He avoided opening the reader's minds to the possibility that the bombs were dropped for other reasons.

Furthering this argument, in the article Stimson justified the use of the atomic bombs stating, "all the evidence that I have seen indicates that the controlling factor in the final Japanese decision to accept our terms of surrender

was the atomic bomb.” (Stimson, 1947, 105) However, the “evidence” he referred to was a citation from the United States’ Strategic Bombing Survey, which concluded “that the use of the A-bomb had ‘in all probability’ been unnecessary in order to avoid the invasion of Japan....” (Nobile, 1995, p.141) This helped to justify the theory that Japan in all likelihood would have surrendered without an invasion and without use of the bombs.

6.4 BOMB TARGETING DECISIONS

While Stimson commendably stated that he had wiped Kyoto off the targeting list, he chose not to go into great detail about the actual selection of the targets. At the same time he failed to give any reasonable justifications as to why alternatives to using the bombs were “discarded as impractical.” (Stimson, 1947, 100)

Stimson briefly talked of the suggested alternatives to having used the atomic weapons to force surrender of Japan. He very briefly touched on the impact of an invasion, but quickly dismissed that in favor of saving American lives. The second alternative mentioned even more briefly was the possibility of performing a demonstration of the bomb’s capabilities rather than using it on live people. He included a quotation from the Scientific Panel’s report on using the bomb against the enemy states, “...we can propose no technical demonstration likely to bring an end to the war; we see no acceptable alternative to direct military use.” (Stimson, 1947, 101) Stimson expected the reader to accept this answer as sufficient in its explanation, or rather dismissal, of any alternatives. However, given Japan’s

declining ability to sustain the war, it seemed possible that some type of alternative use of the bomb could have induced Japanese surrender. This would have produced the desired effect while still having saved American lives, and the vast numbers of Japanese civilians killed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Targeting an already bombed out city such as Tokyo, which had 56.3 square miles destroyed by incendiary attacks, was just such a suggestion made by Stuart A. Udall. Udall, later to be Secretary of the Interior under Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, stated the suggestion of in a mock report of the event from The Myths of August, his book regarding the evolution of atomic weapons since World War II.

The new weapon we have demonstrated today in Tokyo was developed by an international team of scientists. It can wipe out whole cities, but our respect for the humanity of others has caused us to demonstrate its power before we use it for a military weapon. We will give the leaders of Japan ten days to sue for peace, and we will not use the bomb again if a surrender can be arranged.

(Udall, 1996, p.92)

The downfall of Udall's demonstration of the bomb was that it would not produce the desired medium for calculating the full magnitude of power that the two experimental atomic weapons held. This was proved in the fact that the targeted cities of Hiroshima, Kokura and Nagasaki (a last minute alternative to the hazy and smoke covered Kokura) had all been kept intact and removed from the strategic bombing list; this makes the bombing appear to be the final phase of research.

Unfortunately for the American reader, Stimson's article also neglected to say what we now know, that ground zero of the Hiroshima bomb was not a military site, as supposed, but just the center of the city. At the center was the Shima

Hospital and just over a thousand feet away, at the bomb's hypocenter, was the First Hiroshima Municipal Girls High School. The descriptions of the bombings from the survivors' perspectives were unnerving and unsettling.

Many of the students'...eyeballs had popped out, all the way out. And their mouths were ripped open by the blast, their faces were burned, their hair gone, their clothes burned off all over their bodies, and they were blown helter-skelter by the blast...It was just like, well, a scene from hell.

(Nobile, 1995, p.104)

It was no wonder that Stimson, in an effort to keep the American ideology in place, emphasized that *military* targets were chosen. His report neglected to tell us of the tragedy of civilian lives lost. Stimson justified Hiroshima as a vital military target having said it "was the headquarters of the Japanese Army defending southern Japan and was a major military storage and assembly point." Stimson's objective was to suppress any notion that the target was not purely military. The American people believed the common notion that the bomb was dropped on a military target, and it allowed the United States to be the hero by preventing unnecessary deaths and ending World War II. The Targeting Committee's assessment of Hiroshima's status as a target, however, merely said that it

is an important army depot and point of embarkation in the middle of an urban industrial area. ...It was such a size that a large part of the city would be extensively damaged. There were adjacent hills which were likely to produce a focusing effect which would have considerably increased the blast damage:

(Merrill, 1995, p.10)

Stimson could not have left any thought in the American reader's mind that this target was possibly picked for another reason.

In Stimson's discussion of the targeting and use of the atomic bombs he also left readers without justification for the decision to use a second atomic bomb on Nagasaki. The very title of his article, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," puts emphasis on an implied history that only included the use of one bomb. It seemed that Stimson was subtly overlooking the second bomb, and to the reader, who was incomplete in their analysis or who just saw the title of this article, it may have seemed as though the United States only used one bomb.

After reading Stimson's one sentence containing any mention of the actual use of an atomic weapon on Nagasaki, "Three days later a second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki and the war was over," it seemed evident that he wished the readers to overlook the second bomb. (Stimson, 1947, 105-6) The fact that the bomb was used so quickly after the Hiroshima destruction did not allow the Japanese officials any time to formulate any real surrender terms in the in between time. General Groves, who headed the Manhattan Project, gave the only real official explanation for the bomb when he said it was used to "show them we had more than one." He later stated, in his book, Now It Can Be Told, that "the importance of having the second blow follow the first one so quickly, was so that the Japanese would not have the time to recover their balance." (Udall, 1996, p.112) The second bomb seemed hard to justify, knowing that the use of any atomic bomb at all may not have been necessary. For this reason Stimson may have been trying avoid the subject as much as he possibly could.

Yet another, more sinister possibility explained Stimson's omission. After having analyzed the nature in which targets were carefully kept free of any damage in order precisely identify the atomic weapon's effects, it became plausible that some of the reasoning going into the use of the second bomb was to record the differences between the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Furthering this argument was Stimson's omission of the important fact that the bomb used on Hiroshima, dubbed Little Boy, was a uranium gun bomb design and different than that of the Fat Man, a symmetric plutonium implosion design dropped on Nagasaki. (Sherwin, 1975, pp.231-232) It was therefore conceivable that with full knowledge the reader might have developed a theory that the use of two bombs was purely or partially for the betterment of American atomic science, and contributing to a less than honorable view of American ideology.

6.5 THE IMPACT OF THE SOVIET UNION

Stimson obviously did not want the readers to understand the importance of the Soviet Union in the United States' policy. The Cold War era that followed the atomic bomb's arrival uncovered many hidden factors that Stimson's article neglected to include, such as the following facts:

...that the A-bomb project had been systematically kept secret from the Soviet Union; that some advisers had expected that the bomb's use on Japan might also intimidate the Soviets and render them tractable in the postwar period; and that the bomb's likely influence on the Soviet Union had often helped to shape policy and been the subject of deliberations.

(Nobile, 1995, p.140)

Given the policy of keeping the Manhattan Project secret from Russian leader Stalin, one suspected that use of the second bomb, or any bomb for that matter, was done to influence the power relationship between the United States and the Soviets. Truman stated in his diary entry from the Potsdam Conference on July 18, 1945, that “He [Stalin] said he wanted to cooperate with U.S. in peace as we had cooperated in war, but it would be harder.” (Ferrell, 1996, p.30) This type of talk between nations supposedly fighting for the same cause began to bolster Stimson’s implied view that the Soviets could not be trusted.

Stimson’s opinions were recorded in the September 11, 1945 memorandum to Truman,

The advent of the atomic bomb has stimulated great military and probably even greater political interest throughout the civilized world. In a world atmosphere already extremely sensitive to power, the introduction of this weapon has profoundly affected political considerations in all sections of the globe. ...To put the matter concisely, I consider the problem of our satisfactory relations with Russia as not merely connected with but as virtually dominated by the problem of the atomic bomb.

(Ferrell, 1996, pp.78-79)

Truman’s diary entry on July 17, 1945 stated that “He’ll [Stalin] be in the Jap war on August 15.” (Ferrell, 1996, p.30) But Stimson had already expressed his feelings about the importance of having excluded the Russians from being able to gain any piece of the pie in the Pacific. In his July 2, 1945 memorandum quoted in his article about the decision to use the bomb, he advised Truman, “If Russia is a part of the threat [against Japan], the Russian attack, if actual, must not have progressed too far.” (Stimson, 1947, 104) The point which was not included in

Stimson's article, was that the United States and Russia were both jockeying to gain the spoils of the war. For the first time in its history the United States had the capacity to lead the world, but they had to deal with the ideologically different views of the communist Soviet Union. The ability to, as Groves said about the Nagasaki bomb's use, "show them we have more than one," gave the impression to the international community that the United States now controlled the ultimate power known to man. (Udall, 1994, p.112) By flaunting this power, the United States might, as Stimson would state, help the Russians "play ball," and as Truman's Secretary of State Byrnes hoped, "the bomb...might well put us in a position to dictate our own terms at the end of the war." (Nobile, 1995, p.40)

6.6 CASUALTIES EXAGGERATED

Possibly, Stimson's most prominent justification for the use of the atomic bomb was the number of American lives saved by not invading. Unfortunately, careful examination of documents later available showed these numbers were unfounded, and possibly fantastic. In a meeting of the Joint Chiefs (including President Truman) a more modest estimate was brought to attention by George C. Marshall, the army chief of staff. He said, according to Admiral William Leahy's diary, that the operation, "will not cost us in casualties more than 63,000 of the 190,000 combatant troops estimated as necessary..." (Nobile, 1995, p.139) Later in the same meeting, Admiral Leahy, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, made a similar estimate of 35 percent. Assuming he meant 35 percent of the "190,000 combatant troops," he showed an agreement of his and Marshall's numbers. (Nobile, 1995,

p.139) Although, he could have been speaking of 35 percent of the total American force of about 767,000, that figure was still modest in comparison to Stimson's stated estimate of "over a million casualties." (Stimson, 1947, 102) Stimson also used this number in his personal summary, when he concluded the article when he discussed American casualties, having said that the Japanese "had the strength to cost us a million more." (Stimson, 1947, 106) Added to the inflation of numbers was the misleading use of the word "casualty" itself. In military language, casualties included the wounded and missing as well as the dead, while fatalities are just the dead. It was easy for the average reader to have made the mistake of assuming that casualties were those that had died when this was not the case. Thus when Stimson estimated the saving of his million casualties number the reader assumed, incorrectly, that a million lives were saved. Stimson mislead the reader in more ways than one, and did so in order to uphold the ideology that had made America so strong.

Stimson's article excluded some facts from his "exact description of our [United States'] thoughts and actions as I find them in the records and in my clear recollection." (Stimson, 1947, 97) Two of the most prominent exclusions were included in the first draft of Stimson's article, but do not appear in the final draft. First, that some military policy makers had felt, prior to the bombs' use, that "unless the bomb[s] were used it would impossible to persuade the world that the saving of civilization in the future would depend on a proper international control

of atomic energy.” Second, some policy makers “saw large advantage to winning the Japanese War without the aid of Russia...” (Nobile, 1995, p.138)

Stimson himself expressed reservations about the article while speaking to a longtime friend,

I have rarely been connected with a paper which I have so much doubt at the moment. I think the full enumeration of the steps in the tragedy [the atomic bombing of Japan] will excite horror among friends who heretofore thought me a kindly minded Christian gentleman but who will, after reading this feel I am cold blooded and cruel.

(Nobile, 1995, p.138)

CONCLUSION

The significance of the analysis of Stimson's portrayal of the United States' decision to use the atomic bombs has never been more relevant than it is during the present day American war on terrorism. The importance that pertains to this research was not "...history's final judgment, the more general lesson is perhaps of greater significance." (Hikins, 1983, 440) The lesson referred to is the importance of the rhetorical and ideological significance that was gained from understanding how Stimson shaped his article. The government, through Stimson, carefully decided what information was crucial and important in order for the American people to gain a sense of understanding about the decision-making that went into the atomic bombs' use. At the same time they also tended to the American ideology of holding the responsibility of being the world's moral leader.

It is important for the American public to understand the full truth of important events, such as the dropping of the atomic bombs, and it is equally important for them to know the real reasons that decisions are made within the United States' government. While a lot of information is available to the American public, especially during the present day, it is crucial for the government to protect the best interests of the nation, and more often than not that means keeping certain realities from the public. This was true of Stimson's article, which makes analysis of this type very relevant and important. Readers can learn how government used certain tactics to keep certain realities from the public, and apply that knowledge to present day information given to them by the government.

Perhaps if more people had understood the need for American understanding of events within the dominant American ideology, then the 1995 Smithsonian Museum exhibit of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would have been quite different than it turned out to be. Comparing the original proposal for the exhibit with what actually came to be revealed drastic differences. Those differences were caused by a Congressional denial to exhibit most of the same major aspects that Stimson excluded in his 1947 article. This shows that, indeed to the present day, the government is still manipulating the truth about the atomic bombs' real purpose. "To all history [it] clearly mattered. The question was who would shape it?" (Nobile, 1995, p.240)

After studying the analysis of Stimson's article the reader will be able to decipher, interpret and anticipate the information and actions taken by our government currently, and in the future. "The primary goal of the ideological critic is to discover and make visible the dominant ideology or ideologies embedded in an artifact and the ideologies that are being muted... [and] give voice to those interests." (Foss, 1996, pp.295-296) The uncovering of the voice of interest that was muted in Stimson's article "may lead more Americans to wonder, and to question, whether the use of the A-bomb was necessary and just, and why the United States dropped atomic bombs on Japanese cities." (Nobile, 1995, p.240)

The United States went to great effort to ensure the security of the ideology that made up the social reality that most Americans understood. The ideology of American dominance that the post-World War II leaders sought to protect has

probably grown even stronger since 1947. As James W. Hikins put it, “weaving partial truths and falsities into the fabric of his or her choice, the propagandist can construct just the reality required to suit a particular political/social need.” (Hikins, 1983, 389)

The importance of understanding how and why Stimson played to the American ideological standards of the time can help the future people of the United States to better understand the portrayals of present day media coverage and political rhetoric, just as they have helped understand Stimson’s portrayal of the atomic decisions and our country’s place as the world leader.

Future research may profitably investigate the role of ideological rhetoric in the media coverage and justifications for events such as the bombing of Bosnia, the United States’ policy towards communist China, and the current war against terrorist organizations.

In order to better justify the relevance and importance of understanding exactly how Stimson used ideology to play to the American public, it is not necessary to look much further than the present day American war on terrorism and the rhetoric of President George W. Bush. Bush’s address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American people on September 20, 2001 could easily replace Stimson’s article, and the analysis would produce the same ideological results over fifty years later.

Bush’s speech could be argued as the most important address to the nation since World War II. The address followed the first foreign attack on mainland

American targets in 136 years, and was crucial in order to refocus the nation and prepare the American people for a war against the “enemies of freedom.” (Bush, 2001)

The speech is filled with the same rhetorical techniques that Stimson used to play to the American ideology of the time period. Stimson’s article was published during the post-World War II period, and Bush’s speech took place nine days after the September 11, 2002 attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center Towers.

The analysis of Bush’s address yields the same result as the analysis of Stimson’s article, however, the specific rhetoric is different. Terms like “freedom, evil, civilized, and justice” appear in place of Stimson’s use of terms such as moral and savage, but the result is the same. (Bush, 2001) Bush’s speech focused directly on the ideology of American superior “values” and “principles” that had come to the forefront, just as they had during World War II. There is a definite tone in Bush’s chosen rhetoric reflecting Wander’s idea of prophetic dualism or good versus evil - “either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.” He even puts God on the American side, when he said,

Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war...[we are] assured of the rightness of our cause, and confident of the victories to come. In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America.
(Bush, 2001)

In Bush’s speech, just as in Stimson’s article, the United States was the world’s strong moral leader, and America was “called to defend freedom.” Bush

ended any doubt about America that may have been growing within people's minds following the attacks, just as the Stimson article intended to do. Bush said, "the entire world has seen for itself the state of our Union -- and it is strong...The civilized world is rallying to America's side." (Bush, 2001)

Although President Bush's speech appears over fifty years after Stimson's article, and the circumstances surrounding the article are not exactly the same, there are unquestionable parallels between the way the two men shape their points in order to reach a desired affect. The United States' ideology has seen many changes and different patterns over the last fifty years, but the American policy-makers have not changed their focus when it comes to uniting and justifying the nation's actions. This is the significance of understanding how policy-makers formulate what information is conveyed to the public. They do this in order to reach the most desirable end result of the American ideology - both for the American people and the United States as the world's leader.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ferrell, Robert H., ed. (1996). Harry S. Truman and the Bomb: A Documentary History. Worland, Wyoming: High Plains Publishing Co., Inc.

Foss, Sonja K. (1996). Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration & Practice. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.

Hall, Stuart (1989). Ideology. In E. Barnouw (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Communications (pp. 307-311). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hart, Roderick P. (1982). A Commentary on Popular Assumptions About Political Communication. Human Communication Research, 8, 366-389.

Hikins, James W. (1983). The Rhetoric of "Unconditional Surrender" And the Decision to Drop the Atomic Bomb. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69, 379-400.

James, D. Clayton (1975). Years of MacArthur. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

McGee, Michael C. (1978). "Not Men, But Measures": The Origins and Import of An Ideological Principle. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64, 141-154.

McGee, Michael C. (1980). The "Ideograph": A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66, 1-16.

Merrill, Dennis, ed (1995). Documentary History of the Truman Presidency: Volume 1, The Decision to Drop the Atomic Bomb on Japan. University Publications of America.

Nobile, Philip, ed. (1995). Judgment at the Smithsonian. New York: Marlowe & Company.

O'Connor, Alan (1990). Culture and Communication. In J. Downing, A. Mohammadi, and A. Sreberny-Mohammadi, Questioning the Media: A Critical Introduction (pp. 27-41). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Sherwin, Martin J. (1975). A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Stimson, Henry L. (February 1947). The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb. Harper's Magazine, 97-107.

Udall, Stewart L. (1994). The Myths of August: A Personal Exploration of Our Tragic Cold War with the Atom. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

WWW: Harper's Magazine Foundation. (No Date). About Harpers. Harper's Magazine. http://www.harpers.org.about_harpers/ (July 17, 2000).

WWW: Bush, George W. (September 20, 2001). Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. White House Online. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html> (May 14, 2002).

Walker, J. Samuel (1997). Prompt and Utter Destruction: Truman and the Use of Atomic Bombs against Japan. Chappel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Wander, Philip (1994). The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy. In W.L. Nothstine, C. Blair, and G.A. Copeland (Eds.), Critical Questions: Invention, Creativity, and the Criticism of Discourse and Media (pp. 383-416). New York: St. Martin's Press.