Outline lacks weight. Add more significant points
such as deterrence etc
@) Is peale possible in a world full of
weapons
1 - Introduction
to town to work would countries a yound
the globe actively in persuit of more lethal
the globe actively in persuit of more lethal weaponry, the quest for global peace remains skeptical weaponry, the quest for global peace remains skeptical
ALL TO A LANGE MAN TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROP
scenarios, claims that suggest long and sustainable peace can be achieved in a world full of
peace can be achieved in a world full of
weapon's seems fax-fetched.
2- Weapons are akin to a dot double edged sword, it
and bring paris and also destroy it
3- Weapons pose a threat to global peace.
3- Weapons pose a threat to join of a postruction can extend beyond the borders of
a- restruction countries.
a - Destruction can extend beyond the borders of conflicting countries. b - Countries that possess advance weaponry, pose a threat to those who do not.
10 three who do not
- Move militaization leads to move conflict. 3 - Move militaization leads to move conflict.
3- More village overlife is a threat to all man-Kind.
d- Move militaization leads to move control d- Nuclear proliferation is a threat to all man-Kind e- A minor misadventure can pare the way for
e- A minor misavernare and personal destruction.
global restruction
bring page in the world.
y- How can weapon String peace in the world. a- Weapons can be used as a source of
a- Weapons can be use see
b- Violence is more linked with state policies
b- Violence 15 more unite
a they than weaponing

Write all sub points in blue and main points in black Kind of same as sub point a Violence is in the nature of man-kind, it they fail to equip themselves with weapons, they ave at visk of invasion. d- Global de weaponisation is an utopian concept. - main e - Weapons are used to suppress terrorist organisationsHow is it different from main point 3? Conflict and destruction in evitable in a world 19.000 full of weapons. a - Weapons have only cause move harm than good. b- Strong military and lethal weaponery ave the driving forces of an aggressive foreign policy of a state This is an evidence/example not an argument c- Issue of Kashmir remains unresolved, because stake holders are nuclear-armed. Possession of lethal weaponry can add fuel to the five of greed in humans. Nuclear weapons in terrorist hand can risk put lives of millions at visk. 6- Conclusion.

Use thesis-antithesis-synthesis approach When your synthesis is a middle way between thesis and antithesis. Do not use it if synthesis is same as either thesis or antithesis.