

# Is Peace Possible in world full of Weapons

## 1. Introduction

Peace is <sup>the</sup> basic requirement for humanity. In the world, full of deadly weapons, peace is possible with social balance and ~~hormony~~ harmony

2. Prevalent situation of peace and weapons in the world.

3. How peace is possible in world full of weapons (~~Thesis~~)

a. Weapons act as a tool of deterrence

b. Wars were frequent in ancient era when weapons were pre-mature

c. Peace requires social balance not de-weaponization

Define/clarify social balance somewhere

d. US as relatively peaceful country inspite of full of weapons. ← how?

e. Violence linked with the states aggressively involved in de-weaponization i.e. Ukraine, Japan, etc

4. Why peace is not possible in world full of weapons (~~Anti-thesis~~)

a. Militarization leads to wars e.g WW-I & II

b. Wars in ancient era were much less deadly

c. Violence in states even when there is social balance

d. US: A country full of weapons leads to destruction at home and abroad

e. How states involved in de-weaponization

- have successfully reduced the violence
5. Despite increasing weaponization, the situation of peace is improving (Synthesis)
    - a. It was economics and politics that led to major wars instead of weapons
    - b. Wars are decreasing with increasing weaponization.
    - c. Social imbalance does not need weapons for violence
    - d. US, despite of being most weaponized state, is embodiment of dream for everyone.
    - e. Third world states, although least weaponized, but hub of violence
  6. Conclusion.

Give different perspectives in thesis and antithesis, validate those perspectives by including Examples. Do not simply negate your previous point using the same sentence structure Such as points 5d and 4d

The outline is not comprehensive. It contains only a few significant arguments.

A well known saying is that if you want peace then remain prepared for war. Weapons are fundamental in preparation of war. Currently, Russia-Ukraine war is going on and causing huge casualties, but experts often say that despite enormous weaponization, the wars have reduced. According to these experts, wars have connection with social balance economics and politics, not with weapons. On the other hand, contrary opinion is that ~~wars~~ mass militarisation lead to great wars, and mass shootings in <sup>the</sup> US are the evidence of weapons causing destruction. However, it can reasonably be argued that economics and politics disturbs peace more than weapons. US despite highly weaponized is a dream for everyone while in much

What does this example has to do with the second part of the sentence?

less weaponized third world states  
 peace is a rare specie. In short,  
 peace requires social balance  
 and harmony <sup>More than</sup> not deweaponization.

In the current era, when  
 the world is highly weaponized,

The prevalent situation of peace is  
 quite complex. The United States  
 of America is highly weaponized. ← Evidence ?

Wars in recent era are linked with

it. While According to journalist

Faisal Werraich, around 45000

incidents of shooting have been

observed in US in <sup>the</sup> recent decade.

The situation of China is quite opposite

to it. It is using weapons as a deterrent.

Sudan, which is much less weaponized

is often facing civil war along with

many other African states having

similar situation.

A popular opinion among  
 experts is that Peace is possible

in world full of weapons. Their first argument in this regard is that weapons act as a tool of deterrence. This tool has efficiently been used by North Korea to defend itself from United States. Moreover, India and Pakistan often claim their nuclear programme as a tool to maintain minimum credible deterrence. Hence, for them, weapons are a source of achieving peace and avoiding war.

No need to use such indicators

Another argument in this regard is that mass weaponization has come up with industrialization. In ancient era, when weapons were rare and pre-mature, wars were even common then. Those wars were equally brutal and deadly. The incidents of such wars can be found in Mahabharata, in ancient Greek, Roman and Islamic history

Hence, it is not weapons which have led to brutal wars but certain other factors are more crucial in this regard.

The central factor which can be argued in question of maintaining peace and avoiding war is social balance, justice and harmony.

The fourth Rashidun Caliph, Ali bin Abi Talib, who was a great statesman, declared unjust system fragile and unworthy to exist. Moreover, Europe has often tried to maintain harmony to achieve peaceful co-existence.

In short, according to this argument peace requires

if weapons would have been central in disturbing peace then US would have been most destroyed state but the case is opposite. It is much peaceful as compared to less

weaponized states. On the other hand, Ukraine which voluntarily destroyed its nuclear weapons is facing the wrath of destructive war. In short, state  $\{$  which adopted denuclearization is <sup>are</sup> facing war, and state  $\{$  which weaponized itself is at peace.

However, the opinion of achieving peace in world full of weapons is not unanimous. There are people who hold the opposite opinion.

The biggest evidence they give in their support are Great Wars, which took place after mass weaponization of Europe in the aftermath of industrial revolution.

They consider weapons as main evil behind death of millions of people.

They consider weapons as root of this evil. As for as

opinion regarding ancient wars is concerned, they consider such historical record corrupt. According to Professor George Kushner of University of California, Much of historical record related to ancient wars is based on exaggerations. The main purpose, which appears behind these records are arousing curiosity and amusement not quoting truth.

Do not use pronouns for longer periods

So, they mostly try to take example from present era. Today, when social gap has been reduced by a greater extent. People are getting basic services for free. Violence is common, and most prominent example in this regard is of the United States where weapons lead to mass shootings in schools, restaurants, bars and cafes. So,



# evidence? ↓

It appears that weapons lead to such incidents.

Another example given in this context is that states which have reduced and controlled access to weapons have often reduced ~~was~~ violence.

The examples that can be quoted in this context are of Scandinavian states, and of Japan, China and South Korea. The access to weapons is quite rare in these state and so the level of violence.

In the light of above given facts and figures, it can reasonably be argued that although weapons and violence go hand in hand but the root cause of violence is not weapons, but other factors are certainly more crucial. Today, if Russia and Ukraine have reached to this extent

of crisis in sometime in past. ?

They have possibly been reached to same conclusion of war.

France and England fought 100 year war, even when they hadn't access to good weapons. So politics and economics are major reasons of war, not weapons which is just a tool to do so.

Evidence ?

Although, the weaponization has been increased to great extent but the data of United Nations show that past decades of 20<sup>th</sup> century have been most peaceful time as compared to any other time in history. It is a sound argument declining any direct relation between violence and weapons.

The major and direct link which appears on the contrary end is between social

imbalance and violence. Kashmiris and Palestinians having no weapons in front of their enormous enemies come up with full courage. It is imbalance which led them to enter into such asymmetric conflict, not the weapons - in the form of stones - they hold.

The argument of weapons leading to violence is linked with the example of the United States; But the extent at which there is violence, is too insignificant, that United States is an embodiment of dream for millions across the world, as mentioned by Yuval Noah Harari in '21 lessons from 21st century', as compared to China which lacks social justice although it has much less weapons than US, or Africa

and South American States which have less weapons

In conclusion, peace which is fundamental requirement of better human existence on planet is necessary to achieve at all means.

The de-weaponization at all levels cannot <sup>eradicate</sup> violence, which was even present in state of nature. But the true means of intellectually and socially growing the humanity can truly help in this regard, which is much more meaningful than uselessly destroying the means adopted for self defence as quoted in the start that credible self defence is guarantee of peace not de-weaponization.

The writing style is more rhetorical than an academic and formal one.  
 The transitions should be subtle than explicit.  
 There are not sufficient evidences.  
 There are too many spelling mistakes