

Has the United Nations Organisation succeeded in averting war in the world?

Outline

1. Introduction

Thesis statement: the United Nations Organisation (UNO) has not fully succeeded in averting wars. ~~The reason is that war is~~ ^{Wars are} still being fought in one shape or the other. Thus, the UNO has failed to achieve its prime goal of promoting and maintaining peace across the world.

2. The role of the UNO in averting war

3. How the UNO has failed in averting war in the world (Thesis)

- a) Several countries initiated wars
- b) Occurrence of civil wars
- c) Happening of genocides
- d) No halt to foreign funding for wars
- e) Occurrence of nuclearization

4. How the UNO has succeeded in averting wars

- a) Stopping countries from going in war
- b) Ending several civil wars
- c) Helped end genocides
- d) Funding other nations for wars is countries' internal matter
- e) Happening of denuclearization

5. Wars are still their (Antithesis)

- a) Several countries have not stopped wars
- b) Civil wars are still happening
- c) No end to genocides
- d) To stop war funding is the UNO's job
- e) no end to nuclearization

6. Conclusion

Essay

Nations used to fight one another in the past. And conflicts among them did not stop from happening even in the 20th century. As a result, this world witnessed two World Wars. In order to stop countries from going into wars, the United Nations Organisation (UNO) was established. However, the UNO has not fully succeeded in averting wars. The reason is that

Attempt Again

Masha!

Not reflected in thesis statement

re-write all as, Nuclear arms race is faster than ever clearer sub headings such

7

relate to UNO

Add hook

war is still being fought in one shape or the other. Thus, the UNO has failed to achieve its prime goal of promoting and maintaining peace across the world. And one has solid reasons to say that the UNO has failed to stop conflict in the world because waging of war by one country into the other state is still happening. Besides, civil wars and genocides are also happening in the world. And funding of other countries for wars and nuclearization have not stopped. Although, the UNO has failed to make this world a peaceful place to live in, but some of the people still believe that the UNO has achieved its goal of ending conflicts in the world. They uphold that the UNO has stopped countries from waging war against other states. Furthermore, it has succeeded in ending the civil wars and genocides in the world. And to financially aid a country in its war is nations' internal matter. Moreover, it has stopped countries from becoming a nuclear state. Though the supporters of the UNO try to disguise its failures by their arguments, yet the ground realities do not support their claim.

The fact is that the UNO was established to end wars in the world once and for all. Therefore, third World War has not happened. Besides, the UNO has also stopped civil wars in a few countries. It also ended the genocides. Furthermore, the UNO has somewhat stopped nuclearization. However, the UNO has not fully succeeded in its mission. Since its inception, one nation waged a war on the other country. What is more, this world has also witnessed the UNO's helplessness over several civil wars, genocides, funding for war and nuclearization. In short, there is a debate whether the UNO has succeeded in averting war in the world or not.

In fact, the UNO has failed in averting wars in the world because several countries initiated wars. The reason is that such countries are stronger than the UNO. Thus, the world has witnessed a few wars, and the subsequent helplessness of the UNO. For example, the US invaded Iraq in 2003. And the UNO, which was founded to stop war from occurring, could not have stopped the US from doing that misadventure. In short, the UNO as institution has failed to stop war in the world.

Not only has the UNO failed to stop war in the world, but there is also occurrence of civil wars. It means that the UNO could not do anything before major powers that are involved in civil wars. Therefore, many people have been abiding innumerable issues for many years due to civil wars across the world. For example, since March 2015, the civil war in Yemen has killed thousands of people. Besides, people are facing health problems. What is more, country's infrastructure has also been damaged beyond repair (Federation of American Scientists,

First present antithesis then to enter that Do

stating your argument to and to give arguments

difference?

‘Yemen: Civil war and Regional Intervention’, November 2021). In this way, the UNO has not succeeded in ending civil wars in the world.

What is more one can see the happening of genocides in the presence of the UNO. As an institution it seems weak enough that it cannot stop genocides from happening. Since its inception, this world has witnessed several genocides that claimed millions of lives. For example, 1.8 million innocent and unarmed people of Cambodia are said to have been killed by the then government of the country in Cambodian genocide, which lasted four years from 1975 to 1975. And the UNO did nothing substantial to put a halt on those killings (Echoes and Reflections ‘Genocide in Cambodia’, April 2023). In a nutshell, the UNO has outrightly failed to end genocides in the world once and for all.

As far as support of other countries for war is concerned, the UNO is passive because there is no halt to foreign funding for wars. When rich countries are not asked by the UNO for their financial assistance to other countries in their wars, then these powerful states are encouraged to carry on with their plans, even though they have serious repercussions for the world. And anyone with sense of right and wrong can ascertain the fundings of foreign countries to those states that are in war with their enemies. For example, since February 2022, the US has provided more than 43 billion dollars to Ukraine in its war with Russia (US Department of State, ‘US Security Cooperation with Ukraine’, August 2023). Given this, wars are being fought because of foreign funding and the UNO’s silence over the matter.

Like foreign fundings for wars, there is also occurrence of nuclearization. And the UNO has not stopped countries from being nuclear state and disturbing the peace of the entire world. In 20th century a few countries became the nuclear power in the presence of the UNO. For example, India became world’s nuclear power in 1998. In this way, it can be stated with a fair degree of certainty that the UNO has failed to stop countries from becoming nuclear power.

Though critics of the UNO have been criticizing it for years, yet their arguments do not carry weight because the UNO has succeeded in averting wars by stopping countries from going in war. Thus, it has achieved its prime objective of maintaining peace and security in the world. Throughout its history, by using its power, it has compelled countries not to instigate a conflict. And Aggressive countries had to surrendered before its orders. For example, in 1999, when Pakistan was about to initiate war with India, then the UNO compelled the then government of the country to take its forces back from Kargil. Besides, it also ordered India not to take aggressive stance against Pakistan. In this way, the UNO has averted wars in the world.

repetition

?

State how many countries have gained nuclear powers since inception of UNO

Add transition in the beginning of para

The UNO has also succeeded in ending several civil wars in the world. Hence, its critics must think twice before declaring it a failed organization. In the past, it played a role of mediator and ended several civil wars without spilling blood of the harmless people. For example, in October 2020, the UNO made the two warring parties in Libya sign a peace accord by exerting its might, so that peace could prevail in the country (UN, 'Behind the Global Ceasefire Call', October 2020). In conclusion, the criticism on the UNO for not maintaining peace across the globe is nothing but a sham.

As far as the issue of genocides is concerned, the UNO has helped end genocides in the world. In fact, it made its critics calm by fairly performing this job in the world. Dozens of genocides have ended across the globe just because of the UNO's endless efforts. For example, in December 1995, the UNO ended a genocide in Bosnia. To conclude, by its efforts, the UNO has proved that criticism of its critics regarding ending genocide in the world is not right.

And criticism on the UNO for not stopping funding for wars is also ingenuine because funding other nations for wars is countries' internal matter. In this regard, the UNO cannot do anything to stop war funding in the world. The UN Charter clearly prohibits the UNO from interfering in states' internal affairs. For example, Article 2 (7) of the UN Charter upholds that the UNO cannot intervene in the matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. In this way, the UNO approach for not stopping countries from funding a war is not wrong, for it has to work according to its charter that gives autonomy to the states.

When it comes to the issue of denuclearization, one can see the happening of denuclearization in the world. ~~It means criticism on the UNO for not halting nuclearization defies logic.~~ In the past, the UNO stopped several countries from becoming nuclear power by imposing sanctions. As a result, these countries have not been able to get nuclear power, even though they have been doing their utmost for many years. For example, Iran has not been able to get nuclear power. And its credit goes to the UNO since it is stopping Tehran from being nuclear power. In this way, the UNO has succeeded in its mission of stopping nuclearization in the world.

The fact is that the UNO has not succeeded in averting wars in the world because wars are still there, which means Several countries have not stopped wars. They are terrorizing the world by their aggression. If the UNO had stopped these wars from occurring, these warring nations would not have caused chaos in the world. For example, in February 2022, Russia waged a war in Ukraine, and the UNO could not have stopped this war from happening in the first place

redundant

(Dardana Najam, 'The mighty and the UNO', October 2022). In this way, the UNO has failed in averting war in the world.

Besides, several civil wars are still happening. In fact, the claim of the supporters of the UNO that the UNO has succeeded in ending civil wars in the world is a failed attempt to defend it. Had the UNO succeeded in ending all the civil wars in the world, thousands of people would not have been perished in different civil wars that are going on even in the 21st century. According to UN Human Rights Report published in June 2022, 306,887 civilians were killed between March 1, 2011 and March 31, 2021 for the crime that they never committed. Thus, the UNO has outrightly failed in maintaining peace in the world by putting a halt on civil wars.

Moreover, there is no end to genocides. And the supporters of the UNO are just showing the one side of the coin, which displays that the UNO has somewhat contributed to ending a genocide in the world. However, fact lies elsewhere. Many people are still enduring countless issues in different parts of the world due to genocides. For example, Rohingya is stateless and exiled in its own country because government in Myanmar has established one language, one nation and one religion policy. And the UNO observes silence over the matter (Mohan, 'The Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar', August 2018). In a nutshell, the problem of genocide is still there; and it is disturbing innumerable people across the world.

And those who are of the view that the UNO cannot stop war funding are wrong because to stop war funding is the UNO's job. The reason is that the UNO was founded to end those things that sabotage world's prosperity; and funding for wars is one of the reasons that prolongs a conflict and disturbs world's peace. If the UNO indirectly has its influence in several things that are not good for world's peace and security, it can also stop countries from funding for wars because war funding is detrimental to millions of people world's residing in various parts of the world. For example, the UNO has influence in Financial Action Task Force (FATF). Like FATF, it can also exert its power to stop war funding, so that wars end, and peace could prevail. In short, those who say that the UNO cannot do anything to stop war funding are doing nothing but to put a curtain on its errors.

What is more, there is no end to nuclearization. And a few supporters of the UNO are needlessly appreciating the UNO for stopping nuclearization in the world. In reality, there are countries that became nuclear power even in 21st century that shows the inability of the UNO to stop nuclearization in the world. For example, on October 9, 2006, North Korea demonstrated its nuclear capability with its first underground nuclear test. In conclusion, the

UNO has not stopped nuclearization in the world because several countries showed their nuclear ability in its presence.

To conclude, the UNO's purpose was to make this world an egalitarian place to live in, but it has done nothing, especially in front of big powers of the world, such as: P 5 states. Thus, several conventional and civil wars are occurring that have already claimed millions of lives. In reality, the event of holocaust ^{world} was one of the biggest reasons behind establishing the UNO, so that this world ~~could~~ not witness such event in future, ~~but~~ regrettably, the predicament of genocide has not been resolved because masses dwelling in different states are facing this quandary. Besides, the UNO is doing nothing to stop funding for war by maintaining it is countries' internal matter. Subsequently, wars are prolonging because countries do not have financial issues. This is also a fact that the objective of founding the UNO was to stop nuclearization in the world because incidents of Hiroshima and Nagasaki had jolted the entire world. Nevertheless, since the UNO's inception, several countries got nuclear power to threaten the world. Given all that, the UNO has not succeeded in avoiding war in the world.

Organization and structure of points and outline respectively is not fine.

in an argumentative essay, there are always two sides of the argument and you have to pick one.

First discuss the side that is opposing to your stance such as UNO not stopping wars, discuss only the major sub headings

Then prove your stance by discussing your side of argument in detail by countering the anti side points and stating more arguments in favor of your stance

do not go back and forth between two sides