

M T W T F S

Maam, it's a mini-essay for evaluation. It is a humble request not to check it through the prism of noa's argumentative methodology. I've followed a toppers style to see if it gets through.

"Nuclear risk anywhere is a challenge to peace everywhere"

Outline

I- Introduction: Some people opine that nuclear risk anywhere is a challenge to peace everywhere. This is a flawed argument. As presence of nuclear risks has brought peace and stability worldwide.

II- Nuclear risk anywhere is a challenge to peace everywhere - the flawed notion:

A. As the nature of nuclear is to destroy peace

B. As the nuclear accidents have caused havoc

C. As nuclear potential states have attracted sanctions

D. As nuclear states create a security dilemma

III- Nuclear risk anywhere is not a challenge to peace everywhere - the proposition:

A. Nuclear risk prevented world

• wars at all

B. Nuclear states prevent risk of

civil wars

C. Nuclear states compel negotiation

• diplomacy

D. Nuclear risk halt major conflicts

E. Nuclear used for peaceful

• exploration - energy needs

F. Nuclear risk achieved parity in

• security

G. Nuclear risk achieved stable

• alliances for deterrence

IV - What if states pursue nuclear

disarmament?

V - Ways forward to ensure peace

everywhere more effectively:

A. Nuclear treaties to be more

• transparent

B. Foolproof coping mechanism for

• nuclear accidents

C. Strict implementation of nuclear

non-proliferation treaty

VI - Conclusion

Essay about the power of the nuclear bomb
which has been a major point

Nuclear risks have altered the course of history. The two sides of the coin are:

nuclear risk anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere, and nuclear risk is not a

threat to peace. The former side opines that the very nature of nuclear is to destroy peace.

Nuclear states have been using 'nuclear' to ^{manoeuvre} their selfish-interests. However,

the flip side highlights that the recurring world wars of the twentieth century were put to an end by the advent of nuclear.

It brought peace and aftermath. The

precedent of nuclear use came with its consequences such as mass destruction

and health hazards in future, yet the risk of using nuclear again brought peace

worldwide. Since 1945, there have been cold-wars at global level but they

never turned hot due to the presence of nuclear risk. Therefore, the opinion that

nuclear risk is a challenge to peace is a



flawed argument; presence of nuclear risks bring promising peace and stability.

The flawed notion suggests that nuclear risk anywhere is a challenge to peace everywhere. The nature of nuclear is to destroy peace. The rationale behind nuclear exploration and exploitation was to dominate in the international affairs. The tool used to achieve the end goals was ^{enrichment} ~~to enriching~~ of Uranium and Plutonium leading to nuclear atom bombs. The states which followed the pursuit of building nuclear were the US, Soviet Union (Russia now), Germany and other nation-states. The US used its nuclear power to exert its hegemony and attacked Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, the risk of nuclear posed a threat to peace as its true nature is to destroy peace.

Among the other challenges posed by nuclear risk, the nuclear accidents have

also caused havoc. The risk of nuclear also expose comes with hazards of nuclear accidents. The previous two nuclear accidents: Chernobyl and Fukushima have exposed peace to different challenges. They not only caused environmental hazards, but also released radio-active rays which can lead to sudden deaths of a person. Furthermore, these accidents created nation and global level panic leading to chaos. If such accidents are to be appeared in future, they hold great potential of causing peace disturbance. Thus, the risk of nuclear accidents are a challenge to peace everywhere.

Besides this, another nuclear risk which poses serious challenge to peace includes nuclear potential states have attracted sanctions. Threat of sanctions is a threat to peace. Sanctions owed due to potential possession of nuclear portrays the risk of nuclear as a risk to peace. According to Foreign Affairs magazine, Iran has been

prone to sanctions due to the risk of enriching uranium for building bombs (August, 2021). These sanctions have restrained the relations of Iran and the US, and Iran with other US-allies. Sanctioned - Iran has also been fighting its proxies with US-led allies in the Middle-East region. Therefore, sanctions imposed due to nuclear risk has challenged the peace of the region. Thus, it could be re-stated without an iota of doubt that peace anywhere is prone to risk of nuclear threat.

Regardless of the limited stats and analysis on nuclear risk's challenges, it is the flawed notion to say that risk of nuclear is a risk to peace. The proposition is that nuclear risk anywhere is not a challenge to peace everywhere.

Among the other prospects of nuclear risk; one is that the nuclear-possessed states prevented risk of civil wars.

Such states have the potential to nuclear powers which led to the ability of the states to prevent state-civil disputes. According to the report of international think tank, states which have nuclear capability have never experienced civil wars since the nuclear proliferation (Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 2018). On the other hand, states prone to civil war didn't do not possess the nuclear to portray as a deterrence. Such as Yemen, Syria and Congo. Therefore, nuclear risk is not a challenge to peace rather it establishes peace.

It could be concluded that the presence of nuclear risks has brought peace and stability. Anything or any opinion which contradicts this notion is ill and flawed.

As with examples of different states, it has been established that peace path to peace could be led through the nuclear presence.

If states would pursue nuclear disarmament that could lead to global chaos, could lead

to security vacuum and power shifts. All of this would result in anarchy and a direct threat to peace and prosperity everywhere. However, nuclear risks comes with a cost but it could be eluded by ensuring effective mechanism

and treaties. (nuclear proliferation and disarmament) On the other hand states have to curb their arms race to prevent the nuclear arms race from becoming a global arms race. Such as the arms race between the US and the USSR. Therefore nuclear disarmament is a challenge to peace and stability.

If could be concluded that the pressure of nuclear risks has brought peace and stability. Although my opinion which is that nuclear disarmament is a challenge to peace and stability.