

If position gas can go,  
why not nukes by  
james carroll



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

CC2 Sujen R. Croman Critical Analysis Minglei Chen If Poison Gas Can Go, Why Not Nukes? By James Carroll: This paper evaluates the argument made by James Carroll in his article. The author presents a question in his title, that is answered in the great article. The rhetorical question actually emphasizes that banning nuclear weapon is indeed, very difficult. Besides, it also supports the main idea that says that nuclear abolition is nearly impossible to achieve. The author presented his opinion in the first paragraph, and later made use of relevant examples to support his argument.

In the second paragraph, he expresses that many people have tried to abandon chemical weapons in early twentieth century, yet they could not succeed in their attempt. Same patterns prevail today and it is just as difficult to ban the use of nuclear weapons as it was in the past.

In the third paragraph, the author says that people hold different opinions on whether chemical weapons should be banned or not. However, the contradiction is only apparent. Actually, no one would keep from using chemical weapons in a war. In the past, the chemical weapon has proved very powerful. Therefore many countries acquired it and used it as required. However, because of the massive destruction to life and property as a result of its use, people have started to consider banning chemical weapon.

In the fourth paragraph, the author expresses that there has been peace for a while since the peoples concern about aborting the use of chemical weapons, and no or very little use of chemical weapons has been made. After the World War I, the movement to ban chemical weapon resumed. The poison gas was outlawed by the Geneva Convention. That was similar to banning chemical weapon. However, in the World War II, most countries used chemical weapon once again.

<https://assignbuster.com/if-posion-gas-can-go-why-not-nukes-by-james-carroll/>

In the fifth paragraph, the author highlights how the use of nuclear weapon widened considerably after the World War II. Technologically advanced countries began to possess their own bombs. The mushroom cloud became a real nightmare. Consequently, no one used chemical weapon anymore, as all proceeded to make nuclear weapon and the situation worsened further.

The author puts forward an excellent example to explain why it is nearly impossible to abandon nuclear weapon today, just like it was to relinquish chemical weapon in the past. He has presented a lot of facts and statistics to make the whole argument valid through reliable data. The author has maintained a moderate tone throughout the article. He narrates a story in which he tried to present the chemical weapon as an example. With the passage of time, people developed different attitudes towards poison gas. Initially, no one accepted to ban it. After the World War I, they made significant effort to ban the chemical weapon. However, as the new generation weapon came out, use of chemical weapon practically declined to extinguishment.

In the language part, the author expresses how horrible the chemical weapon has been a lot of times. Obviously, he wants to convey that it is harmful. But people just could not help using it. In this respect, there is a little satire in his essay. As for the persona, I have found the author objective. He puts forward so many evidences to prove that abandoning the use of chemical and nuclear weapon is in the best interest of mankind. The author has made a lot of effort to support his assertion.

The evidence is reliable as the history he refers to is exactly as he has presented it. The whole article is clearly organized and logical. Every

paragraph has its own point and contributes to the development of the <https://assignbuster.com/if-posion-gas-can-go-why-not-nukes-by-james-carroll/>

complete argument. The language is easy for the readers to understand. The author has made use of emotional language to explain how people have developed fear for the weapons. The author also offers expertise in this article. However, the argument is totally biased towards justifying the authors opinion. Therefore, I feel it shows only one side of the picture.

Bibliography:

Carroll, James. " If Poison Gas Can Go, Why Not Nukes?" The Boston Globe.  
23 June 2008.

Web. 31 Oct. 2010. .