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War is in nobody’s interest, Prime Minister Imran Khan recalled that Pakistan has suffered greatly due to earlier regional conflicts. He made it clear that Pakistan would not be part of any conflict in the region.

The DG ISPR quoted General [Bajwa](https://dailytimes.com.pk/508426/pm-summons-emergency-cabinet-session-to-discuss-general-bajwas-extension-case/) as having told the United States officials that Pakistan wants the Situation to de-escalate and shall support all initiatives which bring peace in the region. We call upon all concerned to avoid rhetoric in favour of diplomatic engagement. We all have worked a lot to bring peace in the region by fighting against terrorism. COAS further said that Pakistan would continue to play constructive role towards success of the Afghan reconciliation process so that it does not get derailed and the region goes towards conflict resolution instead of new conflicts. The COAS talked to the U.S Secretary of Defense and informed him of Pakistan’s stand on the tensions between the United States and Iran. Pakistan is on diplomatic move for Middle East peace, a message to the world that Pakistan is to continue efforts for peace.

Conflict is a central aspect of social relations. Too often it becomes ongoing and violent, engulfing innocent bystanders as well as intentional participants. Sociologists have defined war as conflict between organizations that possess trained combat forces equipped with deadly weapons. This meaning is broader than the legal definition, which typically requires a formal declaration of hostilities. Sociologists approach war in three different ways. Those who take a global view study how and why two or more nations become engaged in military conflict. Those who take a “nation-state” view stress the interaction of international political, socioeconomic and cultural forces and those who take a micro view, focus on the social impact of war on individuals and groups they belong to.

In recent years, the United States has begun to recognize that its security can be threatened not just by nation-states, but by political groups that operate outside the bounds of legitimate authority

The internal decision-making process that leads to war has been researched and studied a lot. During the Vietnam War, presidents Johnson and Nixon both misled congress, painting a falsely optimistic picture of the likely outcome. Based on their intentional distortions, congress appropriated the military funds the two administrations requested. But in 1971 the New York Times published a set of classified documents now known as the Pentagon papers, which revealed the real prospects for the war. Two years later over Nixon’s veto congress passed the war powers Act, which requires the President to notify congress of the reasons for committing combat troops to a hostile situation.

From a micro point of view, war can bring out the worst as well as the best in people. In 2004, graphic images of the abuse of Iraqi prisoners by U.S. soldiers at Iraq’s Abu Ghuraib prison shocked the world. For social scientists, the deterioration of the guard’s behavior recalled memories of Phillip Zimbardo’s mock prison experiment conducted in 1971. Though results of experiment, highlighted by researchers have been applied primarily to civilian correctional facilities, Zimbardo’s study was actually funded by the office of the naval research. In July 2004, the US military began using a documentary film about the experiment to train military interrogators to avoid mistreatment of prisoners.

Though war is a decision that is entered into by governments, public opinion plays a significant role in its execution. By 1971, the number of U.S soldiers killed in Vietnam had surpassed 50,000 and antiwar sentiment was strong. Surveys undertaken at that time showed the public was split roughly equally on the question of whether war was an appropriate way to settle differences between nations. This division in public opinion continued until the United States became involved in the Gulf war following Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990. Since then, U.S sentiment has been more supportive of war as a means of resolving disputes.

Sociologists have considered peace both as the absence of war and as a proactive effort to develop cooperative relations among nations. While we have focus on international relations, we should note that in the 1990s, 90 percent of the world’s armed conflicts occurred within rather than between states. Often, outside powers became involved in these internal conflicts, either as supporters of particular factions or in an attempt to broker a peace accord. In at least 30 countries where such conflicts occurred none of which could be considered core nations in world systems analysisat least 10,000 people died (as reported by Dam smith in 1999).

Sociologists (based on research and theory) have tried to identify conditions that deter war. International trade may act as a deterrent to armed conflict. Means are required to integrate people so that they work together and think together. Immigration and foreign exchange programs have a beneficial effect on international relations tending to more cooperation and coordination. Non-Governmental organizations (NGOS) can also have positive impact for cooperation and reconciliation.Many analysts stress that nations cannot maintain their security by threatening violence.

In recent years, the United States has begun to recognize that its security can be threatened not just by nation-states, but by political groups that operate outside the bounds of legitimate authority. Indeed, terrorism is now considered the foremost threat to U.S security and they admit the U.S military is unaccustomed to fighting terrorism. The U.S depends however, on sophisticated technology to kill terrorists.
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