Humanize before you submit

Likely Turnitin score: **85-100%** - over 20%

Humanize the colored text

Keep humanizing until this report says Ready to submit.

Once the title says Ready to submit, you're covered: if Turnitin flags it after that, get a free month of Pro Bundle ($14.99) - plus $25 if the text came straight from our humanizer. This report isn't covered yet. See terms

Reads as AI - catches 83 of 100 sentences Turnitin flags

Measured on 1,707 Turnitin reports of 20% or more, October 2026. Papers vary.

Highlights are our estimate - Turnitin may mark other sentences.

EliteWorks is not affiliated with Turnitin.

Nuclear weapons are among the most destructive technologies ever created, raising serious ethical concerns about their use, possession, and restriction. Since their development in the mid-twentieth century, they have fundamentally changed the nature of warfare and global politics. While some argue that nuclear weapons serve as a deterrent that prevents large-scale war, the humanitarian, environmental, and moral risks far outweigh their strategic benefits. This creates a significant ethical dilemma between maintaining national security and protecting global human well-being. On one hand, governments claim a duty to protect their citizens through deterrence. On the other hand, nuclear weapons pose a threat to all of humanity. This paper argues that nuclear weapons should be strictly limited and eventually eliminated because their potential for catastrophic harm outweighs any benefits they provide. From a utilitarian perspective, which focuses on maximizing overall well-being, the risks associated with nuclear weapons make their continued existence morally unjustifiable.

One of the strongest ethical concerns about nuclear weapons is the massive harm they cause to civilians. The atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 demonstrated the devastating consequences of nuclear warfare. Hundreds of thousands of people died instantly or suffered long-term effects such as radiation sickness, cancer, and genetic damage. These attacks highlight the fact that nuclear weapons do not distinguish between military targets and innocent civilians. Entire cities were destroyed, and survivors faced lifelong suffering. Because of this indiscriminate destruction, nuclear weapons are considered ethically problematic under most moral frameworks, particularly those that emphasize the protection of innocent life **(International Committee of the Red Cross “What We Do)**. Even beyond the immediate

destruction, the long-term health and environmental effects show that nuclear weapons cause suffering that extends far beyond the battlefield. This makes them fundamentally different from conventional weapons and raises serious moral concerns about their continued existence.

Another ethical issue is the idea of nuclear deterrence. During the Cold War, countries such as the United States and the Soviet Union built massive nuclear arsenals to deter each other from attacking. This strategy, often referred to as mutually assured destruction, is based on the idea that no country would initiate a nuclear war if it meant its own destruction as well. While this may have prevented direct conflict between major powers, it created a system built on fear and constant risk. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 is a clear example of how close the world came to nuclear war due to political tensions and miscommunication. This event demonstrates that deterrence does not eliminate danger; instead, it creates a fragile balance that could collapse at any moment. Human error, technological failure, or misinterpretation could easily lead to catastrophic consequences. Therefore, the sense of security created by nuclear deterrence is misleading, as it depends on perfect decision-making in situations where mistakes are always possible.

Scientific research also highlights the global consequences of nuclear war. Studies on “nuclear winter” suggest that a large-scale nuclear conflict could inject massive amounts of smoke and debris into the atmosphere, blocking sunlight and significantly lowering global temperatures. This would disrupt agricultural production and lead to widespread famine across the world. According to research by Robock and others, even a limited nuclear conflict could have devastating global effects on climate and food supply **(Robock et al.)**. This means that nuclear war would not only affect the countries involved but could threaten the survival of humanity as a whole. From a utilitarian perspective, which evaluates actions based on their consequences, the

possibility of such widespread harm makes nuclear weapons morally unacceptable. Even if the probability of nuclear war is relatively low, the magnitude of its potential consequences is so extreme that it outweighs any perceived benefits.

Supporters of nuclear weapons argue that they are necessary for maintaining national security and preventing large-scale war. According to this view, nuclear deterrence has helped maintain peace between major powers since World War II. Without nuclear weapons, some argue that countries might be more likely to engage in direct conflict, potentially leading to more frequent wars. This argument suggests that nuclear weapons, despite their dangers, serve a greater good by preventing even worse outcomes.

However, this argument fails to fully account for the risks associated with nuclear weapons. While deterrence may reduce the likelihood of certain types of conflict, it introduces new risks that are equally, if not more, dangerous. Accidental launches, cyberattacks, and miscommunication between nations could all lead to unintended nuclear war. Additionally, the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries increases the likelihood that they could be used in regional conflicts. From a utilitarian perspective, these risks cannot be justified, as they create the possibility of harm on a global scale. Therefore, even if nuclear weapons have contributed to stability in some cases, the overall risks they pose outweigh their benefits.

In addition to their destructive potential, nuclear weapons also raise serious moral concerns about responsibility and justice. Governments that possess nuclear weapons justify them as necessary for protecting their citizens. However, this creates a moral conflict between national interests and global responsibility. While a government may have a duty to protect its own people, it also has a responsibility to avoid actions that could cause harm to millions of innocent people worldwide.

From a utilitarian standpoint, the well-being of all people should be considered equally, not just the citizens of one country. Therefore, policies that risk global destruction cannot be morally justified simply on the basis of national security. This highlights the need for international cooperation and shared responsibility in addressing the threat of nuclear weapons.

Because of these dangers, the international community has attempted to restrict nuclear weapons through various agreements and organizations. International organizations promote disarmament through cooperation and global agreements **(United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, "ODA at a Glance")**. This treaty reflects a global recognition that nuclear weapons pose a serious threat to humanity. More recently, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (2017) represents an even stronger effort to eliminate nuclear weapons entirely. Additionally, organizations such as the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), which won the 2017 Nobel Peace Prize, argue that nuclear weapons are incompatible with humanitarian law because no effective response is possible after a nuclear attack **(International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, "Which Countries Have Nuclear Weapons")**. These efforts demonstrate that many nations and organizations recognize the ethical problems associated with nuclear weapons and are working toward solutions.

From an ethical standpoint, nuclear weapons also raise questions about the kind of world societies want to create. Many ethical frameworks, especially utilitarianism, emphasize reducing suffering and promoting overall well-being. Nuclear weapons directly contradict these goals due to their capacity for mass destruction. Even if they are never used, their existence creates fear, instability, and the constant possibility of catastrophe. A morally responsible global society should prioritize cooperation, diplomacy, and conflict resolution over reliance on weapons of mass destruction.

In conclusion, nuclear weapons present severe ethical problems due to their humanitarian impact, global environmental risks, and the instability of deterrence-based security. While some argue they are necessary for national defense, the potential consequences are too catastrophic to justify their continued existence. From a utilitarian perspective, the immense scale of possible harm outweighs any benefits they provide. Therefore, nuclear weapons should be strictly limited and eventually eliminated through international cooperation and ethical commitment to global well-being. By prioritizing human life and long-term survival over short-term security concerns, the world can move toward a safer and more just future.

Works Cited

International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. *Nobel Peace Prize 2017 Award Information*. ICAN, 2017, https://www.icanw.org/.

International Committee of the Red Cross. *The Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons*. ICRC, https://www.icrc.org/.

Robock, Alan, et al. “Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict.” *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 2007.

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. *Nuclear Disarmament and Arms Control*. United Nations, https://www.un.org/disarmament/.