# Nuclear deterrence: analysing the utility, challenges, and future of nuclear weapons in international security

**Kevin Vaishnav**
Foreign Policy Observer and Alumni,
Indian Institute of Governance and Leadership, New Delhi.

## Abstract

Since the development of atomic weapons during World War II, nuclear deterrence has been a cornerstone of international security. Rooted in the principle of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), this strategy aims to prevent aggression by ensuring catastrophic retaliation. While nuclear deterrence played a crucial role during the Cold War, its relevance in the modern geopolitical landscape is increasingly debated. Emerging nuclear states, advancements in missile defence and cyber warfare, and the ethical dilemmas surrounding mass destruction challenge the effectiveness of this strategy. This paper critically examines the historical impact of nuclear deterrence, the contemporary political and technological challenges it faces, and the moral considerations surrounding its continued use. Through this analysis, the study evaluates whether nuclear deterrence remains a viable security measure or if alternative approaches are necessary in an evolving global order

**Keywords: Nuclear Deterrence, International Security, Geopolitics.**

## Introduction

Since World War II, when atomic weapons were developed, nuclear deterrence has been a fundamental component of international security. Essentially, nuclear deterrence is deployment of nuclear weapons to threaten and overwhelm retaliation to stop enemies from acting aggressively. The basis of this strategy is Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) principle, which argues that any nuclear attack by one country would result in a devastating response, ensuring the extinction of both parties. During the Cold War, MAD theory influenced world geopolitics, and for many nations today, nuclear deterrence remains a key component of military strategy. Although it is debatable that nuclear weapons have avoided major conflicts, their continued applicability in a world that is changing rapidly is currently under scrutiny.

Technological developments, efficacy of nuclear weapons, and moral dilemmas associated with application of such destructive force constitute a few of the challenges that have developed as the 21st century has advanced and challenged efficacy of nuclear deterrence. The rise of new nuclear states, particularly in volatile regions, has complicated the global security environment, while advancements in missile defence systems and cyber warfare raise questions about the credibility of deterrence strategies. Moreover, the ethical dilemma surrounding the threat of mass destruction inherent in nuclear deterrence remains a contentious issue. While some contend that nuclear weapons remain necessary to preserve global security, others support complete nuclear disarmament.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the value of nuclear deterrence, its difficulties in the current geopolitical environment, and its prospects in a world that is becoming more complicated. A thorough analysis of nuclear deterrence's role in modern international security will be given in this paper by examining its historical efficacy, the political and technological obstacles it encounters, and the moral arguments surrounding its justification. A thorough analysis of nuclear deterrence's role in modern international security will be given in this paper by examining its historical efficacy, the political and technological obstacles it encounters, and the moral arguments surrounding its justification.

**The Utility of Nuclear Deterrence in Contemporary International Security**

In contemporary international relations, the concept of nuclear deterrence remains among the most essential strategies. At its core, nuclear deterrence works by dissuading adversaries from engaging in aggressive actions through the threat of catastrophic retaliation. The theoretical underpinnings of nuclear deterrence can be found in the writings of scholars such as Thomas Schelling, whose work in *Arms and Influence* emphasizes significance of threat of punishment rather than actual application of nuclear weapons. Schelling argues that nuclear deterrence is not about using nuclear weapons but ensuring the enemy believes that a retaliatory strike will occur if they attack first (Schelling, 1966).

During Cold War, when US and Soviet Union embraced Mutually Assured Destruction strategy, nuclear deterrence had been exemplified. Both powers maintained significant nuclear arsenals, ensuring that a first strike would lead to devastating retaliation. This credible deterrent helped prevent confrontation between the superpowers, despite their involvement in various proxy conflicts worldwide.

Other countries including India and Pakistan, that possess nuclear arsenals and have fought over Kashmir, have been included in nuclear deterrence in post-Cold War era. Due in substantial measure to deterrent impact of their weapons, they have avoided full-scale conflict since becoming nuclear powers in 1998. The region as a whole in addition to these countries would suffer greatly from a nuclear war, demonstrating that some academics refer to as stabilizing deterrence through prospect of mutual destruction. (Levesques, Bowen , & Gill, 2021)

Conflicts involving nuclear and non-nuclear governments have been prevented in large part due to nuclear deterrence. During Cold War, U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe deterred Soviet aggression against NATO members. Today, the U.S. extended deterrence, assuring allies of a nuclear response if attacked, remains a stabilizing factor in regions like East Asia and Europe.

**Challenges to Nuclear Deterrence: Technological and Geopolitical Factors**

Nuclear deterrence has helped maintain peace among major nuclear powers, but it now faces significant challenges due to technological advancements, nuclear proliferation, and changing international relations. Consequently, its credibility and effectiveness as a stabilizing force in global security are increasingly questioned.

Missile defence systems development constitutes one of primary challenges to nuclear deterrence. In recent decades, countries have advanced technologies aimed at intercepting incoming missiles, with examples including the U.S. Ground-based Midcourse Defence (GMD), Russia’s S-400, and China's expanding capabilities. These systems could potentially neutralize the threat of a nuclear strike, reducing the necessity for nuclear retaliation. However, if an adversary believes a missile defence system can thwart a successful counterstrike, the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence is diminished. (Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2017). Moreover, these advancements in missile defence could lead to an arms race, as nuclear powers may feel compelled to develop even more advanced offensive nuclear capabilities to penetrate these defences, further destabilizing global security.

Nuclear deterrence credibility has been threatened by cyberwarfare. Cyberattacks could interfere with nuclear threat responses since nuclear command and control systems depend increasingly on digital technologies. This risk extends to potential cyber-enabled nuclear terrorism, where non-state actors might exploit advanced cyber tools. A successful cyberattack could hinder decision-making processes for retaliatory strikes, leaving a nuclear-armed state unable to respond swiftly to provocations (Hodyr, 2016). The calculation of nuclear deterrence is generated more difficult by the intersection of nuclear technology and cyber threats since possibility of malicious interventions, system failures, or human error increases.

As nuclear weapons proliferate, more actors become involved, complicating nuclear deterrence and making stability more difficult to sustain. Although international efforts to stop proliferation, countries including Iran and North Korea have made progress on their nuclear programs. North Korea's growing arsenal raises tensions in East Asia, while Iran's ambitions create friction with the U.S. and its allies. The emergence of new nuclear states poses challenges for applying deterrence effectively in conflict-prone regions. Additionally, regional rivalries, such as between India and Pakistan, highlight proliferation risks, as both nations have a history of

military confrontations. While nuclear deterrence can prevent full-scale wars, it does not eliminate the risk of devastating limited conflicts (Narang, 2014).

The development of non-state actors interested in nuclear materials poses a serious threat to nuclear deterrence and raises concerns regarding nuclear terrorism. Groups like ISIS have shown they can execute sophisticated attacks, posing serious threats since these actors are less affected by traditional deterrence strategies. This makes it difficult for the international community to secure nuclear materials and prevent weapon proliferation. Additionally, the changing nature of international relations complicates deterrence, as it now involves a mix of non-state actors, regional powers, and states with varying strategic interests, making effective deterrence more challenging than before.

## The Ethical and Strategic Debate: Is Nuclear Deterrence Still Justified?

The use of nuclear deterrence has long been a topic of intense ethical debate. While nuclear weapons have undeniably contributed to maintaining peace between major nuclear powers, their existence and the threat they pose raise serious moral questions. On the one hand, by creating a strategic balance of respect and fear, nuclear deterrence has arguably prevented major conflicts, especially amongst nuclear-armed states. However, critics argue that the strategy of deterrence itself is immoral and that the existence of nuclear weapons, with its capacity to cause catastrophic destruction, is an existential threat to humanity. This section will examine the ethical considerations surrounding nuclear deterrence, as well as the strategic justification for its continued use.

### *Ethical Concerns: The Dangers of Mass Destruction*

Nuclear weapons' extreme destructive potential is among the primary ethical objections against nuclear deterrence. Millions of people could be killed, entire cities could be destroyed, and the environment could be permanently harmed by a single nuclear bomb. Critics argue that the threat of using such weapons to prevent conflict is morally indefensible. Nuclear weapons are intrinsically indiscriminate since they don't distinguish amongst military and civilian targets, as International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons argues (ICAN, n.d.). The ethical concept of proportionality, that states that application of force should be appropriate to threat encountered, is violated by a massive amount of destruction they can impose (ICAN, n.d.)

The concept of Mutually Assured Destruction relies on the assumption that both sides will act rationally to avoid escalation. Critics argue this is flawed, as miscalculations or human errors during conflicts could lead to catastrophic outcomes, as seen during close calls in Cold War, especially Cuban Missile Crisis. Furthermore, the threat of nuclear retaliation, intended to deter aggression, raises moral concerns, as it coerces through the fear of massive harm to innocent populations. This human cost is a central argument for advocates of nuclear disarmament.

### *Strategic Justifications: The Role of Deterrence in Maintaining Stability*

Considering the moral challenges, proponents of nuclear deterrence argue that it has been crucial to preserving world peace, especially in the years following World War II. The fact that nuclear deterrence has avoided substantial disputes among nuclear-armed states serves as its primary strategic defence. As Charles Glaser argues in *The Nuclear Revolution*, the presence of nuclear weapons creates a situation in which potential costs of war are so high that rational states will avoid direct conflict (Glaser, 1991). Despite ideological disagreements and proxy wars during the Cold War, countries including US and Union have avoided full-scale conflict due to this referred to as balance of terror.

Furthermore, proponents of nuclear deterrence claim that it has stabilized areas where traditional military conflicts may have otherwise intensified. For instance, despite their significant ideological and tactical disagreements, the Cold War concluded without direct conflict between NATO and the Warsaw Pact owing to nuclear deterrence strategies employed by US and Soviet Union. In similar terms, some observers claim that by preventing a full-scale conflict between the two nuclear-armed countries, India and Pakistan's acquisition of nuclear weapons has contributed to maintaining stability in South Asia.

***The Case for Nuclear Disarmament: Moving Beyond Deterrence***

There is a growing call for nuclear disarmament due to the significant risks of nuclear deterrence, including accidental launches and miscalculations. Since existence of nuclear weapons increases risk of proliferation and nuclear conflict, Global Zero movement supports their complete abolition. Disarmament highlights ethical case that nuclear weapons are inherently immoral and pose an unacceptable threat to global security. Advocates believe that global security can be achieved through diplomacy and nonviolent means, rather than through the threat of annihilation.

**The Future of Nuclear Deterrence: Emerging Trends and Policy Recommendations**

Nuclear deterrence faces current opportunities and difficulties as global security environment changes. Future of nuclear deterrence remains uncertain due to the emergence of novel technologies, changing geopolitical alliances, and the continuous threat of nuclear proliferation. Although many countries' security strategies still heavily rely on nuclear weapons, new factors are progressively influencing dynamics of deterrence. This section will explore emerging trends that will influence the future of nuclear deterrence, as well as policy recommendations for addressing the challenges and opportunities presented by these developments.

***Emerging Trends: Technological and Geopolitical Shifts***

Among most significant advances influencing nuclear deterrence in future is development of new technologies, including hypersonic weapons, cyber capabilities, and artificial intelligence (AI). These technologies have the potential to disrupt traditional deterrence models in several ways. For instance, AI-powered systems may enhance the speed and accuracy of decision-making processes related to nuclear retaliation. While this could improve the effectiveness of deterrence, it also raises concerns about the risks of automated decision-making in high-stakes situations. By introducing new vulnerabilities, potential for AI misjudgement or cyber interference in nuclear command and control systems could compromise legitimacy of deterrence.

Furthermore, current missile defence systems have been placed to the test by the development of hypersonic missiles, that may travel at speeds greater than five times the speed of sound. It may be more difficult for nuclear-armed countries to protect themselves against a first strike if these missiles can get past missile defence systems. The advent of these new technologies could lead to a new arms race, as nuclear powers seek to maintain their deterrent capabilities in the face of increasingly sophisticated threats.

Geopolitically, the shifting global balance of power is also influencing the future of nuclear deterrence. A more multipolar nuclear landscape is a result of Russia's nuclear capabilities, China's ascent to global superpower status, and the continued nuclear aspirations of nations including North Korea and Iran. A more complicated and dispersed security environment is replacing the conventional concept of nuclear deterrence, that depended on bipolar stability of Cold War. Maintaining strategic stability becomes more difficult as the number of nuclear-armed states increases, increasing the probability of nuclear warfare. Specifically, in the decades that follow, nuclear deterrence measures are anticipated to centre on nuclear competition between US and China (Scott & Waltz, 2002)

***Policy Recommendations: Enhancing Stability and Reducing Risks***

To address these emerging trends and ensure the continued effectiveness of nuclear deterrence, several policy recommendations can be made. First, international cooperation on nuclear arms control and non-proliferation should be strengthened. Despite its current tension, 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) with Iran is an example that how diplomacy could be crucial in preventing spread of nuclear weapons. To reduce risks of nuclear proliferation, international treaties that include Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) should be strengthened, and new arms control agreements should be pursued.

Second, nuclear states need to make investments to improve dependability and transparency of their nuclear command and control systems. As new technologies like AI and cyber capabilities become more integral to national security strategies, it is crucial for ensuring that nuclear weapons are protected from potential cyberattacks or technological malfunctions. Establishing secure, verifiable communication channels between nuclear powers could help reduce miscalculation risk and accidental escalation.

Third, nuclear-armed states should explore “no first use” (NFU) or “sole purpose” policies for their weapons. NFU would require states to wait until attacked by a nuclear opponent prior to utilizing nuclear weapons. This might decrease pressure to stockpile nuclear weapons while reducing possibility of accidental or pre-emptive deployment. Declaring nuclear weapons a "sole purpose" of deterrence instead of offense might also reduce nuclear conflict. While such policies are controversial, particularly among nations with more adversarial relationships, they could help build confidence and reduce the overall reliance on nuclear arsenals (No First Use, n.d.)

Finally, long-term efforts should focus on advancing nuclear disarmament. While the complete elimination of nuclear weapons may not be achievable in the short term, gradual reductions in nuclear arsenals, coupled with enhanced verification mechanisms, could contribute to greater global security. By fostering international cooperation and committing to multilateral disarmament efforts, states can work towards a safer world, even as they continue to maintain deterrence as a strategic tool.

**Conclusion**

International security has been influenced by nuclear deterrence for over 70 years, originally to prevent major wars involving nuclear-armed states. Deterring direct conflicts, Mutually Assured Destruction held major nations stable during the Cold War. Technological advances comprising missile defence systems, cyber warfare, and AI challenge nuclear deterrence. The development of additional nuclear states and regional powers complicates deterrence, increasing the possibility of miscalculation or escalation.

Geopolitical changes, including China’s rise and ongoing U.S.-Russia tensions, further complicate deterrence strategies, making global security more fragmented and unpredictable. Despite these challenges, nuclear deterrence remains a powerful tool for maintaining stability, though it raises ethical concerns about the threat of mass destruction.

To address these challenges, it is vital to prioritize arms control and non-proliferation, invest in securing nuclear command systems against cyber threats, and consider adopting “no first use” policies to minimize accidental escalation. Long-term goals should include gradual reductions in nuclear arsenals and new verification mechanisms, moving towards disarmament.

In conclusion, while nuclear deterrence will still be significant in international security, it must adapt to emerging threats and ethical considerations for a more stable and peaceful global environment.

## References


1. Center for Strategic & International Studies. ( 2017, February 1). The Future of Alliances and Extended Nuclear Deterrence. USA.
2. Glaser, C. (1991). *Analyzing Strategic Nuclear Policy.* Princeton Library.
3. Hodyr, E. (2016). *Cybersecurity of nuclear weapon systems.* Warsaw.
4. ICAN. (n.d.). *Why a ban?* Retrieved from ICAN: https://www.icanw.org
5. Levesques, A., Bowen , D., & Gill, J. (2021). *Nuclear Deterrence and Stability in South Asia: Perceptions and Realities.* The International Institute for Strategic Studies.
6. Narang, V. (2014). *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict.* Princeton University Press.
7. *No First Use.* (n.d.). Retrieved from Center for Arms Control and Non - Profileration: https://armscontrolcenter.org/issues/no-first-use/no-first-use-frequently-asked-questions/
8. Schelling, T. (1966). *Arms and Influence.* Yale University Press.
9. Scott, S., & Waltz, K. (2002). *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed.* W.W. Norton.