

FEMINISM AND THE QUESTION OF THE CULTURE OF WAR

Bruno Yammeluan IKULI, PhD*

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Federal University Otuoke, P.M.B. 127, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

<p>Corresponding Author Bruno Yammeluan IKULI, PhD</p> <p>Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Federal University Otuoke, P.M.B. 127, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.</p> <p>Article History</p> <p>Received: 08 / 05 / 2025 Accepted: 21 / 05 / 2025 Published: 25 / 05 / 2025</p>	<p>Abstract: The paper aimed at assessing the contemporary values of the human person, especially as a women in the midst of the contemporary valuations of conflicts and wars as a means of development. It is about the feminist-ethical conception and evaluation of the operational practice of the imposing <i>Culture of War</i> as against the <i>Culture of Peace</i>, and how it is effecting the development of the womenfolk. It recognized that ethics has being for the operational values of the human persons as subjects of lived experiences based on the choices we make. This has being for the promotion, protection and respect for the fundamental human rights, especially the right to life, which gives a firm foundation for other rights for the sustainability of the society in harmony, peace, equity and justice. The paper recognized that these qualities of living in any given society cannot be promoted by the <i>Culture of War</i>. As such, the feminist ethicists with the contemporary feminist movements and interests to reposition the womenfolk in relation to the sustainability of the whole human race; advocate for possible eradication of the <i>Culture of War</i> in every society as practiced by the governments of the nations. Adopting phenomenological method of analysis, the paper concluded that the feminist ethicists recognized that the society can be more peaceful and orderly when the lives and values of women in reference to the valuation of all lives, and learn the justice and the values of the society are dependable on the values such society has on the women as subjects of lived experiences.</p> <p>Keywords: Culture of Person, Culture of War, Ethics, Feminism, Feminist Ethics, Human Person, Human Values, Social Order, Women Rights.</p>
<p>How to Cite: IKULI, B. Y., (2025). FEMINISM AND THE QUESTION OF THE CULTURE OF WAR. <i>IRASS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</i>,2(5)147-152.</p>	

Introduction

Following Aristotelian tradition on epistemic development, the human person is a product of nature and nurture. He or she is a product of nature and responds to nature accordingly, at the same time. He or she consciously and unconsciously creates environment, culture and language for himself or herself. With these factors of development, the human person remains a social being, and longs for the warmth of others.¹ He or she is a composition of mysteries, replete with enigmas that make him or her unique.² The uniqueness which is implicit in him or her and

which segregates him or her for the lower animal remains the indispensable sources of his or her culture. With culture, the definition of morality presupposes a characteristic of the human person as a social, inter-subjective and political being who possesses certain definitive qualities such as self-awareness, rationality, inter-personality and a sense of the future and the past.³

The human person is a being that necessarily exists in relationship, fraternity and friendship, and such factors of socialization are always and indispensably possible and relevance within the applications of human culture. Although, according to Fidelis Aghamelu; “this idea of personhood is not understood by every culture.”⁴ That is the reason why some cultures are inhuman to humanity in terms of barbaric and cannibalistic practices. Rooted

¹See, G. U. Ukagba & A. A. Asekhauno, Human nature, dirty hands and social disorder: a socio-political understanding of the Nigerian society. *Ogisiri: A New Journal of African Studies*, 7, 2010, pp. 119-135, see, 120; and G. U. Ukagba & S. I. Odi, Poverty and social disorder: a socio-political understanding of the Nigerian civil society. *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 11(2), 2010, pp. 162-187, see, p. 165.

²A. Agbaje, “Culture, corruption and development.” In *Voices from Africa*, Issue Number 4: *Culture and Development*.

Geneva: United Nations Non Governmental Liaison Service, 1992.

³B, A. Lanre-Abass and E. A. Layode, “Moral basis of governance.” In O. A. Oyeshile and F. Ofor (eds). *Ethics, governance and social order in Africa*. Ibadan: Zenith Book House, 2017, p. 83.

⁴F. C. Aghamelu, p. 96.



in human freedom, reason and responsibility, human culture is the “reality about the potentials of the person and such a person remains a metaphysical centre of development that is deeper than all the qualities and essences which are found and enumerated by the subject of love.⁵ With love for the rights and dignity of the human persons there is social order in terms of what any culture practices, necessarily based on the principles of natural law and morality.

The idea of nuclear war has been a prolonged issue; over the years, as the human persons have been coming up with different inventions and creativities, especially within ambitious employment of the tools of science and technology that has helped them to overcome various difficulties in life. These have also, in the same way, help in propelling them in inventing the materials of their own destructions, especially for the procurement and execution of wars and other form of conflicts in the society, as due to the issues of political and economic interests and values. These occurrences and inventions is as a result of human’s greed and need to acquire and conquer more, it could be as a result of a quarrel for land, power and show of superiority. But in the end, all these wars, with the aid of nuclear warfare do not always yield the best results; instead there are mostly always negative results. Thus, the outcomes of nuclear war have in one way or the other affects humanity, among those who have postulate theory are the feminist, who seek to view the effect of nuclear war on the side of the female folk.

To understand the holistic personality of global peace, justice and harmony, humanity must understand itself as a being beyond the reign of physical or material absurdity. From this conception, the possibility of global peace, justice and harmony is to experience the values of human otherness and togetherness. Hence, bringing the reality of ethical thinking and studies into the concept and idea of nuclear warfare, we are to evaluate and assess the ethics of nuclear war; its rightness or wrongness in the occurrence of the world.

Conceptual Clarifications

Feminism: Feminism is a range of socio-political movements and [ideologies](#) that aim to define and establish the political, economic, personal, and social [equality of the sexes](#).⁶ Feminism holds it that societies prioritize the male point of view rather than that of the women folk and that women are treated unjustly in these societies.⁷ Thus, efforts to change this include fighting against [gender stereotypes](#) and improving educational, professional, and interpersonal opportunities and outcomes for women. [Feminist movements](#) was originated in the late 18th-century in Europe, where there was campaigned and continue to campaign for [women's rights](#), the right which include the right to [vote, run for public office, work](#), earn [equal pay, own property, receive education](#), enter contracts, have equal rights within [marriage](#), and [maternity leave](#). Feminists have also worked to ensure access to [contraception](#), legal [abortions](#), and [social](#)

[integration](#) and to protect women and girls from [rape, sexual harassment](#), and [domestic violence](#).⁸ It’s worthy to note that the movement also addresses issues such as changes in female dress standards and acceptable physical activities for females.

Many scholars consider feminist campaigns to be a main force behind major historical [societal changes](#) for women's rights, particularly in [the West](#), where they are near-universally credited with achieving [women's suffrage, gender-neutral language, reproductive rights](#) for women (including access to contraceptives and [abortion](#)), and the right to enter into contracts and [own property](#).⁹ Although feminist advocacy is, and has been, mainly focused on women's rights, some feminists argue for the inclusion of [men's liberation](#) within its aims, because they believe that men are also harmed by traditional [gender roles](#). [Feminist theory](#), which emerged from feminist movements, aims to understand the nature of gender inequality by examining women's social roles and lived experiences; feminist theorists have developed theories in a variety of disciplines in order to respond to issues concerning gender.¹⁰

War: Simply put, war is a battle that is fought with the use of any kinds of weapons. For instance, nuclear war refers to a hypothetical or actual armed conflict between nations or groups in which nuclear weapons are used as a means of warfare. It involves the deployment and detonation of nuclear weapons, which release an immense amount of energy and cause devastating destruction and loss of life. Nuclear war carries the potential for catastrophic consequences due to the destructive power of nuclear weapons. The detonation of a nuclear bomb can cause immense explosions, release intense heat and radiation, and produce a shockwave that can level entire cities. The immediate effects include massive loss of life, destruction of infrastructure, and environmental devastation. Furthermore, the long-term effects can include radiation sickness, genetic mutations, and ecological damage that can persist for years or even generations. The concept of nuclear war emerged during the Cold War era, when tensions between nuclear-armed superpowers, such as the United States and the Soviet Union, heightened the risk of a global nuclear conflict. The use of nuclear weapons in warfare has been widely condemned due to the indiscriminate and catastrophic nature of their effects, leading to global efforts to prevent the proliferation and use of such weapons. Today, discussions around nuclear war often focus on disarmament efforts, arms control treaties, and non-proliferation agreements aimed at reducing the number of nuclear weapons and preventing their use. The aim is to promote peace and stability while minimizing the risk of nuclear conflict and the potentially catastrophic consequences associated with it.

⁸Echols, Alice *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967–1975*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989) ISBN 978-0-8166-1787-6.

⁹Messer-Davidson, Ellen *Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press 2002), ISBN 978-0-8223-2843-8.

¹⁰Nancy Chodorow, *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*. New Haven, Conn.: (Yale University Press 1989). ISBN 978-0-300-05116-2.

⁵See, F. C. Aghamelu, p. 96.

⁶Mary Hawkesworth, *Globalization and Feminist Activism*. (Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 25-27. ISBN 978-0-7425-3783-5.

⁷Gamble, Sarah "Introduction". *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Post-feminism*. (Routledge, 2001), VII. ISBN 978-0-415-24310-0.

Philosophy and the Culture of War

Nuclear ethics is a cross-disciplinary field of academic and a relevant study of policy in which the problems related with nuclear arms control, nuclear deterrence, nuclear disarmament, nuclear warfare, or nuclear energy are examined through ethical or moral theories. It focuses on the moral aspect of nuclear war.¹¹ In contemporary security studies, the problems of nuclear warfare, deterrence, proliferation, and so forth are often understood strictly in political, strategic, or military terms,¹² but in the study of international organizations and law, however, these problems are also understood in legal terms. Nuclear ethics assumes that the very real possibilities of human extinction, mass human destruction, or mass environmental damage which could result from nuclear warfare are deep ethical or moral problems. Specifically, it assumes that the outcomes of human extinction, mass human destruction, or environmental damage count as moral evils. Another area of inquiry concerns future generations and the burden that nuclear waste and pollution imposes on them. Some scholars have concluded that it is therefore morally wrong to act in ways that produce these outcomes, which means it is morally wrong to engage in nuclear warfare.¹³

Feminism and the Culture of War

A feminist perspective on nuclear war would likely emphasize the devastating impact of such conflicts on all aspects of human life, particularly on women and marginalized communities. Feminism, as a social and political movement, seeks to address gender inequality and challenge systems of power and oppression. Here are some key points that may reflect a feminist perspective on nuclear war. The Feminist emphasize a disproportionate impact on women, they explain that in times of armed conflict, including nuclear war, women often bear the brunt of the suffering. They are more likely to be victims of sexual violence, displacement, and loss of loved ones. The destruction of infrastructure and breakdown of social systems can exacerbate existing gender inequalities and place women at a greater disadvantage.¹⁴

Nuclear War also disrupts the roles of caregivers, in that Nuclear war causes a misappropriation of the roles of women In the society and disrupt the traditional roles of women as caregivers. With widespread destruction and loss of lives, women often find themselves overwhelmed with the responsibilities of caring for the wounded, orphaned children, and the elderly. This can further reinforce gender stereotypes and place additional burdens on women. Feminism recognizes the interconnectedness of social justice and environmental issues. Nuclear war would have catastrophic environmental consequences, including the

contamination of water, soil, and air. Women, who are often primary caregivers and responsible for food security, would bear the brunt of these ecological challenges, impacting their health and livelihoods.¹⁵

Feminists critique the patriarchal nature of militarism and its association with power, dominance, and violence. Nuclear weapons are seen as symbols of patriarchal power, reinforcing the idea that security lies in the possession of destructive capabilities. Feminists advocate for nonviolent conflict resolution, disarmament, and the reallocation of resources from military spending to social programs that address the root causes of conflicts.¹⁶ Feminism acknowledges the importance of intersectionality, which recognizes that women's experiences of war are shaped by their intersecting identities, such as race, class, nationality, and more. A feminist analysis of nuclear war would consider how the impacts and risks are experienced differently by women from various cultural, economic, and geographic backgrounds. It would emphasize the importance of global solidarity and cooperation to prevent nuclear war.¹⁷

Ethics of Nuclear War

Understanding the idea of nuclear deterrence and the reasons it is a critical ethical issue is beneficial and crucial. Deterrence is a psychological phenomena that entails threatening an aggressor with destructive retaliation in order to persuade it not to strike. Because the effectiveness of deterrence depends on the persuasiveness of the threat's message rather than just the retaliator's skill, there is a psychological component to it. To put it another way, the opponent must believe that the retaliatory threat is real and significant for deterrence to be effective. The utilitarian theory of John Stuart Mills provides an intriguing framework for approaching this problem. According to utilitarianism, "the aim of action should be the largest possible balance of pleasure over pain or the greatest happiness of the greatest number." Thus, this principle's basic tenet is that agents—in this example, military strategists—should endeavor to provide as much long-term joy or happiness for people as feasible.

Uncertainty is the key element of this theory that has the most bearing on nuclear deterrence. One should select the course of action with the highest predicted utility when the exact implications of a given action are unknown. The Expected Utility Principle is what this is called. The issue with this is that comparing deterrence and disarmament makes it almost impossible to determine a quantitative result. This is due to the difficulty in estimating the likelihood of the opponent's choice of action. Nuclear deterrence is effective and maximal value is attained if the adversary is persuaded by the possibility of retribution. However, what happens if the aggressor decides to attack despite not being convinced by the principle? There is an issue here. Which is preferable: continuing to be attacked and avoiding an unethical act,

¹¹Sohail H. Hashmi and Steven P. Lee, ed. *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

¹²Buzan, Barry; Hansen, Lene. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2009). 4

¹³Doyle, Thomas E., "Kantian non-ideal theory and nuclear proliferation", *International Theory*. **2**(2010). (1): 87–112.

¹⁴Rebecca Johnson, "Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the UK Government White Paper on Trident", United Kingdom, 2006.

¹⁵Rebecca Johnson, "Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the UK Government White Paper on Trident", United Kingdom, 2006.

¹⁶Carol John, "Feminism and Anti-Nuclear Activism", Stanford Encyclopedia, 1987.

¹⁷Rebecca Johnson, "Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the UK Government White Paper on Trident", United Kingdom, 2006.

or retaliating as warned to save the greatest number of lives? At first, it appeared difficult to apply this to nuclear warfare. Recall that unilateral disarmament and nuclear deterrence are the two possibilities under comparison. The extinction of all people on Earth appears to be the worst case scenario for both possibilities. For instance, in both situations, the adversary nation may carry on attacking or other nuclear-armed states may intervene. It is conceivable that catastrophic nuclear war might wipe out humanity in its most extreme form.¹⁸ However, it should be mentioned that there is very little chance that this will happen in the case of disarmament. Neither idea addresses the intrinsic virtue of nuclear deterrence itself, even though both seek to base moral judgments on the best or largest result. It is helpful to include deontology, another area of philosophy, in this situation. Deontology emphasizes whether an activity is right or wrong rather than whether the results are right or bad.¹⁹ Using this perspective, one could contend that endangering other people—especially innocent people—is inherently wrong. Therefore, the nuclear deterrence policy is inherently evil because it endangers the lives of innocent people in both the opposing and retaliating nations.

These arguments against nuclear deterrence are reasonable in their respective contexts, but it is also necessary to consider the matter from a militaristic and worldwide perspective. A Carnegie Council video titled "Are Nuclear Weapons Useful?" asserts that nuclear technology cannot be "disinvested." Nothing stops enemy states with the same technological capability from employing nuclear weapons, even if a nation has them but opposes their use. Would leaders of the United States refuse to defend the nation or retaliate if a nuclear assault were to occur, merely to uphold moral principles? Although nuclear deterrence may be unethical in theory, in practice it may be necessary in dire situations. Bilateral disarmament, or the consent of both countries to withdraw, is an additional alternative that may have greater practical relevance. A neutral third party, like the United Nations, may be responsible for intervening if a situation like this actually arises. If bilateral disarmament were accomplished, nuclear deterrence and unilateral disarmament could be averted on the verge of nuclear war. This would minimize both parties' use of dishonest tactics.²⁰

The Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons

The entire International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement has been forever changed by the terrible destruction and suffering that Japanese Red Cross and ICRC medical personnel saw in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 while they tried to aid tens of thousands of dying and injured people. This has fueled the movement's advocacy for the ban and abolition of nuclear weapons for the past 75 years.²¹ The ICRC and other organizations started

recording the impacts of the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on human health, the environment, and medical infrastructure a few weeks after they occurred.²²

Since then, scientists have been looking at evidence of the short-term and long-term effects of nuclear weapons testing and usage. The World Health Organization (WHO) compiled the body of knowledge regarding the effects of nuclear explosions on health and health services in a significant report published in 1987. The research stated, among other things, that the human body suffers terrible short- and long-term consequences from blast waves, thermal waves, radiation, and radioactive fallout caused by nuclear explosions, and that current health services are ill-equipped to significantly lessen these impacts.²³ Since then, there has been a steady increase in the amount of evidence demonstrating the immediate and long-term humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons testing and use, as well as the readiness and ability of national and international organizations and health systems to aid those affected by such incidents.²⁴

With new research and analysis highlighting the age- and sex-specific effects of ionizing radiation on human health, among other things, the immediate and long-term humanitarian and environmental effects of nuclear weapons use and testing are still being closely examined by scientists.²⁵ The long-term environmental effects of nuclear weapons testing, such as mortality and infant mortality rates; the effects of a nuclear conflict on food security, ocean acidification, and the global climate; and proof and analysis of regional nuclear testing readiness and response strategies.²⁶

Furthermore, little is known about how ionizing radiation affects reproductive health, despite the fact that it has been shown that women and children are disproportionately harmed by it. The following are some potential research questions in this field: Why can biological sex contribute to radiation harm? Why do early children suffer the most from biological sex differences in

²²ICRC, "ICRC report on the effects of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima", 2016: <https://international-review.icrc.org/articles/icrc-report-effects-atomic-bomb-hiroshima>, accessed 5 January 2023;

²³WHO, *Effects of Nuclear War on Health and Health Services*, 1987: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/39199>.

²⁴John Borrie and Tim Caughley, *An Illusion of Safety: Challenges of Nuclear Weapon Detonations for United Nations Humanitarian Coordination and Response*, UNIDIR, 2014, pp. 8–15: <https://unidir.org/publication/illusion-safety-challenges-nuclear-weapon-detonations-united-nations-humanitarian>.

²⁵Mary Olson, "Disproportionate impact of radiation and radiation regulation", *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 2019:

²⁶BeyzaUnal, Patricia Lewis and SasanAghlani, "The Humanitarian Impacts of Nuclear Testing: Regional Responses and Mitigation Measures", Chatham House, 2017

¹⁸Martin, J. Are Nuclear Weapons Useful, Carnegie Council. (2015).

¹⁹ Johnson, J.L. "Nuclear Deterrence." *Eastern Oregon State College Review*, 1-22. (1998).

²⁰Kavka, G.S. (1987). *Moral Paradoxes of Nuclear Deterrence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²¹Inh Schroeder, "The ICRC and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement: Working Towards a Nuclear-Free World since 1945", 2017: <https://doi.org/10.1080/25751654.2018.1450623>, accessed 5 January 2023;

radiation harm? Does the proportion of reproductive tissue and its radiation response play a role?²⁷

The Risk of the Use of Nuclear Weapons

An essential component of a risk assessment for nuclear weapons is the data gathered from the predictable effects of a nuclear explosion. Even though nuclear weapons haven't been used in combat since 1945, there have been an alarmingly high number of near-misses where mistakes or miscalculations have resulted in the unintentional use of nuclear weapons.²⁸ It was shown at the three conferences on the humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons in 2013 and 2014 that the following factors significantly increase the likelihood of a nuclear weapon detonating, whether through accident, error in judgment, or design:

The vulnerability of nuclear weapon command-and-control networks to human error and cyber attacks

- Keeping nuclear arsenals at high alert levels, with thousands of missiles prepared for launch in a matter of minutes
- The risks associated with non-state actors gaining access to nuclear weapons and associated materials.

The conferences also noted that current military doctrines and security policies that prioritize nuclear weapons, along with regional and international tensions between nuclear-armed states, increase the likelihood of nuclear weapons being used. They came to the conclusion that, given the devastating consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation, the risk of nuclear weapons being used is unacceptable, even if the likelihood of such an event were thought to be low.²⁹ The likelihood of nuclear weapons being deployed has grown since the three conferences on the humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons. Although there are various ways to think about nuclear threats and their origins, the following related developments are what make the likelihood of using nuclear weapons higher:

The trend of nuclear reductions is currently being replaced by a process of modernization and creation of new nuclear weapons with innovative, "more usable" capabilities, following decades of considerable reductions in the world's nuclear arsenal. A return to the idea of "nuclear war fighting" and an expansion of the situations in which the use of nuclear weapons may be justified are two of the most notable signs that nuclear weapons are becoming more significant in the military doctrines and security plans of nuclear-armed states.³⁰ The integration of digital technologies in nuclear command, control, and communications,

new missile technologies, increased activities and reliance on space infrastructure, and broader technological advancements all contribute to the complexity of decision-making processes and raise the possibility of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that could lead to the use of nuclear weapons. It is harder to discern the adversary's intentions when the nuclear arms control legal framework is eroded, as demonstrated, for instance, by the termination of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. This decreases predictability and transparency in policy and decision-making processes.³¹ The following four risk-of-use scenarios can be used to envision the growing likelihood of nuclear weapons being utilized:

- The use of nuclear weapons as specified and intended by stated policies, doctrines, plans, and conceptions is known as "doctrinal use of nuclear weapons."
- Escalatory usage, or the deployment of nuclear weapons during a protracted battle or state of tension
- Unauthorized use, or when a non-state actor uses nuclear weapons without authorization
- Accidental usage, which includes both technical and human error in the use of nuclear weapons.³²

It is crucial to take into account both the individual and combined technologies when evaluating the hazards associated with technological advancements. Decision-making systems may be impacted in unforeseen ways by the interdependencies and relationships between new technologies. A misguided overconfidence in the ability of digital technologies to provide accurate information could result from, for instance, a greater dependence on these tools in decision-making processes, which could introduce new sources of error that are challenging to identify. A state may misread or misunderstand another state's actions as a result of the introduction and usage of new technologies, which raises the possibility of needless escalation.³³

Evaluation

Feminism is a broad social and political movement that advocates for equal rights and opportunities for women. It seeks to challenge and dismantle gender-based inequalities and discrimination. Evaluating feminism's implications on nuclear war requires examining the movement's principles and goals, as well as considering how gender dynamics intersect with issues related to war and conflict. Feminism highlights the existence of gendered power imbalances in society, which can also be observed in the context of nuclear weapons and war. Historically, decisions regarding warfare and nuclear weapons have been dominated by men, while women's perspectives and voices have been marginalized. Feminism aims to address this by advocating for

²⁷Lilly Adams, "The human cost of nuclear weapons is not only a "feminine" concern", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 2019:

²⁸Patricia Lewis et al., "Too Close for Comfort: Cases of Near Nuclear Use and Options for Policy", *Chatham House*, 2014:

²⁹Alexander Kmentt, "The Humanitarian Consequences and Risks of Nuclear Weapons: Taking stock of the main findings and substantive conclusions", presentation to the ICRC and IFRC expert meeting in Geneva on 2 March 2020.

³⁰Matt Korda, "The Key Drivers of Nuclear Risk", presentation to the ICRC and IFRC expert meeting in Geneva on 2 March 2020

³¹Matt Korda, "The Key Drivers of Nuclear Risk",

³²Wilfred Wan, presentation to the ICRC and IFRC expert meeting in Geneva on 2 March 2020; Wilfred Wan (ed.), *Nuclear Risk Reduction: Closing Pathways to Use*, 2020, chapter one:

³³Yasmin Afina, presentation to the ICRC and IFRC expert meeting in Geneva on 2 March 2020; BeyzaUnal and Patricia Lewis, "Cybersecurity of Nuclear Weapons Systems: Threats, Vulnerabilities and Consequences", *Chatham House*, 2018:

gender equality in all spheres, including issues of war and peace. For Benedict XVI;

The attainment of peace depends above all on recognizing that we are, in God, one human family. This family is structured, as the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* taught, by interpersonal relations and institutions supported and animated by a communitarian “we”, which entails an internal and external moral order in which, in accordance with truth and justice, reciprocal rights and mutual duties are sincerely recognized. Peace is an order enlivened and integrated by love, in such a way that we feel the needs of others as our own, share our goods with others and work throughout the world for greater communion in spiritual values. It is an order achieved in freedom, that is, in a way consistent with the dignity of persons who, by their very nature as rational beings, take responsibility for their own actions.³⁴

Feminist perspectives often emphasize the importance of non-violence, diplomacy, and peaceful conflict resolution. Feminist scholars and activists argue that war and militarism perpetuate patriarchal systems and exacerbate gender-based violence. By promoting alternative approaches to security, such as dialogue, negotiation, and disarmament, feminism aims to prevent conflicts and reduce the likelihood and brotherhood of the Culture of War to that of Family: According to Benedict XVI.

Indeed, in the healthy family life we experience some of the fundamental elements of peace: justice and love between brothers and sisters, the role of authority expressed by parents, loving concern for the members who are weaker because of youth, sickness and old age, mutual help in the necessities of life, readiness to accept others and, if necessary, to forgive them. For this reason, the family is the first and indispensable teacher of peace.³⁵

Feminism recognizes the importance of diverse perspectives and experiences, challenging traditional notions of power and authority. Applying this principle to nuclear war implies that decision-making processes should include diverse voices, including women's, to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the consequences and alternatives to armed conflicts. Many feminists advocate for nuclear disarmament, seeing it as a vital step toward a more peaceful and equitable world. They argue that the possession and threat of using nuclear weapons perpetuate a culture of fear and violence, and that investing in disarmament efforts would free up resources for social and economic development, benefiting all members of society.

The use and possession of nuclear weapon over the years have been viewed by some nations and countries as having a bad and negative impact in world equality. But in the midst of these, there are those who try to argue for the usefulness of nuclear war. As stated in the clip from the Carnegie Council titled, "[Are Nuclear Weapons Useful?](#)" nuclear technology cannot be "disinvested." Even if a country possesses nuclear weapons, but is against using them, there is nothing preventing aggressor nations with the same technological capabilities from using them. Would leaders of the United States refuse to defend the nation or retaliate if a nuclear assault were to occur, merely to uphold moral principles?

Although nuclear deterrence may be unethical in theory, in practice it may be necessary in dire situations. Bilateral disarmament, or the consent of both countries to withdraw, is an additional alternative that may have greater practical relevance. A neutral third party, like the United Nations, may be responsible for intervening if a situation like this actually arises. If bilateral disarmament were accomplished, nuclear deterrence and unilateral disarmament could be averted on the verge of nuclear war. This would decrease any misleading tactics on perhaps with more real world applicability is bilateral disarmament, or agreement from both nations to retreat. On the brink of nuclear war, if bilateral disarmament were achieved, then nuclear deterrence and unilateral disarmament could be avoided, and it could be the responsibility of a neutral third party such as the United Nations to intervene if a situation like this were to actually occur. This would help to lessen any deceptive strategies on both sides.³⁶

Although it is not the main goal of this work, Ethics in Nuclear War aims to provide a response to the question of whether using nuclear weapons in combat is morally acceptable or unacceptable. This argument can't be too intrusive. Because it is already problematic that it impacts non-combatant parties in a conflict. In short, it is unethical because, as G. Fairbairn and D. Webb would say, a nuclear war would unavoidably result in the indiscriminate slaughter of innumerable innocent.³⁷ The history that we possess of the use of nuclear weapons shows how easy it is to kill a large number of people with such weapon, even when such weapons were small and at a primitive stage of development. In this same light, some people still believe that the use of nuclear weapons can be justified, because so much human effort and resources has been used to create and maintain the nuclear weapons. So though it may be unethical, the alternative of not having any at all is also worse, since those who already have could use it to their advantage.

Conclusion

Upon looking at the idea of nuclear weaponry and arms in wars, it is clear that it would be difficult to limit the use of nuclear weapons and their productions, even if this decision is taken by people and not computers. This is because, people cannot monitor the transactions and applications of nuclear arms night and day, even when super computers have been placed to accomplish this on their behalf. And the best course of action will not depend on human judgment in relation to a particular scenario. Hence it would be necessary that an autonomous institution be created, a faction that would strive for world peace and settle any dispute amicably without the use of nuclear force, as different from the United Nations (UN). This could, in a way help checkmate the use in wars and conflicts. It is important to note that feminism is not a monolithic movement, and there are different perspectives within it. Some feminists may focus primarily on gender equality, while others might have broader concerns about social justice and peace. Therefore, evaluating the implications of feminism on nuclear war depends on the specific feminist perspectives being considered.

³⁶Kavka, G.S. (1987). *Moral Paradoxes of Nuclear Deterrence*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

³⁷ G. Fairbairn, D. Webb, in “Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics” (Second Edition), 2012.

³⁴Benedict XVI, *WDP*, 2013, no. 3.

³⁵ Benedict XVI, *WDP*, 2008, no. 3)