



Using Nuclear Weapons In Current Conflicts 'Morally Outrageous'

By: The World Affairs Council of San Antonio – February 25, 2013

The Cato Institute has never been shy about putting its opinions into the marketplace. The libertarian think-tank recently endorsed the Hagel nomination as one of cautious pragmatism to the surprise of people who thought they were staunch allies of the Defense Department and big budgets.

Benjamin Friedman explained at the World Affairs Council of San Antonio that the Cato Institute and its constituents have always been opposed to large bureaucratic budgets and have been pro-peace for decades.

His lecture, entitled *Overkill: The Case for Reevaluating U.S. Nuclear Strategy*, outlined the beginnings of our current strategy as one still rooted in cold-war thinking and, considering our current enemies and wars, one that is patently absurd.

"The wars we fight in the United States historically are against weak states without nukes. These fights, whether or not you think they are a good idea, have limited or remote bearing on our physical safety, and without a more proximate threat to us here, the idea of us using nuclear weapons is morally outrageous."

In this presentation, Friedman advocates a large reduction in nuclear arms to reflect the actual need and focuses it in the hands of a single branch of the military. He says this would free the strategy of bureaucratic recalcitrance and makes sense.