

Challenging Militarisation : Perspectives on Military Spending

An IPB Reflection Paper

By David Hay-Edie and Colin Archer

October 2009



The initial drop in military spending after the end of the Cold War has not been sustained. Although the number of armed conflicts is diminishing, military expenditure is rising in almost all regions. The challenge to peace and disarmament campaigners is how to reverse this trend. This paper suggests ways of thinking about this challenge, and some paths for campaigners to pursue.

1. INTRODUCTION: Why is military expenditure rising?

There are a number of reasons for the rise in militarisation and in military spending in many parts of the world.

- Firstly, the “9-11” effect. The attack on New York and Washington were seized on by the Bush Administration to justify the US-led invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the subsequent sustained increase in US defense expenditure for the “war on terrorism”. Many other countries followed suit. Despite the decline in the traditional perception in some countries (eg Western Europe) of risk from an external conventional attack by an aggressor state, military establishments have used the “counter terrorism” argument to lull the public into acquiescence in high levels of military expenditure.¹ This has been accompanied by a lack of transparency and the absence of effective oversight by parliaments and public opinion.

11) *SIPRI Yearbook, 2009, Summary* “...Global military expenditure in 2008 is estimated to have totaled \$1464 billion. This represents an increase of 4% in real terms compared to 2007, and of 45% since 1999”



- Secondly, **Internal Instability**. In several developing countries with sharp regional tensions, the fear of conventional military attack remains real (eg Eritrea/Ethiopia, Pakistan/India, Israel/Iran, etc). This helps to justify high military spending. Internal instability, mainly in poorer countries, is however a growing factor behind the perception of security threats *within* states, eg Chechnya, Serbia/Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and in states which are perceived as “failed”, eg Somalia. The strategy in response to this is often a development of “counter insurgency” warfare, both urban and rural. New types of conventional warfare techniques and weaponry are being developed to meet this threat.
- Thirdly, **US Unilateralism**. Disarmament and arms control has generally floundered, despite some successes such as the conclusion of the Cluster Munitions Convention. The Bush administration withdrew from, or remained inactive in, most disarmament frameworks, helping to keep them stalled. This picture may now be changing, but not all for the better. The Obama administration looks likely to bring about the withdrawal of US forces from Iraq over the next three years, with accompanying military savings. But this is largely offset by the rise in military spending on Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Obama administration is more favourable to disarmament and arms control, yet it has increased the US defense budget by 1.6% and pursues the reinforcement of NATO, partly for the growing NATO-led war in Afghanistan and partly due to pressures from ex-Soviet bloc states eager to retain a strong NATO in the face of a resurgent Russia.
- Fourthly, **National Prestige**. The traditional nationalistic regard for the prestige and power status of military power is as powerful a motive as ever. As newly industrialized countries such as India, China, Brazil increase their economic power, so they tend to seek the prestige of military power. Other countries also seek prestige in a similar way (Algeria, Venezuela, etc). This motive is both a reaction to US dominance, and reflects the perception that military power projection is needed to safeguard access to declining quantities of non-renewable energy resources or other raw materials (see below).
- Fifthly, **Resource Competition**. The sharpened international competition for scarce fuels is increasing international tensions over control of these resources, with a danger of more “resource wars”. This provides an important long-term stimulus for increased defense spending².
- Sixthly, **Climate Change**. A related, but as yet undeclared, motive for greater military spending may be to contain the growing threat of internal disturbances arising in poor countries ravaged by climate change, and associated cross-frontier migration. This reinforces the general perception of growing instability (see sub para 2 above).
- Lastly, **Humanitarian purposes**. The military have exploited public support for humanitarian interventions in disaster relief, peace-keeping and conflict situations, in order to secure the “militarization” of humanitarian relief, usually through protection of relief convoys and of endangered civilians. This has boosted the image of the military, but it has blurred the distinction between such activity and the development and humanitarian work being done in the field by aid agencies. Much of the work done by the military could be done by civilian agencies.

Currently shrinking economies, rising unemployment, and collapsing financial systems means governments have had to devote large sums in emergency packages to stimulate growth and bail out hard-hit sectors. This is beginning to make them – and their public – look with more critical eyes at areas of spending which can be correspondingly cut. Amongst these should be the military sector. But the military sector too often manages to be treated as “ring-fenced” when spending cuts are considered, to the point where reductions in defense spending are virtually taboo for reasons

2. “Energy conflicts could bring military clashes, Russian Security Strategy warns”, (Guardian, UK, 13 May 2009, by Luke Harding, Moscow correspondent).



of “national security”³. The goal of staving off unemployment also comes to the aid of the military, because of reluctance to sacrifice the jobs provided by military employment and weapons production. Patriotism, with its calls to “Support our Troops” fuelled by media bellicosity, is an emotional driver of remarkable force.

Despite all the factors considered above, there remains an opportunity for those in civil society working for disarmament and reduced military spending. How can this best be grasped? This paper argues that the case for reducing military spending needs to focus in greater detail on (a) how countries’ current defense strategies provide the doctrinal support for military spending, and (b) what types of spending and weapons are being increased (or cut back). If this analysis is done rigorously, disarmament campaigns can then press governments, and marshal public opinion, with greater precision on targeted areas of military spending.

This paper seeks to identify trends common to a representative range of countries, drawing up a schema that identifies priorities for disarmament campaigns in selected military categories.

Taking some current defense strategies of individual countries or groupings of countries, we can see the following picture. In the final section we suggest some arguments to help secure reductions in military spending appropriate to each category.

2. INDIVIDUAL COUNTRY PROFILES

United States: It is worth looking at the US first since it accounts for overwhelmingly the greatest share, 43%, of world military spending. Its defense budget in fiscal year 2009/10, at \$534 billion (basic), and \$130 billion (for Iraq and Afghanistan), represents an increase of 4% in real terms. US military spending is 5 times greater than China’s, 8 times more than Russia’s, 85 times more than Iran’s and 110 times more than North Korea’s. Moreover, what the US does – and plans to do – with its military spending has a very great influence on what other countries do.

The Obama administration is taking a fresh look at US defense strategy. A picture is emerging from the defense budget for the current 2009/2010 Fiscal Year which has been presented to Congress, and from first indications of the outcome of the current Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The following appear to be the main elements of the new US defense strategy.

- Overall spending levels : Given the administration’s continuing commitment to an albeit declining US military presence in Iraq, and to intensifying the war in Afghanistan, military spending levels will rise in the short term but should decline if the wider Middle Eastern situation is stabilized.
- Pressures to reduce and rationalize military spending : These are now real, though slow in taking effect. Defense Secretary Gates has said “The spigot of defense spending that opened up on 9/11 is closing. Two major

campaigns (Iraq and Afghanistan) ongoing, the economic crisis and resulting budget pressures will force hard choices on the US Defense Department”.⁴

³ *SIPRI 2009 Yearbook, Summary* : “The year 2008 will be remembered as the beginning of the severest economic recession since 1929. It was a year in which public anger over the greed and corrupt practices of the financial sector boiled over, rocking some governments and calling into question the management of the global economy. However what has not yet been called into question is the high priority still afforded to the military. These new figures show us that weapons and preparations for warfare remain untouchable in most austerity programmes, and indeed they reveal an increasing militarisation among the big powers.”



- Shift in threat perception : The main security threat to the US is no longer only seen as the military power of traditional adversaries such as Russia and China. Rather, it comes from (i) states with ideologically fanatical leaderships which take on aggressive, destabilizing policies (Iran, North Korea), endangering not only the US and Western interests but also in some contexts allies such as Israel, Egypt etc (ii) “failed” or “failing” states which produce the “asymmetric” threat from insurgencies⁵ and piracy flowing from central government weakness or collapse (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia), (iii) the growing menace of cyber warfare.
- Consequences in US military response : The main response is to shift US resources, priorities and doctrines away from traditional conventional warfare relying on heavy weaponry (nuclear warheads, battle tanks, bombers, aircraft carriers, outdated fighter jets) to weapons better suited to fighting insurgencies and piracy: unmanned predator drone aircraft, light warships, well armoured light infantry vehicles and advanced Information Technology systems.
- Economic crisis factors : Expensive weapons that generate few jobs are unsuited to current US circumstances of rapidly rising unemployment and competition for government financial support. Therefore Gates sent the White House a \$10 billion package in military projects to include in the US Stimulus package. These include job creation projects such as improving needy infrastructure (new barracks, military hospitals, child care centres etc). Meanwhile there will be more spending attention to the needs of military staff, and on equipment such as cargo ships and tanker aircraft.
- Weapons down-graded or prioritized: Some of these have been alluded to above. The following are being cut back, frozen or given less than sought for by the military : the out-moded F22 fighter jet, some bombers, some destroyers (DDG-1000), and the army’s \$160 billion modernization plan, notably the Future Combat Systems (expensive high tech synchronized weapons systems). The expensive Missile Defense (MD) system (\$10 billion) ostensibly targeted at Iranian missiles has now been replaced by a much slimmed-down alternative, and the US and Russia have signed a preliminary agreement to negotiate a successor treaty to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). This should reduce US and Russian nuclear stockpiles by between 1500 and 1675 warheads each, and pare down ballistic missiles, submarine-launched missiles and heavy bombers by between 500 and 1,000 each. Weapons prioritised include the predator drones that are being deployed in increasing numbers, especially in Pakistan.⁶
- Internal US reaction : The Obama administration’s plans are running into predictable resistance from vested interests such as the military and the weapons industries (and their Congressional representatives), as well as right wing Republicans. Wider disarmament goals, which if attained would translate into reduced US military spending, have also been denounced. John Bolton (former US Representative to the UN) strongly opposes the Obama administration’s more open position on ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and on negotiating a Convention To Prevent an Arms Race in Space. However, some US opinion argues that the new US defense posture does not depart far enough from traditional US military policy.^{7 8}

4 *“TIME”, 23 February 2009 : “Taming the system – curbing the Pentagon’s appetite for expensive new weapons could be the US Defense Secretary Robert Gates’ biggest challenge yet”, by Mark Thompson.*

5. *International Herald Tribune (IHT), 24 April 2009 : “Gates’ next lever to reshape the Pentagon : the Quadrennial Defense review (QDR)” “...The QDR will assess whether the U should worry more about conventional threats from established countries or more “asymmetric” threats from unstable countries, eg Somalia, Pakistan...”*

6. *IHT, 7 April 2009 : “Gates’ budget plan reshapes Pentagon’s priorities”, by Elisabeth Bumiller and Christopher Drew*

7. *IHT, 26 May 2009 : “A fast way to lose the arms race”, by John R. Bolton*



- **New weapons** : Sections of the US military and their defenders are deploying arguments for wholly new and sometimes exotic weapons systems. The US Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has sought funding for new weapons in the “exo-atmosphere” that would destroy a fleeting target in 300 miliseconds.⁹ (9) The consensus that cyberwarfare and other IT threats need to be defended against is producing a raft of proposals for new weapons funding.

Given the above, disarmament and peace campaigners (both in the US and abroad) need to support the Obama administration’s commitment to cutbacks in military spending, oppose any tendency to backtrack on this, and resist concessions to pressures for new types of expensive and destabilizing weapons which would negate progress made in other areas (eg the Bunker Buster bomb).

Russia : Like many other countries, Russia’s defense strategy is in part a reaction to US (and other countries’) military pressures in recent years, as well as a reflection of its domestic circumstances. Russia has loudly proclaimed a new, more assertive, defense strategy. This reflects a realization that its armed forces have lagged behind those of its perceived adversaries since the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the end of the Warsaw Pact. It also reflects the perception that NATO has taken advantage of Russian weakness to further expand its reach right up to Russia’s frontiers, notably by admitting several former Warsaw Pact countries.¹⁰

If Western countries are now faced with a more aggressive Russian military posture, they have only themselves to blame, at least in part. They should have seized on the opportunity to reduce military tensions in Europe. The pressures from the East European countries newly freed from the fetters of Soviet domination, and seeking the protection of the West from this ever happening again, proved however too great. Many of these countries were soon admitted both to the European Union and to NATO, where they have strongly backed an anti-Russian military posture and a further expansion of the EU and NATO to include those ex Soviet bloc countries not yet members of Western groupings.

The Bush administration’s “War on Terror”, and the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, have never in itself been a prime cause of tension with Russia, beset as it has been by the separatist Muslim movements in Chechnya and other tensions in the Caucasus. It has rather been the way in which the US, during the Bush administration, stoked up its military spending and power across the board, stepping aside from a range of arms control agreements or objectives that would have underpinned a new détente with Russia. The Russians perceived a threat from US “encirclement”, including US bases near their borders. (China also has a similar view of US bases in Japan and South Korea).

The Russian reaction when oil and gas prices rose strongly, bringing a windfall to Russia, was to sharpen its defense strategy and greatly increase its military spending. Russia has had to scale back its expenditure plans somewhat in the face of the sharp decline in oil and gas prices and the worldwide economic recession, both of which have hit Russia very hard. Nevertheless, Russia still gives high priority to modernization of its armed forces.

In a similar way to the Obama administration, Russia aims to develop a more “operable”, streamlined military capable of fighting the same perceived threats of insurgency and terrorism. It plans to sharply reduce its ageing and expensive

8. *IHT*, 14 July 2009 : “*Empire of Bases*”, by Chalmers Johnson. Referring to the almost 800 US military bases around the world, Johnson comments “...No one suggests that closing some of these unpopular, expensive imperial enclaves might be a good way to save money. Instead, the reverse: the Kyrgystan air base will cost 3 times more, from \$17m to \$60m in annual rent – a condition of its being extended! ...Japan could also up the ante re the 38 US bases on Okinawa. The US empire of bases will eventually bankrupt the US”

9. *Defense News (US)*, 4 June 2009 : “*US force – sizing, basing, strategy need overhaul*” by John T. Bennett

10. *International Peace Bureau (IPB) News*, May 2009 : “*Russia rearms, in spite of economic downturn*”



300,000-strong officer grades which have made the Russian armed forces increasingly “top heavy”. The goal is a much leaner and fitter military force with a rapid reaction capacity. The poor performance of the Russian military during the Georgia crisis is seen as underscoring this need.¹¹

Faced with an overwhelming US advantage in conventional weaponry and more up-to-date US nuclear weapons, Russia seeks to devote greater resources to upgrading both its nuclear and conventional forces. So far in 2009, Russia has increased its military spending by 26% to \$37 billion, with \$1.9 billion for strategic weapons systems. As long as the US is perceived as retaining a huge conventional superiority, Russia is hesitant to reduce too sharply its nuclear arsenal, while the US is unconstrained by conventional arms controls. In a reversal of the Cold War roles, it is now the Russians who rely on nuclear weapons for deterrence against conventional forces.¹²

Russia is giving priority to its thriving arms exports for economic reasons and to exploit such exports to countries in the developing world. Thus in 2006 Russia contracted to sell combat jets, missiles and tanks to Algeria while Gazprom and Lukoil obtained oil and gas supply concessions, with Russia writing off \$5 billion in Soviet-era debt. It has made similar deals with Libya and Venezuela.¹³

Anything that reinforces the rather paranoid aspect of Russian policy is unhelpful. Disarmament campaigners need to continue our opposition to NATO expansion (no admission for Ukraine and Georgia) and to Western military policies that appear to Russia to be aggressive meddling in its own backyard. The Obama administration’s commitment to re-entering the international disarmament scene is a golden opportunity and must be vigorously supported. But the Russians will be looking at actions, not words. If progress is made in curbing NATO’s hostile profile, this will encourage efforts to reduce military spending generally around the world, including Russia.

France : Like the other Permanent Members of the UN Security Council, France is a prime exponent of militarization with its retention of nuclear weapons, large arms production and exports, and military bases abroad. It has recently been reinforcing this posture. In 2008, France overtook the UK in military expenditure (\$66 billion compared with the UK’s \$65 billion). Under Sarkozy, France has dropped the Gaullist policy of distancing itself from the perceived Anglo-Saxon domination of NATO, rejoining NATO’s Joint Command. Over the years 2004 – 2008, France was the fourth largest arms exporter, behind the US, Russia, and Germany, and just ahead of the UK.

The latest French Defense White Paper, published in June 2008, describes France’s new defense strategy in some detail. Apart from fully rejoining NATO, the aim is to set integrated goals for both foreign intervention and national defense with the key objectives being flexibility, deployability and inter-operability. France shares with Russia and the Western countries the objective of making the core of its armed forces more capable of rapid reaction and employment at full combat readiness. Weapons procurement and equipment are subordinated to this goal.¹⁴ (14)

The French nuclear deterrent is being modernized, as in other nuclear armed states. In parallel, the emphasis of France’s overseas military bases is being shifted from its traditional focus on its former African colonies to the Middle East. The first new French overseas base for 50 years was opened in the Gulf at Abu Dhabi, in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), in May 2009, under the name “Camp de la Paix” (“Peace Camp”). Two clear objectives are to guard

11. *Le Figaro (France)*, 18 March 2009 : “Medvedev veut réarmer la Russie face à l’OTAN”

12. *IHT*, 23 May 2009 : “A reset is not enough”, by E.Wayne Merry “...The broader problem is US dominance in non strategic weaponry, a basic security problem for Russia. Russia can not agree to deep reductions in its nuclear arsenal because US non nuclear systems, not constrained by arms controls, can be deterred only by nuclear weapons”

13. “*TIE*”, 17 April 2009 : “Russia Rearms” by Vivienne Walt

14. *International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), UK, The Military Balance, 2009*



against a perceived threat to other Middle Eastern countries from Iran, and to safeguard supplies of oil through the Straits of Hormuz, which account for 40% of the world's supplies.

This base takes its place alongside the traditionally strong UK and US (Fifth Fleet) naval presence in the Gulf and represents a further militarization of the region. Although only 500 French soldiers will be stationed there, the deep water port will accommodate French submarines and aircraft carriers, and the airport will provide a base for French "Mirage" and "Rafale" jets. The gathering of intelligence in the area is a priority, so equipment (including aircraft) serving this goal is being stationed at the base.¹⁵

Although French military involvement in Africa is being relatively downgraded, European involvement is being stepped up with active French participation. This takes the form of the European (EU) force "EUFOR" stationed in Chad, which has a peace-keeping role in the area adjoining the conflict and humanitarian emergency in Darfur.¹⁶ The resources dimension of militarization in Africa is evident, as securing the supply of key minerals from African sources remains a key goal of Western countries in the face of growing Chinese competition. (See also **Russia** above).

United Kingdom : Like the US, Russia, France and China, the UK's defense budget has increased in 2009. Military spending stands at £38 billion, despite the severe UK economic recession.

One reason is the soaring cost of British military operations in Afghanistan, which have increased by 50% since the same period last year. There are currently about 8,000 British troops in Afghanistan and the number will increase this year by between 1,500 and 3,000.¹⁷

In the current pre-electoral situation, military spending has become a political football. There are indications that the Labour Party, in its efforts to stay in power, will undertake to protect defense spending from budget cuts next year in the face of Conservative plans to include defense in spending reductions. The Conservatives have however pledged to spare "urgent, operational" spending from cuts, no doubt code for the Afghanistan war.

One key area of uncertainty is the fate of current plans to upgrade the UK nuclear deterrent through development of the new Trident missile at £20 billion. This, like the Afghanistan war, is unpopular and there is strong opposition to it in the Labour Party. Current plans for two new aircraft carriers, to be loaded with 150 fighter bombers, may also be reconsidered. The issue of employment creation also recurs in UK discussions of military spending. The UK Minister for Defense Procurement has been quoted as admitting that much defense-related production is capital intensive, and therefore less useful in job creation than the more labour-intensive employment in other sectors.¹⁸ Meanwhile the top British arms manufacturer, BAE - second largest defense contractor in the world, after Boeing (US) - has been making record profits based partly on its thriving sales of armoured fighting vehicles for use in Iraq and Afghanistan.¹⁹

NATO : It is not possible to consider the defense strategies of many Western countries without looking at the important influence of NATO, of which most are members. Unfortunately, the continued existence and expansion of

15. *Le Figaro*, 26 May 2009 : "La France ouvre une base militaire à Abu Dhabi", by Isabelle Lasserre

16. *Le Figaro*, 26 May 2009, Pierre Rousselin : ".....Ainsi, l'Eufor, l'opération menée au Tchad dans le cadre de la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense, a montré qu'il était possible de mutualiser l'effort que notre pays assumaient souvent seul en Afrique »

17. *Guardian Weekly (UK)*, 20 February 2009

18. *Campaign against the Arms Trade (CAAT), UK, Bulletin April/June 2009*

19. *Guardian Weekly (UK)*, 27 February 2009



NATO is one of the key expressions of Western militarisation. Some of the use of NATO forces can arguably be defended, such as the interdicting of drug traffickers and opium factories by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) which has been recently expanded.²⁰ However NATO's policy of "minimum nuclear deterrence" underpins the alliance's reliance on nuclear weapons and acts against the objective of preventing nuclear proliferation.²¹ It remains to be seen whether President Obama's recent speech proclaiming his ambition of a "nuclear weapons free world" will translate – beyond the nuclear warhead reductions in a new START Treaty – into any serious move by NATO away from its nuclear deterrence doctrine.²²

If NATO's unpopular war in Afghanistan is unsuccessful this will discredit the Alliance. Russia continues to resent NATO's expansion towards its borders and the courtship of NATO by countries such as Georgia and the Ukraine. But the desire for control of oil and gas supplies in the Middle East, and the need for secure pipelines in the Caucasus, have made the area together with Central Asia strategically sensitive for reasons of resource scarcity as well as Islamic terrorism. The deepening water crisis in the Middle East is perhaps a factor adding to these tensions, showing the impact of climate change through global warming. Taken together, these factors help to explain the growing militarisation in the wider region, including China which also faces a restless Uighur minority in its province of Sinkiang.

China : In tandem with China's remarkable economic growth, the country has been steadily increasing its military power. Much of this can perhaps be explained as due to the "prestige" factor referred to earlier, whereby a country's badge of influence on the world scene is seen to necessarily include military power. China has been a long way behind in this sense. At a time when sheer numbers in a country's armed forces counts for much less than power and rapidity of military "punch", China's massive but relatively poorly equipped land army is a declining asset.

China's defense strategy is therefore to invest its growing resources in a modernized, slimmed down, army and an expanded modern navy and air force. Though exact figures are hard to confirm, China's military spending is estimated to amount to \$85 billion in 2008, second only to (but far behind) the US, and this year is set to increase by 15%, one of the faster growing military budgets. Meanwhile the Peoples' Liberation Army (PLA)'s relatively poor response to recent natural calamities, and the challenge of restive minorities in Sinkiang and Tibet, have led China to put priority on making its armed forces more effective in disaster relief and in domestic repression. But in addition, China's conventional forces and nuclear deterrent are being modernized while its navy is being considerably expanded into further "deep water" capacities. China's participation in international peace-keeping operations is also being increased.²³

Probably China does not perceive a threat of the same magnitude from US power as Russia, though if Japan substantially re-arms, that could change. China is however acutely in need of secure supplies of overseas oil, gas, and a range of minerals. This will inevitably encourage its militarization. The government is however aware of the need to make its military activities more transparent, and is therefore opening a new website on the lines of that of the US State Department, in addition to the existing Chinese Government website.²⁴

20. *"The Friend" (UK Quakers), 17 April 2009, Rae Street: "NATO continues its dangerous and destabilizing policy of expanding to take in new members"*

21. *IISS, The Military Balance, 2009*

22. *IPB News, 3 March 2009 : Ernie Regehr (Project Ploughshares, Canada) : "NATO should reinvent its security doctrine and end its reliance on nuclear weapons"*

23. www.china.org.cn

24. *Le Figaro, 18 March 2009*



Meanwhile the danger of war between Taiwan and China appears to have receded for the time being. Taiwan and China are expanding their range of contacts and Taiwan is due to reduce its military forces by 16% over the next five years, to 210,000 in 2014 (from a postwar high of 600,000). Conscription will be ended in 2011. China has said it is ready to sign a peace agreement with Taiwan.²⁵ Nevertheless, Taiwan continues to import large quantities of arms from the US, and competition for resources in the Spratley Islands remains a source of tension between China and several states in the region.

Other countries' defense strategies and military spending : The recession is causing some countries, notably in Europe, to consider making some cuts in defense spending. But with some exceptions (eg Taiwan) defense strategists are usually reluctant to downplay reliance on military security.

Developing countries with rapidly growing economies, such as India and Brazil, now playing larger roles in international economic decision making (via G20 for example) are maintaining significant real increases in their military spending, partly for reasons of power projection and prestige. But the sharpened perceived threats from internal or regional instability, minority grievances, and in some cases insurgency play a role in many countries' defense strategies – not least the poorer ones – to the detriment of other kinds of spending, such as infrastructure, health and education, which are more socially desirable.²⁶ We now turn briefly to a number of other states, and identify their main motives for high military expenditure.

India : Military spending is set to increase by 24% in 2009. India has recently joined the club of countries that have constructed nuclear submarines.²⁷ The main motives or threats behind India's defense decisions, apart from prestige and the desire to rival China's regional dominance is doing, include long running tensions with Pakistan over Kashmir and Islamic terrorism, as well as restless minorities within the nation's borders (Nagas, Naxalites etc).

Pakistan : High military spending in the face of internal and Afghan Islamic extremism, tension with India over Kashmir, nuclear rivalry with India.

Middle East : The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, insurgencies in Pakistan and Yemen, tensions over Iran's possible nuclear ambitions and the Israeli/Palestinian conflict are factors behind the increasing military spending in the region. Even Jordan, not often mentioned as an unstable country, increased its military spending by 57% between 2005 and 2007. The Kurdish problem contributes to high military expenditure by Turkey. In addition, competition for control over oil and gas supplies in the region, and concerns for secure pipelines in the area and in the adjoining Caucasus and Central Asia, remain key factors. Almost all states except Iran are one way or another clients of the US and are subject to a complex amalgam of military and political pressures.

Latin American countries : In Brazil, President Lula issued a new defense strategy in December 2008 aimed at a substantial upgrading of Brazil's armed forces. Brazil is acquiring attack helicopters from Russia, and submarines from France. The motive seems to be mainly prestige, since Brazil has few external threats. Colombia and Peru, faced with insurgencies, have high military expenditure. Oscar Arias, President of Costa Rica (which has no army) has recently denounced Latin America's projected military expenditure of \$50 billion, nearly double that of five years ago

25. SIPRI Yearbook, 2009 : www.sipri.org

26. IHT, 30 March 2009, by Travis Sharp

27. Guardian Weekly, 17 July 2009 : "Of guns and democracy – military spending is a threat to human rights in Latin America", by President Oscar Arias, Costa Rica, Nobel Peace Prize winner



– this in a continent where 200 million people live on less than \$2 a day. He pointed to the continuing power of the military in Latin America, who often view themselves, despite ostensibly democratic systems, as the final arbiter of social conflicts (as in the recent coup in Honduras).²⁸ Indeed, the political, self-serving power of military/industrial establishments around the world continues to be a prime driver of military expenditure, including in several Western countries.

African countries : African military spending is low in absolute terms, but high relative to the needs of the people. This reflects a continuing military culture - despite the wave of formal democratisation processes - and wars due to border tensions (Ethiopia/Eritrea), and instabilities associated with weak central government or Islamic extremism (insurgencies in Somalia, Chad, Sudan), struggles over resources (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, etc). There is also ongoing spending on military prestige and regional power projection in countries such as Egypt, Algeria, Libya, and South Africa.

Australia : The government of Australia's internationally-minded Prime Minister Kevin Rudd released a Defense White Paper in May 2009 outlining a sharp upgrading of Australia's armed forces. China's military build-up was mentioned as one reason, and the need for a higher Australian profile generally. \$72 billion will be spent on, *inter alia*, doubling Australia's submarine fleet and adding up to 100 fighter jets to the Australian air force.²⁹ It is likely that the rising military power of China explains increasing ASia-Pacific defense spending, as well as tensions over **North Korea's** nuclear arms and hostile posture.

3. WIDER GEO-POLITICAL ISSUES

Resource Competition

The world's growing economy has an insatiable appetite for the dwindling supplies of non-renewable fossil fuels as well as supplies of minerals needed in industrial processes. Control over their supply is a contributing factor to the rising military spending and military activities of the main powers active in the areas where these supplies are located – notably the Middle East, Caucasus, Central Asia, and parts of Africa and Latin America. Although it will be mitigated by the development – probably faster as the years go by – of non-renewable energy supplies and “green” technology, control over resources will remain an incentive for military spending.

This has been well described in Michael Klare's book “*Resource Wars – The New Landscape of Global Conflict*”³⁰. The paragraphs in this section draw on this work.

We will look below at the main natural resources over which there is a danger of increasing conflict – oil, water, minerals and timber. In the next section, we will look also at the closely related factor of climate change which carries with it the risk of conflict over two other key natural resources – the land and the sea, which sustain the agriculture and fisheries that feed the world.

Oil

Leaving aside fertile land and sea, oil is by far the most important natural resource, far surpassing natural gas, coal and other non-renewable sources of energy as a fuel for the world economy. Oil is also the key fuel for the world's transport systems. Car ownership is increasing dramatically in many countries; rapid industrialization and rising living

28. “Time” Magazine, 13 July 2009 : “Mr World”, by Hannah Beech

29. “Time” Magazine, 13 July 2009 : “Mr World”, by Hannah Beech

30. “*Resource Wars – The New Landscape of Global Conflict*”, by Michael Klare (Henry Holt & Company, Canada, 2002)



standards are driving up demand for oil as a source of energy and transport fuel. The demand for electricity is increasing rapidly, stimulated by rapidly increasing use of the internet. Oil is also used widely as feedstock in the production of plastics, artificial fibres and lubricants.

The Persian Gulf

14 countries jointly produce 90% of the world's oil supply – Saudi Arabia, Iraq, United Arab Emirates (UAE), Kuwait, Iran, Russia, Libya, China, Nigeria, Norway, and the UK. The importance of the Persian Gulf area is shown by the fact that five countries that account for two thirds of proven reserves are located there – Saudi Arabia, Iraq, UAE, Kuwait, and Iran.

Troop levels and military expenditure in the oil producing zones have increased, especially in the Persian Gulf area and the Middle East. This has accompanied a relative decline in military forces stationed in West and Central Europe, the earlier focus of the East/West divide during the Cold War. The Gulf War of 1992 was explicitly oil related, and many see the Iraq war of 2003 and the ongoing war in Afghanistan as reflecting the strategic priority given by Western countries to preventing those strategically located countries from falling again under the control of régimes hostile to Western interests.

It is not only safeguarding the production of oil for Western markets that Western countries seek to protect in their military strategies, but the unimpeded flow of its sea transport. The world's oil transport chokepoints, through which pass 30 mbd - million barrels of oil a day - (40% of world requirements) are the following:

Oil flow in 1998 (mbd)

Straits of Hormuz (at the entrance to the Persian Gulf)	15.4
Straits of Malacca (between Indonesia and Malaysia)	9.5
Straits of Bab el Mandeb (between Yemen and Eritrea)	3.3
Suez canal and Sumed Pipeline (Egypt)	3.1
Bosphorus/Turkish Straits (connecting Mediterranean to the Black Sea)	1.7
Panama Canal (connects Caribbean Sea to Pacific Ocean)	0.6

Projections show that the Persian Gulf will account for an ever-expanding share of the world's oil requirements, from 27% in 1990 to 33% in 2010 and 39% in 2020. The strategic importance of Iran, controlling access to the Straits of Hormuz, is evident. The Sunni Arab states in the area, as well as Israel, are anxious over Iran's rising power. The danger of conflict with Iran is growing, heightened by the possibility of Iranian possession of nuclear weapons. The US has based its 5th Fleet in the Gulf for many years, stationed in Bahrein. Other Western navies are present there in growing force; we have seen that France has opened a base in Abu Dhabi.

Caspian Sea Basin

The Caspian Sea basin is the new oil "El Dorado", with large reserves and production expected to reach 4mbd by 2010 and 6mbd in 2020. It is the scene of sharp rivalry. The US and Western countries are investing heavily in developing oil production to lessen their dependence on the Persian Gulf.



They are developing pipelines to bypass Iran and Russia, by transporting oil from Azerbaijan through Georgia to Turkey and the Mediterranean. The EU seeks to decrease its dependence on Russian supplies of oil and natural gas. US – Russian rivalry for influence in the Caucasus is growing. Russian conflicts with Muslim insurgencies have been centred on Chechnya and the neighbouring provinces of Ingushetzia and Dagestan. The recent Georgia/Russia war of August 2008 was an example of Georgia's unsuccessful attempt to decrease Russian influence and align itself more closely with NATO. Other countries in the Black Sea area seeking to reduce Russian influence over them, such as Ukraine, and are the focus of related tensions. There are ongoing insurgencies in several of the Central Asian republics such as Uzbekistan, Kyrgystan and Tajikistan. China is rapidly developing its oil supplies from the area, with pipelines from Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan to China's Xinkiang Province – now the scene for tensions between the majority Han Chinese and the Muslim Uighur minority.

There are tensions over oil development rights amongst the states adjoining or near the Caspian Sea. Russia and Iran consider the Caspian Sea to be a lake and not subject to the UN Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS). Azerbaijan and other countries involved (including the US and Turkey) disagree, arguing that national sectors extend from the littoral states into the Caspian Sea – affording the littoral states territorial rights.

South China Sea

There are conflicting claims between China, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Taiwan over some of the islands (Spratly, Paracel) in the South China Sea. Naval clashes have occurred over a number of years, and tensions continue. Growing Chinese naval power in the region is an added source of tension. China's rapidly growing demand for oil imports enhances its desire to safeguard sea transport through the area, including the Malacca Straits which are subject to piracy.

Water Conflict

In the area stretching from North Africa to the Near East and South Asia, the demand for water is rapidly overtaking the existing supply. This danger is especially acute in regions where rainfall is scant and several countries depend on a single major source of water – the Nile, the Jordan, the Eurphrates, the Ganges etc.³¹ To complicate matters, population growth is heavily concentrated in these areas. Global warming aggravates the situation, leading to changed rainfall patterns and drought in many parts of the region. Waters in underground reservoirs – aquifers – are non-renewable resources, because once fully tapped they will not fill up again for thousands of years. Desalination of water or reclamation of urban waster could significantly increase water supply, but existing processes are too costly to make this practical in the near future.

Competition among the states in the Nile area - Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, and Uganda - for access to the Nile's waters will intensify with rapidly growing populations and the effects of drought. The Jordan River basin area comprises Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Palestine; the Tigris/Euphrates system passes through Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Turkey; the Indus basin is shared amongst Afghanistan, China, India, Pakistan and Kashmir. All these areas are deeply divided along political, religious, ethnic and ideological lines. Disputes over water are likely to grow in intensity. Hopefully, efforts at international cooperation will prevail over the temptation to resort to armed force to safeguard water supplies.

Minerals, Timber and Outside Intervention

The growing world economy and living standards means an insatiable demand not only for oil and natural gas, but also for timber, gems and minerals such as cobalt, platinum, bauxite, manganese, uranium, and gold. Africa is rich in many of these (as well as oil), and therefore a scene of growing competition for access to them.

31. Natascha Beshorner "Water and Instability in the Middle East" (Adelphi Paper, International Institute for Strategic Studies – IISS – London, 1992)



The recent wars in Angola and Sierra Leone have been largely over control over oil or diamonds. The long-running internal conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire) typifies the result of a power vacuum when the central government is weak and divided – often on ethnic lines – and viewed as corrupt. Conflict is more likely to persist if the international community refuses to intervene to halt the fighting and internal belligerents are able to sell their highly valued commodities on the international market, often illicitly.

Meanwhile the reach of large global companies has meant their involvement in internal conflicts and the widespread use of private military companies employing mercenaries (the “privatization” of war), outside the control of governments or parliaments.

The UN has had limited effectiveness in its interventions to prevent conflict, hampered by the unwillingness of major powers, especially the US, to provide enough troops, funds and equipment for peace-keeping operations. Recently however, there has been an increased recognition that the international community cannot stand by when dictatorial and corrupt regimes bring about misery to their own people. Following a report by a Commission headed by the former Australian Prime Minister, Gareth Evans, the concept of an international “Responsibility to Protect” inhabitants of countries subject to gross abuse has gained acceptance. A danger in following this path, however, is that it could encourage foreign aggressions by countries eager for military involvement beyond their borders for self-serving reasons.

Climate Change

Humanity faces a common threat in rapid man-made climate change, shown in particular by global warming and weather disturbances. These interlink with, and compound, the scarcity of natural resources as a factor for potential conflict.

Ban Ki Moon, the UN Secretary General, warned in 2007 that “*The majority of the United Nations’ work still focuses on preventing and ending conflict, but the danger posed by war to all of humanity and to our planet is at least matched by the climate crisis and global warming.....(The effects of climate change are likely to become a major driver of war and conflict)*” In a similar vein, the US Defense Department issued a report in 2003 arguing that a reduction in global carrying capacity combined with an increase in extreme weather events could lead to destabilization and thus to widespread and large-scale violent conflict.³²

Climate change is having a dramatic effect in the Arctic, with the melting of the Polar ice-cap around the North Pole, and with growing water scarcity in drought-affected regions. The former is producing a scramble, amongst the countries adjoining the Arctic sea, for development rights of undersea oil and gas which will become commercially accessible once the Arctic sea ice recedes sufficiently. Russia is planning a fleet of floating and submersible nuclear power stations to exploit Arctic oil and gas, which constitute about 20% of the world’s sources of fossil fuels. In tandem with this scramble, countries such as Russia plan an expansion in their military capability to defend this commercial exploitation.³³ The potential for military conflict is present: Russia shares an Arctic coastline with the US, Canada, Norway and Denmark, all NATO countries.

Environmental factors are however probably only of secondary importance in leading to conflict, compared to factors such as non-democratic regimes, a local history of conflict, and political instability. One study concludes “There is every reason to be cautious about the links between climate change and conflict. Existing environment and conflict

32. Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall “An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for US National Security” : Washington D.C. Environmental Media Services, 2003

33 IHT, 3 May 2009. John Vidal, “The Observer”, London “Russia to build Arctic nuclear stations”



research has simply not produced sufficient evidence to make anything but highly speculative claims about the effects of climate change and violent conflict".³⁴ We look now at various specific impacts of climate change.

Food The Fourth Assessment Report (FAR) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)³⁵ and other reports have concluded that climate changes, perhaps verging on the catastrophic in terms of reduced agricultural yields and lower fish catches, will produce lower levels of development and a destroyed livelihood for many. This human security disaster is not likely however to result in violent conflict because the changes are likely to be felt over a number of years and even decades, while it is rapid deterioration in supply that is more likely to trigger conflict than gradual deterioration.

Water

Over the longer term, the FAR estimates a reduction in water availability of between 10% and 30% in many already water-stressed areas, including the Mid West of the US, much of Southern Europe and many parts of Africa. The FAR suggests that, in Africa alone, between 75 million and 250 million people could be affected by climate-related water stress within 15 years from 2007. In many parts of the world this problem is expected to be compounded by the decline of glaciers and snow cover. Such a decline is likely to provoke dramatically reduced flows in important river systems such as the Indus in Pakistan and the Ganges in India. (See previous section). Growing populations in some of these areas will add to this problem.

It is not clear however that water insecurity will lead to conflict. There is evidence for both conflict and cooperation among riparian states. Much depends on complex social, legal and political variables such as dispute resolution procedures, the nature of local property rights and the ability of each side to enforce agreements.³⁶

Refugees

The food and water scarcity implications of climate change will probably have flow-on effects in increasing the number of environmental refugees. The melting of the Greenland ice sheet and the West Antarctic ice sheet could raise sea levels by 7 metres by 2100. But in "mega-delta" regions such as Bangladesh 5.5 million peoples' homes will be flooded by a sea level rise of 45 cm, equating to a 10.9% loss of Bangladeshi territory. At the global level, climate change could force 200 million people from their homes. Some of the environmental migrants will bring skills to their new homes. Most studies conclude that these migrations are more likely to provoke some instances of sporadic violence in the countries of the refugees' destination rather than wholesale violent conflict.^{37,38}

Securitisation of the Climate Change Debate

34. Clionadh Norda and Nils Petter Gleditsch "Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Armed Conflict": Political Geography, no. 6, 2007

35. IPCC 4th Assessment Report "Climate Change", Geneva, 2007

36. Nils Gleditsch, Ragnhild Nordas, and Idean Salehyan "Coping with Crisis" (Working Paper Series, 2007)

37. Cullen Hendrix and Sarah Glaser "Trends and Triggers - Climate Change and Civil Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa" : Political Geography, No 6, 2007

38. Idean Salehyan "Refugees, Climate Change, and Instability" : Human Security and Climate Change – An International Workshop, 21-23 June 2005 ("Coping with Crisis", 2007)



Presenting the dangers from climate change as a threat to nation states requiring a military response is the wrong response to the threats concerned. Military institutions are not appropriate to deal with climate change, since they were designed for completely different types of threat.³⁹ (38) The existence of institutions at local, national and international levels that provide non-violent avenues for complaint and compensation are crucial to addressing the grievances that can otherwise lead people to engage in violent conflict. Development aid, education and government capacity building are essential. Technical transfer is urgently needed to aid water saving and facilitate less water-intensive irrigation practices.

The UN and its Agencies, NGOs and other international bodies have a major role to play. The UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) can play a key role in organizing humanitarian relief, starting employment programmes, increasing local capacity, providing technical expertise, health care, education, and aiding states with migrant screening and processing. The World Health Organisation (WHO) and Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) can provide vaccinations and prevent the spread of disease amongst refugees.

In conclusion, to imply that climate change will become a major cause of war and conflict is dangerous in that it threatens to divert attention and resources from what needs to be done and towards military responses that are the last thing the world needs. The emphasis in combating the effects of climate change must be on institutions and on a unified approach that involves actors from all levels of politics and society.

There are some who might dispute the view that the growing adverse impact of climate change is really a factor behind rising military expenditure, or even that it necessarily constitutes potential for future conflict. But the evidence is powerful. The urgency of the climate crisis should be a spur to move away from counter-productive military expenditure to divert the huge amount of resources so used to peaceful and sustainable development. Cooperative development of “green” technology, rather than military technology, should be seen as the way out of natural resource scarcity and dangerous climate change. This would also contribute to a gradual decline in military spending.

The military’s peacekeeping and humanitarian role

We listed humanitarian protection at the outset amongst the reasons for the rise in military spending. It is notable that humanitarian protection is given little acknowledgment or prominence in most defense policies and strategies. This is probably not only because the sums spent, and military staff allocated to these tasks, are relatively minor. The more likely reason is that it is a new area of activity not traditionally associated with the military.

Given the threat from insurgents or terrorists often encountered in post conflict situations, or in situations on the verge of conflict, the need for a possible resort to armed force is used to legitimize the use of the military in peace keeping operations. However there are a number of tasks at present carried out by the military which could better be left to the civilian sector, such as armed police forces and volunteers from NGOs.

Moving from militarisation

We have looked at the main threat perceptions and rationales around the world that lie behind militarization and high defense spending. These can be summarized as embodying the traditional military security approach. We now look at this picture and outline the arguments to contest the military security approach in terms of an alternative human security approach which puts priority on seeking cooperative, longer term policies that address the underlying tensions giving rise to conflict.

4. CATEGORIES OF WARFARE

39. Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver, and Jeap de Wilde “Security – A New Framework for Analysis” : Boulder & London, 1998



A. MASS DESTRUCTION

The Military Security Approach

Perceived Threats :

- A good number of the governments of the more powerful and richer countries see their countries as threatened by enemies armed, or potentially armed, with weapons of mass destruction.
- Since the first production in 1945 of nuclear weapons by the United States, and their use in the Second World War against Japan, there has been a self-perpetuating nuclear arms amongst the gradually expanding club of nuclear weapon states.
- Alongside nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction such as chemical and biological weapons have been developed and deployed.
- In addition to the perception of a possible attack by an aggressor state with nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction, there has recently been added the threat of suicidal attack by terrorist groups armed with such weapons.

Doctrine of nuclear deterrence

- In response to the perceived threat from enemy states, the doctrine of retaliatory response in kind has been developed with the intention to dissuade the adversary state.
- Arsenals of nuclear and other weapons have therefore been retained. We have seen how NATO countries have a “nuclear umbrella” which keeps the doctrine alive.
- The nuclear weapons club has grown from the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (US, Russia, France, UK, China) to include India, Pakistan, Israel, and North Korea.
- Faced also with the danger from “rogue states” that may have acquired or be acquiring nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction, the Bush administration in the US developed the doctrine of a right to pre-emptive attack. The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was an expression of this doctrine.

Military spending

Spending on weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is mainly on nuclear weapons, but also on chemical and biological ones. Taking different categories of expenditure, we get the following picture.

High: ground, air and naval weapons.

Medium: physical infrastructure and bases.

Low: salaries and training for military and civilian staff, including scientists.

Overall: high, though limited to relatively few countries. Large levels of Research and Development (R&D) spending.

Country Examples

We have looked earlier at the main nuclear weapons states (**US, Russia, France, UK, China**) and seen how they spend heavily on nuclear weapons and rely on them as an important part of their defense strategies. Here it is worth



drawing attention to two more recent nuclear weapons states, **India** and **Pakistan**, which developed nuclear weapons in defiance of the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

India and Pakistan exemplify the worst consequences of holding nuclear weapons. The great expense involved has a much greater impact on them than on richer nuclear weapon states, since both India and Pakistan have considerable poverty and their need to allocate resources wisely for economic development is the greater. Moreover there is long standing political tension between the two, centred on the Kashmir dispute, and Pakistan's instability raises the spectre of its nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. India and Pakistan are engaged in a nuclear arms race which adds an extra layer of danger to their rivalry. India developed nuclear weapons perhaps mainly in response to China's nuclear stockpile, and as part of its rivalry with China, though there are long-standing border tensions between the two countries. Now, however, one likely reason for **Iran's** possible attempt to develop nuclear weapons is to follow the example of Pakistan and India, and to dissuade any attack upon it in the way that North Korea developed nuclear weapons probably to dissuade a similar attack upon it to that which Iraq experienced in 2003. One of the adverse knock-on consequences of the 2003 attack on Iraq – ostensibly to pre-empt Iraq's acquisition of weapons of mass destruction – is to make nuclear proliferation more likely.

The Human Security Approach

Adverse costs of military security approach to mass destruction threat:

- The doctrine and policy of nuclear deterrence is suicidal in its rationale. Its retention encourages non- members of the nuclear weapons club to go down the same road.
- The financial costs are huge. , both in actual budgetary expenditure and in terms of “opportunity costs” of potential economic and social gains squandered. The disarmament costs of destroying nuclear missiles and monitoring a disarmament treaty (while considerable) are far less than the operational costs of, for example, deploying nuclear weapons.⁴⁰
- The potential adverse impact on human health, lives, and the environment from the use of weapons of mass destruction is enormous.
- The doctrine of preemptive attack undermines efforts at international negotiation to resolve tensions. It is unacceptable on ethical grounds and under international law.

Proposed action on human security basis :

- Progress in existing efforts at international cooperation on WMD disarmament is urgently needed. This includes full implementation of the Nuclear Weapons Treaty (NPT), at present held up mainly by the nuclear weapons states and NATO.
- Fuller implementation of the Biological and Chemical Weapons Conventions, mainly through wider adherence and better verification systems, is needed.
- A total discrediting is needed of the doctrines of nuclear deterrence and of pre-emptive attack.
- A break in the impasse at the Conference on Disarmament (CD), especially on nuclear disarmament and nuclear fissile stockpiles, is urgently required.

⁴⁰ Ben Cramer “*Nuclear Weapons : At What Cost?*” : International Peace Bureau, July 2009



B. CONVENTIONAL STATE WARFARE

The Military Security Approach

Perceived threat and rationale

- We have seen that there are a number of states around the world situated in areas of high tension which fear an attack by a hostile state using conventional weapons. Most of these are in South or East Asia (India, Pakistan, North and South Korea), the Middle East (Israel, Iran) the Caucasus (Georgia) and in Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia). This perceived threat reinforces the rationale of prestige and power projection that underlies a good deal of military spending worldwide.

Defense policies and doctrines

- These express the traditional centuries-old military mind set whereby an external threat is deterred mainly by the adversary facing an equally or more powerfully armed state ready to resort to arms in its defense. An arms race fuelled by mutual fear often ensues.

Military Spending

Military spending levels remain high, or are increasing, in many countries, especially the poorer ones that can least afford this in economic and social terms. We see the following picture.

High : Ground, naval and air weapons (heavy weapons, intermediate weapons, light and small weapons).

Surplus light and small weapons often find their way into the hands of criminal, terrorist or insurgent groups. Illicit trade world-wide in all these weapons categories continues. Social insecurity is substantially aggravated. Landmines and cluster bombs cause large civilian casualties, though their use has been curtailed through the recently negotiated Landmines Treaty and Cluster Bombs Convention. Depleted Uranium (DU) used in tanks is suspected of causing radiation damage to troops and civilians which lasts long after hostilities end. Alliances such as NATO encourage high conventional defense spending, even though in Europe the danger of conventional attack is very remote and the opposing Warsaw Pact was dissolved following the demise of the Soviet Union.

High : Military and associated civilian staff; military bases and infrastructure. For example, France has opened a new military base at Abu Dhabi.

Country examples :

Of the countries mentioned above as having high conventional military spending, several add this burden to their nuclear weapons spending (**Israel, India, Pakistan, North Korea**) and increase political tensions in their regions.

However, some other countries are increasing their military spending while facing no obvious threat of attack. This is the case for **Brasil, Venezuela, South Africa, and Australia**. They do not suffer internal insurgencies. Why, then, do they spend large sums on their armed forces? One must conclude that a main reason is to obtain the prestige to accompany their economic status; another reason could be to safeguard their natural resources (oil, minerals) from a conceived military threat by resource-hungry countries.

There are countries with tensions with neighbours such as **Israel/Iran, Ethiopia/Eritrea, Azerbaijan/Armenia, Georgia/Russia, and Ukraine/Russia** whose military spending reflects and aggravates these tensions. In the case of the Caucasus and former Soviet territories, the attractions of NATO membership to countries in the area makes the situation more tense.



The human security approach

Adverse costs of military security approach to threat of conventional attack:

- The conventional arms sector employs large sums and staff which divert resources from socially productive uses. Some reconversion of arms production to civilian use has taken place after the end of the Cold War, but not enough.
- In a range of countries (Europe, North and South America) the likelihood of conventional attack has greatly diminished, yet military interest groups continue to wield their power to secure high military spending levels. Above all, wars cause many deaths amongst soldiers and civilians and
- make their way into the hands of terrorists and criminals, causing many deaths, much suffering, and social and economic dislocation.
- **Proposed action on human security basis**
- Greater international cooperation is needed to diminish the internal, regional or international tensions that are used to justify military spending, and extend disarmament in new spheres.
- Continued efforts are needed to control and halt the international arms trade – both legal and illicit – together with the drugs trade that often finances the illegal transfers.
- The needed cooperation is often as much economic and environmental as political, directed at promoting a sustainable economic development that can reduce the tensions flowing from poverty.

C. COUNTER INSURGENCY AND TERRORISM

The Military Security Approach

Perceived Threats

- Much of Western Europe and North America is now free from the threat to the state from radically disaffected minorities or insurgencies, though the break-up of the Soviet bloc brought the conflicts in Former Yugoslavia and the Caucasus. However, this stability does not exist in many parts of the world where the state is weak and undemocratic, and faced with rebellious armed groups.
- Counter terrorism and counter insurgency go back to the 1950s and 1960s with Western wars against Communist-inspired forces in Malaya, Vietnam, Central America etc. Apartheid South Africa waged its own counter insurgency wars.
- The threat from terrorism has however taken on new dimensions recently in many countries. The “9-11” attacks in the US by extremist Muslims, and subsequent Muslim terrorist attacks in Spain, the UK, India, Somalia, Indonesia etc have led to a heightened threat perception from Islamic terrorism. The widespread use of suicide bombing, and the increasing incidence of hostage-taking and maritime piracy have also sharpened the perceived threat worldwide from terrorism.

Defense Policies and Doctrines

- The military security based response has been to develop new strategies for counter insurgency warfare. We have seen that many defense doctrines are placing greater emphasis on capability for this type of warfare, both rural and urban, as well as on sophisticated intelligence and IT systems and weapons technology designed to identify and meet the threat.



- The US-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are expressions of the new counter insurgency policies, but the ongoing counter insurgency wars in Pakistan, Colombia, Somalia, etc also fall into this category.
- The role of navies in combating piracy in threatened sea lanes has altered naval priorities towards smaller, coastal ships as we see in the case of US, French, British and other defense strategies.

Military Spending

Expenditure on counter terrorism accounts for a growing share of total military spending, and is an important reason for the growth in overall military spending. Most spending goes on medium or light weapons systems, highly trained or specialist forces and surveillance equipment. We have seen how the new US defense strategies also give priority to drone aircraft. Thermobaric weapons, using lethal blast effect against insurgents, fall into this category.

Country examples:

We have mentioned above **Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Colombia** and **Somalia** as countries with ongoing insurgency wars. There are other examples, such as **Sudan (Darfur), Yemen, Algeria**, the **Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)** - one of the worst and longest standing civil wars – and **Burma** (with several long-running insurgencies). Recently, the Tamil insurgency in **Sri Lanka** ended with much loss of life. In several of these wars, internal and international competition for control over valuable natural resources, and the easy availability of arms, compounds the situation.

The Human Security Approach

Adverse costs of military security approach to terrorism and insurgency

- From a human security standpoint, the main adverse costs of the emphasis on counter insurgency and counter terrorism is not just financial waste but also human suffering. Innocent civilians are killed, often in great numbers (Iraq, increasingly in Afghanistan) in the crossfire of armed conflict, or displaced as refugees in even greater numbers (Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka).

Proposed action on human security basis

- Over the longer term, a key way of tackling insurgencies is to cooperate on resolving by negotiation the political grievances that underlie many such conflicts (Kashmir, Israel/Palestine), and to working for economic development and more democratic government. NATO policies in Afghanistan now partly reflect this.
- In the shorter term, military intervention by outside powers usually exacerbates the situation (Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan). If there has to be fighting, it is best left to the local military.
- Civil society is already working through cooperative action in many areas to reduce the tensions that give rise to terrorism and insurgency. This includes efforts to eliminate or control the supply of arms to the belligerents, and reduce trafficking in drugs which often provides financial resources for the belligerents. This is where the human security approach lays its emphasis.

D. HUMANITARIAN PROTECTION AND DISASTER RELIEF

The Military Approach

Perceived threat

- Peace keeping under the auspices of the United Nations, EU, African Union etc around the world aims at protecting civilians in post conflict situations, and preventing a return to armed hostilities.



- The danger of further loss of life in situations of natural calamity (earthquakes, monsoons etc) is also a reason to involve the military.
- On the whole, armed soldiers in peace keeping forces have performed a valuable role in restraining armed conflict and in policing the peace, though they can be ineffective (eg UN Force in the Congo).
- The military can be restive however in situations where they can not use their fighting skills, and where a role in local economic or rehabilitation is required. Here, soldiers trained to carry out civilian-type aid, eg in Afghanistan, are not as effective as civilians from aid organizations – but the latter are deterred by insecure local conditions.

Military Spending

Military spending on humanitarian, peacekeeping or disaster relief accounts for only a small share of total military spending, and is not a spur to develop new weapons systems.

Country examples : There are UN or other (eg Organisation for African Unity, OAU) peace-keeping forces in over 20 countries around the world (such as **Cyprus, Lebanon, DRC**), and military forces have been engaged in disaster relief work in a variety of countries (such as **Indonesia**, after the tsunami, and earthquake-hit countries in **Central America**). The costs fall either to the international community as a whole, through the UN, or through aid to the individual countries stricken by the disasters.

The Human Security Approach

Adverse costs of military security approach

The phasing out to civilians of military involvement in peacekeeping and disaster relief operations is needed: armed civilian police, and a variety of civilian experts, are more suitable to do the job than the military.

Proposed action on human security basis

The goal is to replace soldiers by civilian advisers and trainers (engineering, police, judicial advisers, etc).

E. RESOURCE COMPETITION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The Military Approach

Perceived threats

- Many states, especially the more powerful ones with economies heavily reliant on external supplies of non-renewable resources, are sharpening their competition for scarce resources as the prospect of resource supplies running out draws closer. The perception of this threat is intensifying.
- At the same time, as evidence grows of the rapidity and far-reaching effects of global warming, all states around the world are taking growing account of this new threat.

Military Response and Spending

- Defense strategies tend to direct their attention to projecting military power into regions of resource scarcity and competition. Some of these, such as the Middle East and South Asia, are also regions of long-standing political tension.



- Other regions plentiful with scarce resources, such as the oil and gas rich Arctic, are bordered by NATO and the Soviet Union, whose current relations are likely to be further strained by this new sphere of militarization.

The military security response to climate change

The effects of climate change on military strategies are less clear to ascertain, and less spelt out by governments. However, some trends can be identified.

- For example, navies are putting more resources into coastal naval patrolling to interdict flows of illegal migrants.
- The stress on rapid reaction, highly “operative” forces for intervention abroad may be intended not only for counter insurgency but also to intervene in situations where poorer (especially strategically located) countries with a weak central government face extra instability due to floods, droughts, sea level rise etc due to climate change.

The Human Security Approach

Adverse Costs of the Military Security Approach

- This is the area where the disadvantages of militarisation are clearest. Faced with competition over scarce natural resources, a resort to force – survival of the strongest – will lead to increased instability. Extra expenditure on military forces is inappropriate when expenditure is needed more than ever to transform economies to reliance on renewable energies and “clean” technologies. Equally, when the whole world is faced with the adverse impact of climate change, it makes better sense to concert international efforts to seek common solutions rather than reinforce military structures.

Proposed action on human security basis

- Efforts under way to negotiate much stronger international climate change agreements such as the successor to the Kyoto Agreement need to be greatly strengthened.
- Regarding resource competition, rather than intensifying national competition over matters such as oil exploitation rights in Africa, etc, attention should be focused on negotiating international legal frameworks for resource allocation similar to the UN Law of the Sea Convention. Land resources should be seen as much as part of the global commons as the resources of the sea.

5. CONCLUSION : ABANDONING THE MILITARY MIND-SET

The perceived threats we have considered in this paper of armed attack, insurgency, and terrorism, to which military force is seen as responding, are themselves rooted in human violence. The other, newer, threats of resource scarcity and climate change are rooted in uncontrolled human greed. Development of renewable energies, as well as of products and technologies not dependent on declining natural resources, can help to avoid armed conflict over resource scarcity and climate change.

However, if military spending - which is essentially unproductive and negative in human, economic and environmental terms – is to be seriously curtailed there needs to be an underlying change in mind-set and lifestyle. Humanity can currently be likened to the passengers and crew of a ship in danger of sinking from several grave threats - mutual nuclear annihilation, natural resource depletion, and radical deterioration of the environment and climate.

Some of the passengers are busy feuding with each other and either attack others or fear attack by others, so they make raiding parties against enemies in other parts of the ship, and spend large sums acquiring arms for this purpose. There is a danger that if some of the more lethal arms are used, the whole ship will sink.



Others are rich and self-indulgent, eating far too much food and living a lavish, comfort-seeking life at the expense of, and in exploitation of, the others in the luxurious quarters of the ship.

The poor passengers in the lower levels of the ship live deprived and cramped lives, often indulging in protracted internecine feuds, and some are filled with resentment of the rich passengers above them. Some of them acquire arms and make raiding attacks on the rich. Others quarrel amongst themselves and fight each other.

Meanwhile the ship's supplies of fuel and food are under severe strain, as the ship's captain and crew are warned each time they put to port for fuel and food supplies.

A severe storm is also building up, with the waves growing in size and the winds beginning to blow more and more strongly. Some of the ship's officers and crew are beginning to look closely at these gathering dangers, but others say the storm will pass. More and more of the thinking passengers and crew are nevertheless beginning to call into question the selfishness, greed and violence of many on board the threatened ship.

In too many countries around the world there are not enough passengers - as on the good ship "Earth" just described - who have abandoned one of the evils that undermine the security of humanity's ship - the military mind-set.

This paper would not be complete without including some factors not mentioned above helping to move humanity from its military mind-set. These factors also need to be greatly strengthened:

- **Education** : Too many schools and textbooks around the world refer to armies, weapons and wars without any critical view of them - their continued existence is taken for granted. Efforts at peace education need to be greatly strengthened. This should be closely linked to environment education, teaching how militarization diverts resources much needed to help preserve the environment and address climate change.
- **Religion** : Most religions are based on love for fellow human beings, as well as for God, but many do little to discourage war and fundamentalist elements even encourage war and suicide attacks. Religions need to do more for peace, disarmament, and the environment, including the education to secure all three.
- **Governments** : The current global economic crisis should be a spur to governments to stop investing huge sums in military spending, and divert the resources so freed to productive use. But most do not. Instead, we see continuing expensive arms fairs, government subsidies and promotion for arms exports, and well publicized military parades (with foreign soldiers and leaders invited) such as the traditional 14th July French military parade and airforce flypast in Paris.

Much is however being done to move away from militarisation. Many individuals, civil society organizations, international organisations and governments are working to resolve political and economic tensions, lessening the danger of recourse to military spending and to armed force. Environmental discussion and negotiation is beginning to factor in the environmental costs of militarisation and war. There is much more to do. It is hoped that this paper will contribute.

International Peace Bureau, Geneva

November 2009