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REDEFINING SAFETY

“The mandarins who are managing this pandemic are fond of speaking of war. They don’t even use war as a metaphor, they use it literally. But if it really were a war, then who would be better prepared than the US? If it were not masks and gloves that its frontline soldiers needed, but guns, smart bombs, bunker busters, submarines, fighter jets and nuclear bombs, would there be a shortage?”

Arundhati Roy, April 2020

'What does safety mean to you?' we recently asked Greenpeace supporters over Instagram, as part of our 'Thursday series' where we pose different questions to followers and invite them to engage.

We deliberately did not use the term ‘security’. We wanted to use a word that had a clear meaning but which was equally relevant across the spectrum of worries, concerns or threats that people experience or perceive. We felt 'safety' was a term people could more easily relate to, connect to their own experiences.

We received hundreds of responses. Safety clearly meant different things to different people. But there were many commonalities. Responses varied but with some repeated themes − having a home and a job, being able to provide for one’s family, having access to clean water and air, being able to walk safely at night free from harassment, living in an equal society, being healthy, not having to wear a mask, being free from the multiple threats of runaway climate change.

People’s lived experiences matter. This was clearly a small, non-representative sample but nevertheless, the answers came together to represent a vision which I believe is shared by many around the world − a vision of living in a healthy, just society and the desire to have basic needs met. Practically none of the responses we got were related to traditional threats commonly associated with ‘national security’ or ones that could be resolved by military power.

If 2020 has taught us anything, it is that military prowess and power cannot deliver the safety we actually need. It is inappropriate and inadequate to task. The COVID pandemic has resulted in billions of citizens in lockdown simultaneously around the globe watching in horror as health systems worldwide are reaching the limits of their capacity or beyond. The COVID crisis has exposed the truth: how ill-prepared our systems are in dealing with real threats and, linked to this, how government finance priorities are alarmingly detached from what the real needs are, coupled with the actual dangers facing our societies. New figures on military spending released in April showed that as the pandemic was peaking in parts of the world, spending on guns and bombs actually grew while hospitals were lacking basic life-saving supplies, such as masks and ventilators.

---

1 Arundhati Roy: ‘The pandemic is a portal’, https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fe-fcd274e920ca
Throughout history, keeping society safe has been equated with military might. Today, that has led us to the belief that massive, runaway military expenditure is the only lens through which to frame society’s safety, its well-being. This well-established myth, disseminated and sustained by the weapons industry with support from governments, is vital in justifying disproportionate expenditure and lucrative profits.

The reality is that unnecessary and massive military spending comes at the expense of health and other crucial services for the people. It also comes at the expense of financially dealing with catastrophic climate change. While governments boosted military budgets year on year, they ignored pandemic warnings and cut healthcare-investment, all the time watching the clock tick on the climate emergency.

This report *Global Military Spending, Sustainable Human Safety and Value for Money* by Tipping Point North South challenges us to reflect on these exact questions and demonstrates how deeply inadequate the concept of ‘national security’ is in light of the ongoing pandemic and the rapidly unfolding threats of climate change. It asks what we can learn by looking at the policy and spending priorities of governments, and argues that, unquestioned and at our peril, governments are massively outspending on weaponry compared to the climate emergency or global health protection.

The pandemic is far from over but the COVID crisis has given us a preview of shocks to come as our climate crisis continues to unfold while in regard to the looming global economic crisis post-COVID, governments will have to choose their spending priorities wisely and carefully.

And we need civil society to become much more vocal in demanding governments work for real safety.

We must speak up against excessive military spending and in favour of a better, smarter allocation of national budgets for the citizens and the greater good for the planet.

This coming year 2021 must be the year when military spending starts to drop to more realistic proportions with savings redirected towards essentials for actual human safety – providing universal healthcare, combating poverty and protecting the environment. For the first time in decades there is a real chance for us to achieve this. If all this is ignored in our post-pandemic recovery plans it would be a tragedy on many levels – not least because it would mean that we have failed to call to account the trillions of tax-payers’ money wasted on the military industrial complex, for many more years to come.

Jen Maman, Senior Peace Adviser, Greenpeace International

03/12/2020
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GLOBAL MILITARY SPENDING, SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SAFETY AND VALUE FOR MONEY

The nations of the world spend more today on their militaries than at the height of the Cold War. Of that $1.9 trillion, the USA accounts for 40%. It spends almost as much as the next top 10 spenders combined and three times as much as China, the second highest spender.\(^2\)

Geopolitical threat – real, perceived, exaggerated or invented – will likely always be with us. But there are other, equal if not greater threats to our local, national, regional and global security which are not accorded the same order of attention, urgency or resources as conventional security threats – they are climate change, habitat loss and mass species extinction, global economic instability (poverty and inequality) and now, pandemic.

“What we urgently need now is a rethinking of the entire concept of security. Even after the end of the Cold War, it has been envisioned mostly in military terms. Over the past few years, all we’ve been hearing is talk about weapons, missiles and airstrikes... The overriding goal must be human security: providing food, water and a clean environment and caring for people’s health. To achieve it, we need to develop strategies, make preparations, plan and create reserves. But all efforts will fail if governments continue to waste money by fueling the arms race... I’ll never tire of repeating: we need to demilitarize world affairs, international politics and political thinking.”

Former President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, April 15, 2020\(^3\)

CLIMATE CHANGE: AN EXISTENTIAL THREAT TO OUR SHARED HUMANITY AND PLANET

We are in the midst of the sixth mass extinction.\(^4\)

Yet the most socially and economically damaging threat to our collective global security/safety – climate change – is nowhere near centre stage in defence/security policy-making.

---
\(^2\) https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2020-04/fs_2020_04_milex_0.pdf
\(^3\) https://time.com/5820669/mikhail-gorbachev-coronavirus-human-security/
\(^4\) What is a ‘mass extinction’ and are we in one now?, https://theconversation.com/what-is-a-mass-extinction-and-are-we-in-one-now-122535
According to USA-based Climate Policy Initiative’s analysis, total public expenditures on climate change, both international and domestic, amounted to $141 billion in 2016, compared with military expenditures of $1.66 trillion.\(^5\) On average, the expenditure of national governments on climate change amounted to 8.5% of what they spent on defence, a ratio of 12:1.\(^6\) The G7 and other industrialised countries committed in 2015 to spend $100bn a year under UNFCCC to support climate action in developing countries.\(^7\) In truth, they didn’t and what they spent in International Climate Finance is completely overshadowed by their military spending ($21bn versus $845bn spent by G7 in 2016).

Since 2016, global military spending has gone up significantly.

Professor Neta C. Crawford and Catherine Lutz are directors of Brown University’s Costs of War project and although writing here about the USA and the COVID-19 pandemic, their lesson could be applied to all big defence spending nations. They make a powerful case:\(^8\)

“Now is the time for fundamental change premised on the value of real security as human security. We can make our infrastructure both green and good for the economy. We can finance public education, public health, and high-quality veterans care. But, to do so, we have to reduce the Pentagon budget, invest in the programs actually keeping us safe and end the post-9/11 wars. Otherwise we’ll just be sleepwalking back toward another version of the mess we’re in now.”

**WE HAVE OUT OF DATE DEFINITIONS OF DEFENCE AND WE ARE PAYING A TERRIBLE PRICE**

Every person, community, society, nation, region needs protection from aggressors and terrorists and it is the job of government to defend its citizens from such threats. We argue that these threats need to be in their place, proportionately, alongside much greater but entirely marginalised human security threats such as climate breakdown and pandemic.

And, it would appear, some in the most powerful military might agree.

“Rosa Brooks, a Counselor to Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in the Obama Administration, suggests the US military’s future leaders agree national security threats are centered on the economy and the environment rather than threatening global powers with massed battalions. She reports a session with majors and lieutenant colonels at the Army’s School of Advanced Military Studies at Fort Leavenworth, where she asked what they saw as the most serious threats facing the US in the next two decades. When she offered North Korea, Iran, or Al Qaeda, no hands went up, Islamic terror more generally elicited only one or two in agreement, along with weapons of mass destruction. The far more popular answers were resource scarcity and conflict driven by climate change alongside global economic collapse. This suggests that many officers must be suffering some existential doubts: the big threats are not ones the military can do much about.”\(^9\)

---


\(^7\) [https://wwwodiorgblogs9611-g7-take-climate-finance](https://wwwodiorgblogs9611-g7-take-climate-finance)

\(^8\) [https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/06/07/opinion/too-much-military-spending-got-us-into-this-mess/](https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/06/07/opinion/too-much-military-spending-got-us-into-this-mess/)

\(^9\) [Close the Pentagon: Rethinking National Security for a Positive-Sum World, Charles Kenny, 2020](#)
Yet, climate change funding is absolutely the poor relation to military spending, as is pandemic preparedness. In 2010 the UK government had identified pandemic as a Tier 1 security threat in 2010 and again in its 2015 National Security Strategies (NSS). During this time, however, little was done to turn the plan into action, whether in terms of infrastructure preparation or raising public awareness to deal with this particular threat, compared to other Tier One threats such as terrorism and wars.

The ‘risk’ pyramid needs up-ending. Climate chaos should no longer be kept in the environmental and/or humanitarian ‘box’ issue and pandemic left at the door of austerity hit, privatised public health services and an underfunded World Health Organisation.

There are other ways to slice the ‘defence spending’ cake.

**THE F-35: A MASSIVE PUBLIC TO PRIVATE WEALTH TRANSFER**

The Lockheed Martin F-35 weapons system, described as a "flying credit card," is probably the single most successful programme of public wealth extraction ever devised by a private company. It is currently projected to cost more than $1.7 trillion during its 50-year lifetime for the United States and the total lifetime cost for all the countries that bought F-35s could be as high as $2 trillion.

The Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II, apart from being the most expensive military weapons system in history, is pretty inadequate at anything it is supposed to excel.

> “Well, this is what I say about the Joint Strike Fighter; you pay for it five times. You pay the capital costs, you pay the operating costs, you then pay the opportunity costs of what you could have bought with the money. You pay for it diplomatically because having a good capable military changes the calculus in international relationships. And finally, if push comes to shove, when your air force is defeated, you can lose sovereignty. And that is the ultimate price to pay.”

*Chris Mills, former Wing Commander with the RAAF*

**VALUE FOR MONEY: THE F-35 PROGRAMME VS EVERYTHING ELSE**

The research in this ‘Value for Money’ report provides detailed evidence that helps us to make the case for why the time has come to update and modernise current defence and security thinking – and spending – in order that we can better deal with the greatest threats to our collective safety: climate change and pandemic.

---


12 https://www.pogo.org/analysis/2020/10/selective-arithmetic-to-hide-the-f-35s-true-costs/


14 *Is the Joint Strike Fighter the right plane for Australia?*

https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/7224562#transcript
This extends to other inter-related issues of critical importance to human and ecological survival, also grossly underfunded ie climate financing (local, national or transnational financing to address climate change); disaster response and disaster risk reduction; habitat protection and conservation of global biodiversity; the protection of global health and the role of the WHO; global pandemic surveillance and control; conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, UN peacebuilding and peacekeeping; poverty and inequality.

The F-35 is as good as any to make this ‘value for money’ case. Had the $2 trillion estimated global total lifetime cost of F-35 programme been applied to the activities/areas/agencies listed above, this is what the global community would be receiving instead:

- Climate finance for 20 years
- UN disaster response for the next 400 years
- UN disaster risk reduction for the next 4,000 years
- Global biodiversity conservation at $100bn per annum for the next 20 years
- WHO funding at $2bn per annum for the next 1,000 years
- WHO’s COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund for 2,963 years
- Global pandemic surveillance and control at $8bn per annum for the next 250 years
- Money for 4 years to lift the poorest people in the world above extreme poverty (UBI for the 700 million poorest)
- UN peacekeeping operations at current $5bn per annum for the next 444 years
- UN peacekeeping at $15bn per annum for the next 133 years

**SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SAFETY BETTER DESCRIBES OUR 21ST CENTURY DEFENCE AND SECURITY NEEDS**

“We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.”

*Rev Martin Luther King Jnr*

Both the UN’s ‘human security’ framework\(^{15}\) and the Oxford Research Group’s ‘sustainable security’ framework\(^{16}\) effectively brought security together with wider issues, including and especially, climate change, causing a major shift in how security is perceived and defined.

We can expand even further on this and aim for a sustainable human safety framework that re-shapes the foreign and defence policy framework of the 19\(^{th}\) and 20\(^{th}\) centuries. The word ‘safety’ is now starting to be used in some contexts, as a replacement for security.\(^{17}\) It far better describes what we need. It also speaks more directly to people in a way that ‘security’ does not.\(^{18}\)

---


\(^{16}\) https://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/sustainable-security-global-ideas-for-a-greater-britain

\(^{17}\) https://www.greenpeace.org/international/story/30235/security-military-spending-war-covid-coronavirus/

For many people – citizens and leaders alike – this is a tough debate. But as we tip into runaway climate change and as we are warned that COVID-19 will not be the last pandemic,\(^\text{19}\) our shared humanity is facing an existential threat.

If not at the 11\(^{\text{th}}\) hour, when will be the time to redefine, redesign, repurpose the ‘terms of reference’ for our collective foreign and defence policy-making?

**And if sustainable human safety** is a better term for what we should be aspiring to, then to achieve it, we need to **transform defence**.

In this report ‘Global military spending, sustainable human safety and value for money,’ the word ‘safety’ replaces ‘security’ in many contexts.

---

INTRODUCTION

In 2020, the world saw the highest levels of global military spending according to SIPRI — just shy of $2 trillion. No doubt the world’s big spenders who account for 75% of that $1.9 trillion (USA, China, India, Russia, Saudi Arabia, France, Germany, UK, Japan and South Korea) would argue that this expenditure was vital in protecting their citizens primarily from (1) geopolitical threats (USA from Iran or China; China from USA and allies that encircle it; Russia from NATO nations, EU/NATO from Russia) and (2) terror threats from ISIS, Al-Qaeda or Hezbollah.

How ironic, then, that the entire global human family was forced into lock-down and in fear of its life not because anyone declared war, not because of nuclear threats, not because of ‘the other’ — but because of a virus.

“The structure of the system is so unstable that in 2020 it took a tiny microbe just a few months to topple the whole global economy. To be collapsed by one microbe can be considered careless; to be unprepared for future shocks is downright reckless. While scientists advise that future climate and pandemic shocks are already in the pipeline, societies and governments are stoically unprepared to act to prevent or mitigate shocks.”

Economist and Jubilee 2000 campaigner Ann Pettifor

“We are defending ourselves against the wrong threats. For decades, UK governments have been fighting not just the last war but a redundant notion of war, spending hundreds of billions against imaginary hazards. At the same time, as we have become horribly aware over the past few weeks, they have neglected real and urgent dangers... That £41.5bn spent on the military is more than twice as much money as the UK spends on preventing climate and ecological breakdown – which are not just potential threats but current emergencies. It is hundreds of times more, as we are now discovering, than the government has spent on preparing for pandemics.”

British investigative journalist and environmentalist George Monbiot, author of ‘Out of the Wreckage: A New Politics in the Age of Crisis’

‘National security’ – or rather sustainable human safety – policies need to be drawn from a much wider remit if they are to truly rise to the challenge of combating the greatest threats to our collective human safety: climate change and pandemic. While governments recognise both as posing a great threat to their national security, it is not met by anything like the scale of resources needed to meet the challenge.

Moreover, the Global South, least responsible and yet suffering most from climate change, is now hit with double whammy of the coronavirus and climate breakdown crises. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, South Asia notably was facing the worst monsoon season in decades.

---

"Yet international climate finance to date has largely excluded any financing for loss and damage, beyond insurance schemes," Zoha Shawoo of Stockholm Environment Institute clarified.23 There will not be 'green recovery' after the COVID-19 pandemic for the Global South if the Global North are not assisting with urgent additional funding to address the losses and damages already incurred due to climate emergency. The Global North has a moral duty to help because its climate change is already wreaking havoc in the Global South.

We need a new ‘sustainable human safety' foreign and defence policy framework for the 21st century. Of course, all governments must protect their citizens against would-be aggressors, terrorism and cyber threats. But these threats need to be in their place, proportionately, alongside other (much greater but entirely sidelined) 'clear and present danger' threats such as pandemic and climate emergency.

This 'Value for Money' report argues that the evidence is there to make this case. We need a mind-shift on climate change and pandemic: both need to be at the ‘defence’ top table and in equal 'pole position'. As if these two threats were not enough, we know both are also inextricably linked with extreme poverty and inequality. Governments are ignoring the consequences of this at their peril. In the USA for example, this concern is becoming more and more apparent.

**BOB SCHIEFFER:** Do you, I take it you do not see, though, Russia as posing the greatest national security threat to this country at this point?

**SECRETARY ROBERT GATES:** I think the greatest national security threat to this country at this point is the two square miles that encompasses the Capitol building and the White House.

**BOB SCHIEFFER:** How do you mean that?

**SECRETARY ROBERT GATES:** If we can’t get some of our problems solved here at home, if we can’t get our finances in a more ordered fashion, if we can’t begin to tackle some of the internal issues that we have, if we can’t get some compromises on the Hill that move the country forward, then I think these foreign threats recede significantly into, as far as being a risk to the well-being and the future of this country.

Former U.S. Secretary of Defence Robert Gates, Face the Nation, CBS News, May 11, 201424

---

Charles Kenny of the think tank Center for Global Development in Washington DC writes

“All that we can know is that US spending is at an all time high at a moment when traditional military threats are at an all-time low and that defense spending is a grossly inefficient tool to confront the more pressing global threats that we do face. It is time to shift spending to more appropriate foreign policy tools.”

And he concludes his book ‘Close the Pentagon: Rethinking National Security for a Positive-Sum World’ with these words:25

“But today, both parties harbor – indeed they elevate – global misanthropes who want to close borders, abandon mutual cooperation and hide behind walls and weapons systems. That this is occurring in what is still the World’s only superpower is perhaps the biggest single reason to fear for future progress towards global peace and prosperity. When it comes to US national security, the greatest threat is from within.”

If we – global civil society and political leaders alike – are to fully appreciate why we need to move to ‘sustainable human safety,’ we need to first understand where current defence and foreign policy priorities are and then, by extension, what the military budget priorities are.

Only then can we see more clearly the direction we need to move in if we are to have much more comprehensive ‘defence’ position. In other words, a far better sustainable human safety outcome and, when it comes to military spending, true value for money.

SECTION ONE: $2 TRILLION A YEAR TO KEEP US ALL FROM HARM OR TO MAINTAIN A FAILING STATUS QUO?

THE WARTIME METAPHOR AND PANDEMIC

We are now familiar with the ‘war-time’ metaphor being applied to Covid-19 as leaders around the world find ways to describe the enormity of the virus’s impact on the world’s population, whether that be the massive economic impact or terrible human loss.

And in truth, in many countries where wartime casualties were not of the order say, of Russia or China, the parallel holds true. For example, the UK lost many more lives to the mismanagement of COVID-19 than civilians were killed in during WW2 blitz and in a shorter period of time – 40,000 civilians died in the seven-month period between September 1940 and May 1941.26

Doctors, nurses, care workers are ‘frontline’ in the ‘battle’ against COVID-19. The UK Labour Party leader Keir Starmer described the delay in implementing the COVID-19 track and trace system as a ‘hole in our defences’.27

In early October 2020, British Prime Minister Boris Johnson gave a speech to the UN General Assembly, with an appeal to ‘heal the world, literally and metaphorically.’ He offered up his five-point plan for ‘health security’ to be championed by the UK with their G7 presidency next year:28

“We have all been up against the same enemy. The same tiny opponent threatening everyone in much the same way, but members of the UN have still waged 193 separate campaigns, as if every country somehow contains a different species of human being... Unless we unite and turn our fire against our common foe, we know that everyone will lose... Our second step should be to develop the manufacturing capacity for treatments and vaccines so that the whole of humanity can hold them like missiles in silos ready to zap the alien organisms before they can attack... Never again must we wage 193 different campaigns against the same enemy.”

It’s a wonderful speech calling the world to unite. But it’s disingenuous to say the least.

PANDEMIC WAS A TIER ONE SECURITY THREAT AND NOTHING WAS DONE

“Humanity was caught napping. We have been scrabbling to catch up, and with agonising slowness we are making progress.”

Boris Johnson UN General Assembly speech29

No. Many politicians and defence planners were caught napping and the rest is history.

27 https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2020-05-20/debates/AC290C61-34C0-4330-A077-7FC2D3EBBDDB/Engagements
29 ibid
The UK government identified pandemic as a Tier 1 security threat in 2010 and 2015 National Security Strategies (NSS). The risk of human pandemic disease “remains one of the highest we face”, reported the 2010 NSS. “There is a high probability of another influenza pandemic occurring and, based on a range of data, possible impacts of a future pandemic could be that up to one half of the UK population becomes infected, resulting in between 50,000 and 750,000 deaths in the UK, with corresponding disruption to everyday life.” During this time, however, little was done to turn the plan into action, whether in terms of infrastructure preparation or raising public awareness to deal with this particular threat, compared to other Tier One threats such as terrorism and wars.

General Sir Nick Carter made no mention of either pandemic or climate change at the annual RUSI Lecture in December 2019. Included in the report from Professor Michael Clarke of RUSI:

“The Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS) at his annual RUSI lecture has been widely reported as giving a sobering view of the security challenges that Britain faces in the coming decade... A resurgence of great power politics, a series of nasty trouble spots around the world, demographic trends that tend towards instability, and the disappearing lines between open conflict, civil strife, social and economic subversion... It is necessary to embrace the ‘fourth industrial revolution’ and genuinely integrate the ‘sunrise technologies’ – robotics, artificial intelligence, quantum computing and other disruptive technologies – into our security thinking, rather than to leave them as the interesting afterthoughts for which there was never enough actual cash to exploit properly.”

However, speaking of the pandemic in April 2020, General Sir Nick Carter told us:

“I would say that in all my more than 40 years of service this is the single greatest logistic challenge that I’ve come across. I’ll just give you a scale of the problem; in the 25 days since we’ve started working together with the NHS, they’ve gone from some 240 customers they deliver to normally to nearly 50,000 customers. This has involved creating 260,000ft of distribution warehouse space – that’s nearly four football fields’ worth – and some 38 additional delivery routes per day. That’s the equivalent to driving three times around the world. That is a major logistic challenge.”

Through the first wave of the pandemic, the UK military’s role was to help support the delivery of 1 billion pieces of PPE.

In the USA, the 45th president of the United States has gutted whatever pandemic plans the 44th president of the United States had instructed to be put in place. Had “investments been made previously, we potentially could have [had] a vaccine ready to go now,” Dr Peter Hotez,
director of the Center for Vaccine Development at the Texas Children’s Hospital, told a US congressional committee:35

“Through NIAID NIH support, we developed and manufactured a promising SARS vaccine... The problem was this: By the time we completed manufacturing the SARS vaccine there was no longer interest in SARS as a public health threat. There was no transmission of SARS anywhere and we could not attract further public and private investments to carry this through clinical trials and licensure. In the end, industry is not interested in investing in a vaccine, which they would have to stockpile. No one wants to invest in a product designed NOT to be used. However, as the information in January 2020 showed that SARS and SARS 2 were about 80% similar and the two viruses bound to the same human receptor in the lungs, it became clear that there was a possibility that we could repurpose our SARS 1 vaccine to fight SARS 2... We must recognize that vaccines for neglected and emerging infections fall through the cracks because they are not a priority for pharma and biotechs. We need investments in nonprofit and academic based product development partnerships... It’s tragic that we won’t have a vaccine ready for this epidemic — and practically speaking, we’ll be fighting these outbreaks with one hand tied behind our backs.”

After receiving $billions of emergency funding to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic, the Pentagon has been found to be too slow to act on the extra funding as well as to plan on spending hundreds of millions of dollars on projects seemingly unrelated to the pandemic, including submarine missile tubes, space launch facilities, and golf course staffing.36 Inexplicably, a $1 billion fund meant for medical masks and test swabs was instead spent by the Pentagon for jet engine parts, body armour and dress uniforms — effectively medical supplies for military supplies.37

WHERE THE USA LEADS WE ALL FOLLOW?

THE MILITARISATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

American national security experts Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko in their 2019 book ‘Clear and Present Safety’ argued that the United States, despite facing no plausible existential threats, no great-power rival, no near-term competition for the role of global hegemon and having the world’s most powerful military — in other words, “America is unusually safe and secure from foreign threats” [emphasis added] — this reality is barely reflected in U.S national security strategy or foreign policy.38

Furthermore, “There is also a pernicious feedback loop at work. Because of the chronic exaggeration of the threats facing the United States, Washington overemphasizes military approaches to problems (including many that could best be solved by non-military means). The militarization of foreign policy leads, in turn, to further dark warnings about the potentially harmful effects of any effort to rebalance U.S. national security spending or trim the massive military budget — warnings that are inevitably bolstered by more threat exaggeration.”39

this is not just a recent phenomenon, the United States has a long history of focusing on and exaggerating the wrong threats. For example,

“During the Cold War, although the United States faced genuine existential threats, American political leaders nevertheless hyped smaller threats or conflated them with larger ones. Today, there are no dangers to the United States remotely resembling those of the Cold War era, yet policymakers routinely talk in the alarmist terms once used to describe superpower conflict. Indeed, the mindset of the United States in the post-9/11 world was best (albeit crudely) captured by former Vice President Dick Cheney. While in office, Cheney promoted the idea that the United States must prepare for even the most remote threat as though it were certain to occur. The journalist Ron Suskind termed this belief ‘the one percent doctrine,’ a reference to what Cheney called the ‘one percent chance that Pakistani scientists are helping al Qaeda build or develop a nuclear weapon.’ According to Suskind, Cheney insisted that the United States must treat such a remote potential threat ‘as a certainty in terms of our response.’”

They warned in their 2012 article (of the same name as their 2019 book) in Foreign Affairs that

“Indeed, the most lamentable cost of unceasing threat exaggeration and a focus on military force is that the main global challenges facing the United States today are poorly resourced and given far less attention than “sexier” problems, such as war and terrorism. These include climate change, pandemic diseases, global economic instability, and transnational criminal networks – all of which could serve as catalysts to severe and direct challenges to U.S. security interests. But these concerns are less visceral than alleged threats from terrorism and rogue nuclear states. They require long-term planning and occasionally painful solutions, and they are not constantly hyped by well-financed interest groups. As a result, they are given short shrift in national security discourse and policymaking.”

EU FOREIGN AND DEFENCE POLICY SHIFT— FROM ‘SOFT TO HARD POWER’

The EU has a necessarily complex set of bodies which oversee and implement EU-wide policy on all matters of common foreign, security and defence policy. This takes the form of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), which is the EU’s joint foreign and security policy, designed to resolve conflicts and foster international understanding, based on diplomacy and respect for international rules. Trade, humanitarian aid, and development cooperation also play an important part in the EU’s international role.

The Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) is the security and defence policy for the EU. It forms an integral part of the EU’s CFSP. From it flow many departments and bodies, key among them the European Defence Fund (EDF) and its Permanent structured cooperation on defence and security (PESCO); European Defence Action Plan; European Defence Agency.

The EU has no standing army, so relies on ad hoc forces contributed by EU countries. The EU can send missions to the world’s trouble spots; to monitor and preserve law and order, participate in peacekeeping efforts or provide humanitarian aid to affected populations.

However, the EU wants this to change and move from being a soft to a hard power:

40 ibid
41 ibid
42 https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/foreign-security-policy_en
“In this fragile world, soft power is not enough: we must enhance our credibility in security and defence. To respond to external crises, build our partners’ capacities and protect Europe, Member States must channel a sufficient level of expenditure to defence, make the most efficient use of resources, and meet the collective commitment of 20% of defence budget spending devoted to the procurement of equipment and Research & Technology. Capabilities should be developed with maximum interoperability.”

This is illustrated in new spending plans and directions to EU countries. For example, participating countries in PESCO “agree to cooperate to achieve approved objectives in security and defence, committing to ‘more binding common commitments’ in the 5 areas set out in Article 2 of Protocol 10”. Particularly among them, “Defence equipment investment: regularly increase defence budgets; increase defence investment expenditure to 20% of total defence spending; increase joint and collaborative strategic defence capability projects; increase spending on defence research and technology to 2% of total defence spending.” [emphasis added]

But there is a growing movement opposing EU calls for increased military spending and increased militarisation, which also addresses the need to ‘green’ EU Foreign and Security Policy. MEP Sabine Lösing, Vice-Chair of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence, has argued “the European Defence Fund is the end of the civilian nature of the EU budget,” and therefore, the establishment of the EDF and the broader militarization of the Union should be causes for concern for every citizen.

Wouldn’t the EU be better placed to think differently about its collective ‘power’ and take up the idea of making peace-building central to the E.U.’s global strategy?

“Under the E.U.’s current global strategy, conflict prevention risks being little more than an afterthought. Only by addressing the underlying reasons why people fight can we sustainably end conflict. But the current policy debate appears to focus almost entirely on hard security responses...

Yet the E.U., arguably the last woman standing with a belief in values-based multilateral action, human rights and inclusion, has the credibility to emphasize an ambitious conflict prevention and peacebuilding agenda, weaving in defense, diplomacy and development.”

Harriet Lamb, CEO of International Alert

And the evidence that investment in peacekeeping works is clear.

In a 2018 study, it is estimated that if the UN had invested $200 billion in peacekeeping operations with strong mandates during the period 2001-2013, major armed conflict would have been reduced by up to two-thirds (relative to a scenario with no peacekeeping operation) and 150,000 lives would have been saved. The researchers concluded that “UN peacekeeping is clearly a cost-effective way of increasing global security.”

Although the EU's recent commitment to 60% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 is welcome (though still too little and not consistent with the 1.5-2°C target of the Paris

---

48 https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/700203
A detailed, meaningful and well-funded policy on climate change is a very big elephant in the room.

Can the EU lead the way and put climate change – and pandemic preparedness – at the very heart of its CFSP and CSDP policies? Can it see its militaries combining to prioritise peacekeeping instead of chasing the notion of ‘hard power’?

Or is the EU on a slippery slope from which it cannot return? Is British international security expert Professor Paul Rogers correct when he makes the case that the West has an ‘obsolete security paradigm.’

A LESSON FROM THE PANDEMIC: REDUCE THE PENTAGON BUDGET AND INVEST IN PROGRAMS THAT ACTUALLY KEEP US SAFE

“We spend billions of dollars every year on missiles that hopefully will never fly, on weapons that hopefully will never be used. We have to take health security as seriously as we do defence security.”

Kathleen Sebelius, Former US Secretary of Health and Human Services 2009-2014, interviewed for Totally Under Control

Although writing about the USA, this lesson could be applied to all big defence spenders. Professor Neta C. Crawford and Catherine Lutz are directors of Brown University’s Costs of War project and here they make a powerful case:

“COVID-19 proves that things can’t change until we decide they can. For so long, climate change has been considered “too complex to fix.” Last year, our research showed that the US military is one of the most significant contributors to climate change in the world. Its annual emissions are larger than those of Portugal, Sweden, or Denmark.

We need to recognize that business as usual is not good enough. Why does the military have universal health care, while many other Americans are in a lesser category, with their health dependent on their ability to pay? We’re squandering the chance to save lives on an average day — as well as in a pandemic. If we continue investing in hundreds of military bases and wars, while putting Americans back to work in fossil fuel-heavy industries, we miss the chance to avert further climate change. If we continue to prop up cruel dictators, while failing to reform our own election financing and ballot access, we will slide closer to authoritarianism.

Now is the time for fundamental change premised on the value of real security as human security. We can make our infrastructure both green and good for the economy. We can finance public education, public health, and high-quality veterans care. But, to do so, we have to reduce the Pentagon budget, invest in the programs actually keeping us safe and end the post-9/11 wars. Otherwise we’ll just be sleepwalking back toward another version of the mess we’re in now.”

---

51 https://www.imdb.com/title/tt13065386/
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CLIMATE CHAOS: COVID-19 IS BUT A REHEARSAL

AND THE GLOBAL MILITARY IS NOT – YET – PART OF THE SOLUTION FOR EITHER

The global military, far from being a ‘saviour’ from the chaos that ensues from runaway climate change is itself, unbeknownst to many, a major driver of climate change. This is a result of many factors: its oil dependent day-to-day operations; maintenance of overseas bases; wars and conflict; and post-conflict rebuilding, itself carbon intensive. At UN level it is exempt from reporting its carbon emissions despite some countries’ militaries being among the largest consumers of fossil fuels in the world and these emissions are a direct result of runaway global military spending since the former cannot happen without the latter.

Our report ‘Indefensible: The true cost of the global military to our climate and human security,’53 as well as research done by others, shows that:

- The carbon footprint of the global militaries and associated defence industries is 445 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent (2017); this is larger than the annual greenhouse gas emission of the entire country of Italy, and not much smaller than the total GHG emissions by UK (505 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent) and France (482 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent) respectively.

- The global militaries and defence industries account for at least 1% of the total global greenhouse gas emissions, and the figure could be as high as 5%. For comparison, civil aviation accounts for approximately 2.1 % of global GHG emissions, and international aviation alone is responsible for around 1.3% of global GHG emissions. This means that the global military-industrial complex accounts for the compatible amount of greenhouse gas emissions as civil aviation which is essential for global trade and our modern well-being. When everyone is thinking to do their bit by taking fewer flights and buy local food and consumer products, militaries are having a free pass to buy and operate as many big-ticket gas guzzlers (eg, F-35s and Eurofighter Typhoons) as they want, with no hard question asked by our politicians.

- If we rank the world’s militaries together as a single country, they would be the 29th biggest oil consumer in the world, just ahead of Belgium or South Africa. To put it another way, this is half the oil consumption of the world’s 5th biggest economy, the UK or the 6th biggest, France.

- The Costs of War Project (2019) estimated the total US military’s carbon emissions for 2017 to be 339 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent, consisting of 59 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent emitted by the Pentagon and 280 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent emitted by the US defence industry.54 The Pentagon would be the world’s 55th largest CO2 emitter if it was a country, more than many industrialized nations including Sweden and Switzerland.55

---
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According to the 2020 report by Scientists for Global Responsibility, the UK military sector contributed 6.5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent to the Earth’s atmosphere in 2017-2018. Of these, the report estimates that the Ministry of Defence’s (MOD) total direct GHG emissions in 2017-2018 were 3.03 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent, similar to the emissions of the UK’s vehicle manufacturing industry.56

There seems to be no end in sight as governments (especially the big military spenders) are themselves locked into foreign, security and defence spending strategies that are self-destructive, with endless war-for-oil conflicts that create millions of refugees and conflicts that result in ever-greater military spending on ever-more fossil-fuel dependent equipment operated by fossil-fuel reliant militaries.

All this and we have less than 10 years before climate catastrophe is inevitable and irreversible. If, as many argue is the case, the COVID-19 pandemic is but a rehearsal for what will come with climate breakdown, our shared future is very bleak indeed.57

The nations which have handled the coronavirus crisis the worst are also large defence spenders — the USA, UK, France, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Sweden, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Iran, Colombia, Russia and India (all top 40 military spenders58).59 Make of this relationship what we may, the fact is that charged with our protection, our ‘defence’, these nations more or less handed the problem over to austerity hit and/or underfunded/privatised health systems and an equally underfunded WHO.

The climate emergency coupled now with Covid-19 doubly demands that we push our governments for long-overdue economic and environmental structural changes. At the same time, wider civil society must wake up to its blind-spot on foreign and defence policy-making — these policies have contributed to the problem and without reform cannot be part of the solution.

As we stand, the most socially and economically damaging threat to our collective global security/safety — climate change — is nowhere near centre stage in defence/security policy-making. Instead, it is regarded as a ‘national security’ threat in as much as it results in ever-increasing environmental/economic refugees; increased resource wars, or, closer to home, when demanding a supportive, humanitarian military response.

In truth, our $2 trillion annual global military budget speaks more to 19th and 20th century geopolitical occupations than 21st century threats to our collective sustainable human safety. To transform this situation and for defence policy-making to truly address 21st century needs, it has to include

57 https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/apr/22/coronavirus-is-a-dress-rehearsal-for-what-awaits-us-if-governments-continue-to-ignore-science
58 https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2020-04/fs_2020_04_milex_0_0.pdf
Climate emergency: we need urgent climate mitigation, climate finance, disaster risk reduction, habitat protection and conservation of biodiversity;

Pandemic: we need pandemic prevention and control and major investment in global public health;

Conflict: we need to save lives with properly funded conflict prevention, peace-building and peacekeeping, nuclear disarmament.

As humanity faces an existential threat, when will be the time to redefine, redesign, repurpose the ‘terms of reference’ for our foreign and defence policy-making? If not now, when it’s all too late?

For many, this particular challenge to the status quo is a sensitive one. It’s a tough debate to have. But as we tip into runaway climate change, as we are warned that COVID-19 will not be the last pandemic,\(^\text{60}\) the evidence is overwhelming.

Climate change and global health are hard defence & security issues.

*Sustainable human safety* is a better term for what we should be aspiring to and to achieve it, we need to transform defence.

---

SECTION TWO: INDIVISIBLE — ‘SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SAFETY’ & VALUE FOR MONEY

We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive.

*Albert Einstein, speaking of the development of atomic weapons*

Climate change and COVID-19 are both screaming at us that it’s high time we got beyond national self-interest.

Local, national, global inter-connected human safety must, of course, be prepared to deal with for ‘traditional’ threats ie cross-border aggression as well as ‘modern’ threats such as cyber warfare. But the time has come for citizens and leaders alike to recognise that these threats must be proportionate in both time and resourcing and should take their appropriate place alongside threats of equal or greater importance eg accidental or planned nuclear attack, pandemic and climate change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total spending by G7 nations, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ millions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Climate Finance (US$M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military spending vs climate spending

According to Climate Policy Initiative’s analysis, total public expenditures on climate change, both international and domestic, amounted to $141 billion in 2016, compared with military expenditures of $1.66 trillion. On average, the expenditure of national governments on climate change amounted to 8.5% of what they spent on defence, a ratio of 12:1. The G7 and other industrialised countries committed in 2015 to spend $100bn a year under UNFCCC to support climate action in developing countries. In truth, they didn’t and what they spent in International Climate Finance is completely overshadowed by their military spending ($21bn versus $845bn spent by G7 in 2016). Since 2016, global military spending has gone up significantly.

---

65 https://www.odi.org/blogs/9611-g7-take-climate-finance
These tables reveal what should be a shocking truth. Although the figures are from 2016, it cannot be said that G7 nations did not know as much then as we do now about runaway climate change – they did. The Paris Agreement of December 2015 was already in place and to get to that point nations had long been aware of the evidence pointing to the fact that humanity was already teetering on the climate brink.

‘VALUE FOR MONEY’ – FIVE EXAMPLES OF MORE AND BETTER SLICING OF THE GLOBAL MILITARY SPENDING CAKE

The money is certainly available to fund critical human safety activity. We have no need of the often cited, all elusive (apparently) magic money tree. Below are a few comparisons which should give grave pause for thought.

All the categories listed in the comparisons should be considered within the ‘defence’ – or ‘sustainable human safety’ – framework and as a result, should not, under any circumstances, be left begging for money as they all too often are.

EXAMPLE ONE: THE $1.9 TRILLION TOTAL ANNUAL MILITARY SPENDING

Since 2015, the G7 and other industrialised countries have committed to spend $100bn a year under UNFCCC to support climate action in developing countries.66 The pledge was never fulfilled. One-year’s global military spend will fund climate finance for 19 years. Nineteen years.

On average, around $5 billion is spent on UN disaster response every year, and 10% of that was for disaster risk reduction. One-year’s global military spend will fund UN disaster response for the next 380 years, but since prevention is better than treatment, UN disaster risk reduction can be funded for the next 3800 years by one-year’s worth of global military spending.

Currently, just $4 billion to $10 billion was spent globally each year for biodiversity conservation. To stop the sixth mass extinction, scientists estimated around $100 billion a year

66 https://www.odi.org/blogs/9611-g7-take-climate-finance
would be needed to conserve Earth’s current irreplaceable biodiversity.\textsuperscript{67} One-year’s global military spend will fully fund global biodiversity conservation for 19 years.

WHO’s funding is currently $2 billion a year.\textsuperscript{68} Even for this pitiful amount, it relies on private donors to make up the short fall. One-year’s global military spend alone will fund WHO at this level for the next 950 years.

WHO asked the international community to raise $675 million for its COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund but had great difficulty reaching the target.\textsuperscript{69} Consider that just 0.04\% (that’s 4\% of 1\%) of one-year’s global military spend can cover this – and not even be missed. Arms trade expert Andrew Feinstein estimated 40\% of all corruption in world trade is in the arms trade.\textsuperscript{70}

WHO estimated that the cost of planning for a pandemic is around $1 per person per year so we need around $8 billion a year. One-year’s global military spend would fund global pandemic surveillance and control for the next 238 years.

One-year’s worth of global military spend will provide enough money (universal basic income for the 700 million poorest people) for 4 years to lift the poorest people in the world above extreme poverty.

UN spent around $4.5 billion a year on peacekeeping; at this level, one-year’s global military spend will fund UN peacekeeping operations for the next 422 years. To properly fund peacekeeping with strong mandates, the UN will need $15 billion a year; for this, one-year’s global military spend can provide the funding for the next 127 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in $ trillion per year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>in proportion to global military spending</th>
<th>How many years of human safety needs can one-year global military spend ($1.9tr) fund instead?\textsuperscript{71}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate finance</strong>\textsuperscript{72}</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster response</strong>\textsuperscript{73}</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster risk reduction</strong>\textsuperscript{74}</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{67} *How to pay for saving biodiversity*, 2018, Science, DOI: 10.1126/science.aar3454


\textsuperscript{70} https://youtu.be/zhe7JZ0K0xo

\textsuperscript{71} How many years of human safety needs can one-year global military spend ($1.9tr) fund instead?

\textsuperscript{72} https://www.odi.org/blogs/9611-g7-take-climate-finance

\textsuperscript{73} https://medium.com/@UNDPasiapac/the-future-of-disaster-risk-reduction-is-in-better-financing-1605454bf1bd

\textsuperscript{74} ibid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>Percent of Global Military Expenditure</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global fund for biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><a href="https://theconversation.com/to-solve-climate-change-and-biodiversity-loss-we-need-a-global-deal-for-nature-115557">75</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>950</td>
<td><a href="https://www.who.int/about/finances-accountability/budget/en/">76</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td><a href="https://www.who.int/publications-detail/strategic-preparedness-and-response-plan-for-the-new-coronavirus">77</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global pandemic surveillance and control</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td><a href="https://medicalxpress.com/news/2019-03-strategy-inevitable-flu-pandemics.html">78</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBI for elimination of extreme poverty</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td><a href="https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/700203">79</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Peacekeeping</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td><a href="https://www.pogo.org/analysis/2020/10/selective-arithmetic-to-hide-the-f-35s-true-costs/">80</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper funded peacekeeping</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td><a href="https://transformdefence.org/publication/the-military-industrial-complex-how-i-learnt-to-stop-worrying-and-love-the-f-35-lightning-jet/">81</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many years can one-year’s global military spend ($1.9tr) provide funding for human safety needs?**

**EXAMPLE TWO: $2 TRILLION — THE ESTIMATED TOTAL LIFETIME COST OF THE F-35 PROGRAMME**

The weapons system sometimes described as the single most successful programme of public wealth extraction ever devised by a private company, the Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II programme, is currently projected to cost more than $1.7 trillion during its lifetime for the United States alone; from this, we can estimate the global total lifetime cost of F-35s to be around $2 trillion. The Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II, apart from being the most expensive military weapons system in history, is pretty inadequate at anything it is supposed to excel.

---

76 https://www.who.int/about/finances-accountability/budget/en/
79 https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/700203
80 ibid. This study estimated that if the UN had invested $200 billion in peacekeeping operations with strong mandates during the period 2001–2013, major armed conflict would have been reduced by up to two-thirds (relative to a scenario with no peacekeeping operation) and 150,000 lives would have been saved.
82 https://www.pogo.org/analysis/2020/10/selective-arithmetic-to-hide-the-f-35s-true-costs/
There are plenty of alternative ways to better spend this money and deliver sustainable human safety.

The table lists all the examples in the earlier table and shows for how many years the estimated global total lifetime cost of F-35s would fund those programmes/initiatives/agencies.

The estimated global total lifetime cost of F-35s would fund

- climate finance for 20 years
- UN disaster response for the next 400 years
- UN disaster risk reduction for the next 4,000 years
- global biodiversity conservation at $100bn per annum for the next 20 years
- WHO at $2bn per annum for the next 1,000 years
- WHO’s COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund for 2,963 years
- global pandemic surveillance and control at $8bn per annum for the next 250 years
- would provide enough money for 4 years to lift the poorest people in the world above extreme poverty (UBI for the 700 million poorest)
- UN peacekeeping operations at current $5bn per annum for the next 444 years
- would provide proper funding for UN peacekeeping at $15bn per annum for the next 133 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in $ trillion per year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>in proportion to global military spending</th>
<th>How many years of human safety needs can the estimated total lifetime cost of F-35s fund instead?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate finance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster response</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.025%</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global fund for biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 Solidarity</td>
<td>0.000675</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>2963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global pandemic</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveillance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBI for elimination</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of extreme poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Peacekeeping</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funded peacekeeping</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total lifetime</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of F-35s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years can the estimated total lifetime cost of the global F-35 programme fund human safety needs

**EXAMPLE THREE: $760 BILLION SAVINGS VIA THE FIVE PERCENT PROPOSAL**

**INTRODUCING THE FIVE PERCENT PROPOSAL**

The TPNS Five Percent campaign proposal[^1] grew out of the conviction that runaway military spending should be regarded as a 'structural' campaign issue by international development NGOs, working alongside partners in the global south and North America. We are fast approaching $2 trillion p/a on global military spending, *not* including the (long-term) ‘costs’ of military operations and wars (ie veterans, pollution, environmental and infrastructure destructions, etc). It is doubly scandalous that in these times of climate emergency, pandemic and austerity, nations are increasing military budgets.

By joining the ranks of debt cancellation and tax justice, military spending savings could be regarded as yet one more significant 'new' revenue stream, redirecting the funds captured to serving the needs of the global community.

Inevitably, definitions of ‘defence’ are ever more central to this proposal since the question of whose interests are really served by the ever-increasing global military expenditure is at the heart of this matter. Ultimately, it fundamentally challenges us to see military spending as every bit as central to understanding power, poverty, economic collapse, unjust distribution of resources no different from, indeed complementary to, structural campaigns such as debt, trade, tax, climate change and most recently the so-called ‘war on drugs’. It is not an adjunct to any of these issues – it is implicated in each and every one of them.

Andrew Feinstein, author of 'The Shadow World: Inside the Global Arms Trade' argued that neoliberalism needs the war machine. And as we see ever greater movement of peoples due to conflict, economic collapse and climate change, this is doubly true as the movement of peoples creates an opportunity for an even greater military ‘security’ presence.

THE 5% FORMULA

The 5% formula is a two-part mechanism to achieve major, year-on-year cuts to global military spending over 10 years and beyond. It is a long-term, sustainable formula that works for every country.

The first decade calls on the top 20 military spenders (accounting for 85% of $1.9 trillion world spending) to cut their military spending absolutely by 5% each year for decade. This equates to compound cut of 40% to global military spending over the decade, back to mid-1990s spending levels ie $1 trillion dollars, the lowest in recent history (‘lowest’ still being far too high). (NOTE: It would also, by extension, result in significant cuts to military greenhouse gas emissions.) The sum saved over this first decade of absolute cuts would deliver an estimated $760 billion to be redirected to core urgent human and environmental needs.

After the first 10 years, we call upon all nations to adopt the 5% threshold rule to sustainably restrain the global military spending – no country allows any increase in military spending to outstrip economic growth. Most economies grow less than 3% annually; this effectively translates as 2% annual reduction to their military spending.

For example: 0% economic growth = 5% cut to annual military spend; 2% growth = 3% cut to annual military spend; 5% growth = no increase; 7% growth = only 2% increase on annual military spend. Most economies grow less than 3% annually; this effectively translates as 2% annual reduction to their military spending. These savings are then divided equally to fund both domestic and international needs.

NOTE: The 5% Formula is not a call for a one-off absolute cut (eg U. S. senator Bernie Sanders’ 2020 call to cut the military budget by 10% and spend the $74bn in savings on creating jobs, improving education and making housing more affordable to counter the disastrous effects of the coronavirus pandemic and economic meltdown) since the ‘savings’ (eg $74bn) could be recouped in future budgets, benefitting no one. It is also not about a call for say, an annual 10% cut to a given defence budget in any year without a baseline since any supposed redirected saving could be nullified by an even bigger increase (say 12%) to the size of the baseline defence budget. The 5% formula creates the means to drive spending down year on year. Lastly, 5% formula is not about absolute year on year percentage cuts with the aim of zero military spending. Whilst it’s unrealistic to think we will get to zero military spending, nevertheless, the 10% calls by IPB and others, set the bar

---

86 Trends In World Military Expenditure, 2019, SIPRI. https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2020-04/fs_2020_04_milex_0.pdf
One recent practical but ambitious example is U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Lee’s proposal to cut the Pentagon annual budget by up to $350bn (See later).88

**Five Percent Formula Savings**

After a decade of applying the Five Percent Formula (a mere 5% annual cut over 10 years), annual global military spending will be $1.1tn rather than the current $1.9tn.

The table here lists all the activities discussed so far and shows how many years the Five Percent proposal would fund these programmes/initiatives/agencies by diverting military spending.

The total saving over the first decade amounts to $760bn which would fund:

- climate finance for 8 years
- UN disaster response for the next 152 years
- UN disaster risk reduction for the next 1,520 years
- global biodiversity conservation fully for 8 years
- WHO at $2bn per annum for the next 380 years
- WHO’s COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund for 1,126 years
- global pandemic surveillance and control at $8bn per annum for the next 95 years
- would provide enough money for just under 2 years to lift the poorest people in the world above extreme poverty (UBI for the 700 million poorest)
- UN peacekeeping operations at current $5bn per annum for the next 169 years
- would provide proper funding to the UN peacekeeping at $15bn per annum for the next 51 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in $ trillion per year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>in proportion to global military spending</th>
<th>How many years of human safety needs can the Five Percent Formula fund instead by diverting global military spending ($760bn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate finance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster response</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.025%</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global fund for biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 The Five Percent Formula would deliver an estimated $760 billion over the decade to be redirected to core urgent human and environmental needs. https://transformdefence.org/the-five-percent-proposal/the-5-formula-what-is-it/
CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA LEE’S VISION

The first part of the 5% Formula calls for a decade-long annual absolute cut of 5%, equating to a 10-year compound cut of 40%. Is this too much, too drastic, too impractical? Apparently not, according to U.S. congresswoman Barbara Lee.

In June 2020 she proposed a plan to cut the Pentagon annual budget by up to $350bn (i.e. up to 50%). “For years, our government has failed to invest in programs that actually keep our country safe and healthy,” said Lee. “By over-prioritizing the Pentagon and military solutions, our country is drastically underprepared for any crisis that needs a non-military solution... We cannot continue to prioritize funding for a department known for its waste, fraud, abuse, and failure to pass an audit, especially when the money to ‘protect national security’ is failing to protect our most vulnerable citizens... Congress needs to prioritize our safety and our future, not more war,” said Lee.90

EXAMPLE FOUR: $73 BILLION — THE ANNUAL GLOBAL SPENDING ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY THE ‘NUCLEAR 9’

According to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), the US managed to spend $35.4 billion on nuclear weapons in 2019, China ($10.4 billion), the UK ($8.9 billion), Russia ($8.5 billion), France ($4.8 billion), India ($2.3 billion), Israel and Pakistan ($1 billion each), and North Korea ($0.6 billion). In total, the ‘nuclear nine’ blew $73 billion on their

arsenals — $7 billion more than 2018. ICAN’s Executive Director Beatrice Fihn spoke for all of us when she said, “It is absurd to be spending $138,700 every single minute on weapons that cause catastrophic human harm rather than spending it to protect the health of their citizens. They are abdicating their duty to protect their people.”

The table lists all the examples in the earlier table and shows for how many years the Nuclear 9’s annual spending on nuclear weapons would fund those programmes/initiatives/agencies.

The annual global spending on nuclear weapons would fund

- 70% of annual climate finance
- UN disaster response for the next 15 years
- UN disaster risk reduction for the next 146 years
- 70% of the needed $100bn-per-annum funding for the global biodiversity conservation
- WHO at $2bn per annum for the next 37 years
- WHO’s COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund for 108 years
- global pandemic surveillance and control at $8bn per annum for the next 9 years
- UN peacekeeping operations at current $5bn per annum for the next 16 years
- would provide proper funding for UN peacekeeping at $15bn per annum for the next 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in $ trillion per year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>in proportion to global military spending</th>
<th>How many years of human safety needs can the annual global spending on nuclear weapons fund instead?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate finance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster response</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.025%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global fund for biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 Solidarity Response Fund</td>
<td>0.000675</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global pandemic surveillance and control</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBI for elimination of extreme poverty</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91: https://www.icanw.org/report_73_billion_nuclear_weapons_spending_2020
### How many years can the annual global spending on nuclear weapons by the ‘Nuclear 9’ fund human safety needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Peacekeeping</th>
<th>0.0045</th>
<th>0.24%</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper funded peacekeeping</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual global spending on nuclear weapons</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ONE MORE FOR THE POT: THE SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SAFETY ‘SOVEREIGN’ FUND

The Government Pension Fund Global of Norway, also known as the Oil Fund, now valued over $1 trillion in assets, is the world’s largest sovereign wealth fund and was established in 1990 to preserve wealth from Norway’s oil and gas for *future generations*. Shouldn’t we do the same to preserve *sustainable human safety* for future generations? After all, since global military spending at $1.9 trillion is almost twice that of the Norway Oil Fund, it should not be that difficult to redirect a few pennies to invest for our children’s future safety.

Let’s round up the numbers for convenience. Annual global military spending is almost $2 trillion. Divert only 1% of that to set up the *Global Sustainable Human Safety Fund (Global SHS Fund)*, amounting to $20 billion. After initial set-up, we will continue to divert $20bn from global military spending to top up the Global SHS Fund every year. The SHS Fund will be invested in such a way that it will make (let’s be conservative and say) 1% return above inflation — any additional profits will be cashed out to fund global/regional sustainable human safety defence related expenditure.

In other words, the Global SHS Fund will grow 1% inflation-adjusted every year on top of regular annual contributions of $20bn from global militaries.

How much will the Global SHS Fund be worth after 100 years? 250 years? Or 500 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in $ billion</th>
<th>Year 0 (initial value)</th>
<th>After 50 years</th>
<th>After 100 years</th>
<th>After 250 years</th>
<th>After 500 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Sustainable Human Safety Fund</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>22,304</td>
<td>290,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How much the Global SHS Fund will be worth after selected years

Diverting a very modest 1% of global annual military spending every year (i.e. $20bn per year) to the Global Sustainable Human Safety Fund and making sensible investments will make the Global SHS Fund worth $1.3 trillion after 50 years. After 100 years, it will be worth $3.4 trillion; $22 trillion after 250 years; and $290 trillion after 500 years.

---

This does not mean we have to leave the Global SHS Fund alone in order to accumulate such an astronomical amount of wealth. It simply means that if we put it aside until real emergencies threaten sustainable human safety, there is always enough money available to defend ourselves. What are these real emergencies to speak of? Here is one.

All known near-Earth asteroids as of January 2018

NASA's Near-Earth Object Office estimated that, on average, a Tunguska-sized asteroid (i.e. capable of destroying a city) will enter Earth's atmosphere once every 300 years. With our Global Sustainable Human Safety Fund, we know that after just 50 years we will have more than $1 trillion available to build up our defence against a potential Tunguska-sized asteroid. As a reference, the Apollo program (1961-1972) costs only $150 billion in today's money. And if we are really lucky and no Tunguska-sized asteroid strikes Earth in the next 250 years, we will still have $22 trillion left to build an outer-space defence against not just a Tunguska-sized asteroid but also a Chicxulub-sized asteroid (the one that killed off the dinosaurs).

Can we afford to wait?

---

SECTION THREE: WHERE NEXT?

GEORGE FLOYD & #SYSTEMCHANGE

When George Floyd woke up on what was to be his last day on earth, he had no idea, as he uttered those terrible words, begging for his life, that he would trigger a tremor to shake the foundations of global society as we know it. Racism, white supremacy and criminal justice, health, housing, education, media, sport and culture are entangled everywhere and everywhere is now forced to face it and act on it.

George Floyd had been laid off his job as a truck driver because of the COVID-19 virus. The protests that followed this brutal murder were inevitably, inextricably entangled with the pandemic sweeping across the USA. Coming on top of four years of Trumpism which itself was the culmination of 40 years of crony capitalism and globalised neoliberalism, George Floyd’s murder was the absolute breaking point for African Americans and also, many other people of colour, as well as increasing numbers of whites.

And so the call for #SystemChange has been taken up — post COVID, post George Floyd. System change to address the collective threats of climate breakdown, racial injustice, economic/class inequality alongside deep societal and economic uncertainty.

"Before this virus, humanity was already threatened with suffocation. If war there must be, it cannot so much be against a specific virus as against everything that condemns the majority of humankind to a premature cessation of breathing, everything that fundamentally attacks the respiratory tract, everything that, in the long reign of capitalism, has constrained entire segments of the world population, entire races, to a difficult, panting breath and life of oppression. To come through this constriction would mean that we conceive of breathing beyond its purely biological aspect, and instead as that which we hold in-common, that which, by definition, eludes all calculation. By which I mean, the universal right to breath."

Achille Mbembe, Cameroonian philosopher and research professor in history and politics at the University of the Witwatersrand

But for #SystemChange to be fully rounded, it must ensure human safety on all counts.

And this brings us to gender and the woman’s experience, perspective, analysis and contribution which is finally, coming to the fore. As the murder of George Floyd was a catalyst for social protest, so, the #MeToo movement sent a long, long overdue shockwave around the world.

Unexpectedly, the #MeToo Movement, emerging as it did just ahead of the pandemic, has ended up providing us with a fresh lens through which to view the nature of leadership in times of crisis. COVID-19 has presented us with an unprecedented global health crisis so it’s worth asking the question: during the pandemic, how have female leaders compared with their male counterparts and what light might the answers offer as we look to leadership qualities in the future?

96 https://mg.co.za/opinion/2020-06-24-achille-mbembe-the-universal-right-to-breathe/
While there are some male leaders who have done well, few countries with female leaders have done badly. In fact, the actions of female leaders in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Norway, Iceland, Finland, Germany, Taiwan and New Zealand have been exemplary, and the empathy and clear communication they showed in preventing a crisis set them apart from most of their male counterparts. In these bleak times, we can take heart from this.

CONCLUSION

Change is coming and a practical, imaginative, brave discussion about redefining and re-making foreign and defence policy such that it is truly fit-for-purpose as well as understanding its role in climate change, pandemic, economic, racial and gender injustice is part of the system change process which is underway.

The cost-benefit analysis of present-day defence spending is central to moving this debate forward. Indeed, this analysis can only move us towards far greater, genuine ‘value for money’ as we redirect and repurpose military spending from 20th-century ‘national security’ protection of ‘national interests’ to 21st-century sustainable human safety needs.

“What we urgently need now is a rethinking of the entire concept of security. Even after the end of the Cold War, it has been envisioned mostly in military terms. Over the past few years, all we’ve been hearing is talk about weapons, missiles and airstrikes... The overriding goal must be human security: providing food, water and a clean environment and caring for people’s health. To achieve it, we need to develop strategies, make preparations, plan and create reserves. But all efforts will fail if governments continue to waste money by fueling the arms race... I’ll never tire of repeating: we need to demilitarize world affairs, international politics and political thinking.”

Former President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, April 15, 2020
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