



www.gcoms.org
coordination.gcoms@ipb.org

The Global Campaign on Military Spending (GCOMS) is an international campaign promoted by the International Peace Bureau and coordinated by the Delàs Center of Studies for Peace since 2017.



Centre Delàs d'Estudis per la Pau
Carrer Erasme de Janer 8, entresol, despatx 9
08001 Barcelona
T. 93 441 19 47
www.centredelas.org
info@centredelas.org

Global Campaign on Military Spending Handbook is a project done by Delàs Centre of Studies for Peace in collaboration with International Peace Bureau with the support of Institut Català Internacional per la Pau (ICIP)

Authors:


Pere Brunet
Jordi Calvo
Zoe Dubois
Nina Krotov

Barcelona, february 2018

Graphic Design: Esteva&Estêvão

Cover photos: Selfie Campaign poster, GDAMS 2017

INDEX



INTRODUCTION	5
1. THE PROBLEM of MILITARY SPENDING	7
1.1 How much does the world spend on the military?	7
1.2 Military spending and the military-industrial complex ..	10
1.3 Military spending <i>versus</i> sustainable development & human needs	15
1.4 Military spending <i>versus</i> security	19
2. MILITARY SPENDING: DEFINITIONS AND MEASURES	23
2.1 Why to measure milex	23
2.2 How to define, understand and mesure military spending	25
2.3 Various approaches / definition of milex	32
3. THE GCOMS CAMPAIGN	49
3.1 What are the GCOMS objectives?	49
3.2 Who we are?	50
3.3 How is GCOMS coordinated?	51
3.4 When are GCOMS actions taking place?	52
3.5 How can I be involved in GCOMS?	56
4. DEVELOPING STRATEGIES FOR THE GCOMS CAMPAIGN	57
4.1 Opening remarks	57
4.2 Ways to advocate against military spending	63
ANNEXES	77
Annex 1: How to build your media strategy	77
Annex 2: How to build an advocacy coalition	82
Annex 3: Example of letter to be sent to parliamentarians	83

INTRODUCTION

*The world is over-armed
and peace is underfunded.*
Ban Ki-Moon, UN General Secretary

This document is a Handbook for campaigners willing to take action to reduce military spending in the world. It is part of the material for the GCOMS campaign of the International Peace Bureau, IPB.¹ GCOMS, the Global Campaign on Military Spending, was founded in December 2014 to convert the Global Days of Action (GDAMS), which started in 2011, into a year-round campaign. The main aim is to reduce the global military spending thanks to the cooperation of many organisations of civil society. Nowadays, more than 100 organizations from 35 different nations have joined the campaign.

In fact, the campaign started in 2005 when IPB launched its programme, 'Disarmament for Sustainable Development' (D for D), which was designed to direct widespread, public concern to the ongoing, high level of global military spending, and the evidence that all weapons - both the devastating weapons of mass destruction and those used on a frequent basis (small arms, cluster bombs, landmines, etc.) seriously impede sustainable development. Since several world conflicts over the previous decade demonstrated that military solutions were not useful in the attempt to establish peace throughout the world, IPB advocates for reductions in defense budgets and the adoption of a 'human security' approach.

1. The International Peace Bureau is dedicated to the vision of a World Without War: <http://www.ipb.org/who-we-are/>

The central focus of the campaign is military and social spending. The various concepts of these terms are discussed in greater detail in the book, *Warfare or Welfare?*² as well as in a follow-up book, *Whose Priorities?*³ Both books provide examples of creative campaigning by NGOs and other civil society organisations that have taken up these issues.

The first part of this Handbook is an introduction to the problem of military spending. Recent global data are presented to underline the magnitude of the problem, the connection between military spending and the military-industrial complex is discussed, and the basic alternative between military spending and human needs related to sustainable development is shown. Military spending is also discussed in a framework of security.

In the second part, some precise definitions of military spending (Milex) are presented and discussed. It is shown that military spending is always greater than the figures presented by national states and alliances like NATO, because of hidden budget items. Anyway, there is no universal accepted definition of Milex, and this is a fact that makes very difficult to undertake reliable analysis of its evolution, structure and trends.


The third part of the Handbook presents the GCOMS campaign, as documented in its webpages, <http://demilitarize.com> . Finally, the last part of this document includes some advice, ideas and inspiration in order to campaign for the reduction of military spending in the framework of GCOMS, by presenting a compendium of several strategies, related to public-awareness actions, lobbying of politicians and other power-holders, online campaigning, media coverage and networking.

2. Warfare or Welfare? - IPB: <http://www.ipb.org/books/warfare-or-welfare/>

3. Whose priorities? - IPB: <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/12/Whose-Priorities.pdf>

1. THE PROBLEM OF MILITARY SPENDING

1.1 HOW MUCH DOES THE WORLD SPEND ON THE MILITARY?



Global military spending levels have risen steadily in recent years. In 2016, the world's military spending amounted to **USD 1686 billion** compared to **USD 1088 billion** in 2001, according to SIPRI data.⁴ Parts of these data are shown in the table below. With an increase of 0.4 per cent in real terms on 2015, the total military spending accounted for 2.2% of the global GDP in 2016, which means 227 US dollars per person.⁵

4. From SIPRI database, figures are in US\$ at constant 2015 prices and exchange rates: <https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>

5. SIPRI, « Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2016 », April 2017, <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/Trends-world-military-expenditure-2016.pdf>

Military Expenditure 2016 versus 2015 of the 15 main military budgets

2016 Rank	2015 Rank	Country	USD Billions	Variation 2015-16
1	1	USA	611	-4.8
2	2	China	215*	118
3	3	Russia	69.2	87
4	4	Saudi Arabia	63.7*	20
5	5	India	55.9	54
6	6	France	55.7	2.8
7	7	UK	48.3	-12
8	8	Japan	46.1	2.5
9	9	Germany	41.1	6.8
10	10	South Korea	36.8	35
11	11	Italy	27.9	-16
12	12	Australia	24.6	29
13	13	Brazil	23-7	18
14	14	United Arab Emirates	22.8*	123
15	15	Israel	18	19
Total	Top15		1.360	
Total	Worldwide		1.686	14

Source: SIPRI

The table shows the top 15 military spenders in 2016, also showing their rank the year before (2015). The countries remain stable, with very few changes in their relative order. Figures have been estimated in three cases: China, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates (marked with an asterisk). Their total 2016 military expenditure (according to SIPRI data) is given in billions of US dollars, using market exchange rates.

The Table shows that these 15 top spenders in the world are accounting for USD 1360 billion, which is a 81% of the total global spending of USD 1686 billion in 2016³, whereas the rest of countries in the world represent the other 19% of the global Milex. The Table also shows the increase/decrease per country with respect to 2015. There is a high increase in China and United Arab Emirates while Italy, UK and

USA showed slight decreases. Regardless, global Milex increased a 14% between 2015 and 2016.

The USA military expenditure of USD 611 billion in 2016 was over one-third (36%) of the world military expenditure. This is nearly three times the level of China's spending, which is ranked second. Expenditure in North America (Canada and the USA) in 2016 was USD 626 billion, accounting for 90% of total spending in the Americas.³ Europe's military spending accounted for 20% of global military expenditure in 2016 (334 billion). The figure is an increase of 2.8 per cent compared with 2015. Four of the fifteen largest military spenders in the world—France, the UK, Germany and Italy in ranked order, account for a 10 per cent of the global military expenditure.³ Military spending in Asia and Oceania amounted to USD 450 billion in 2016, with an increase of 64 per cent between 2007 and 2016. China had the highest military spending in the region: an estimated \$215 billion, or 48 per cent of regional spending.⁶ On the other hand, military expenditure in Africa as a whole fell by 1.3 per cent to USD 37.9 billion in 2016. Total spending in Africa, however, is still 48 per cent higher than it was in 2007.

Military spending is particularly high in the Middle East. Oman had the highest military burden in the world, at 17% of its GDP, followed by Saudi Arabia at 10%. Israel was the 15th largest military spender in the world in 2016. Its expenditure grew by 19% between 2007 and 2016 to USD 18 billion, with this figure excluding about USD 3.5 billion in military aid from the USA. For its part, Turkey increased its military spending by 9.7% between 2007 and 2016".⁷

However, in contrast to the massive amount of money invested in wars and weapons, **"many states fail to increase their foreign development aid to the UN target of 0.7% of GDP, and to tackle effectively their economic and social development challenges"**.⁸

6. SIPRI, « Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2016 », April 2017, *op.cit*

7. SIPRI, « Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2016 », April 2017, *op.cit*

8. IPB, « Opportunity Costs: Military Spending And The UN's Development Agenda », November 2012, <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/document.pdf>

According to a 2016 OCDE report,⁹ the global community provides annually about **USD 135 billion in official development assistance (ODA)**... while it has spent **USD 1686 billion in military spending** this year. The military expenditure figures of the big spending countries are therefore much higher than their development aid spending. For instance, "in 2010, the United States' foreign aid budget represented only 4% of its military spending. China, India and Brazil each spent the equivalent of about 1% of their military spending on aid and, for Russia, it is even less than 1%. The proportions for the UK (20%), France (22%), Japan (18%) and Germany (29%) look much better but still show that preparing for war is more attractive than investing in sustainable development and promoting peace. Looking at the costs of specific weapon systems compared to development projects, the numbers speak for themselves. For instance, for the price of one aircraft carrier (\$5 billion), an area three times the size of Costa Rica could be reforested in the Amazon (\$300 per hectare). Or for the cost of one battle tank (\$780,000), 26,000 people could be treated for malaria (\$30 per person)."¹⁰

1.2 MILITARY SPENDING AND THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Although it refers to "the public financial resources devoted by governments to the military",¹¹ military spending goes way beyond **politics**. It also concerns the **military / defence industry** - that includes all companies producing weapons, military equipment and technologies and providing a range of related service for governments - as well as **armies**. In other words, military spending falls within a large interconnected ecosystem: there is no military spending without a political will to maintain and increase a country's military capability and without military production, just as there is no military production without military

9. OCDE, « Development Co-operation Report 2016 : The Sustainable Development Goals as Business Opportunities », 2016, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/dcr-2016-en>

10. IPB, « Opportunity Costs: Military Spending And The UN's Development Agenda », November 2012, *op.cit*


11. SIPRI, 11 January 2017: Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure » <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-background/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

personal, and vice versa. This constitutes what is called the Military-Industrial Complex or the “Military-Industrial-Political Complex”¹² - which consists of a revolving-door framework between “the military industry, high-ranking officials of the army, politics, and financing groups that benefit from Defence”.¹³ Such a multi-level vision is therefore crucial for the right understanding of the issue - and must be taken into account when crafting effective lobbying and awareness-raising campaign strategies.

The Military-Industrial Complex is not a new concept. It was already used in 1961 by Dwight Eisenhower in his farewell address as U.S. President.¹⁴ It designates an informal alliance between the military and the arms industry. The driving factor of flourishing alliances between governments and Military-Industrial Complex is that both sides benefit: governments and military obtain war weapons whereas the military industry gets paid to supply them. Because of these revenues, Military-Industrial Complex increases its power and is able to lobby governments with increasing influence. Governments are then incentivised to increase next year military budget, in a spiral process that feeds back and generates more and more arms trade and revenues. Surprisingly, this is a mechanism of self-dynamics that is mostly independent from real world conflicts: it is driven by economic revenues.

While the total amount of money in National budgets is limited, the way in which it is distributed shows the government priorities. Increasing the military budget gives more money to Military-Industrial Complex, making it more powerful and **inflating the global market with more and more arms** while limiting **the amount of funds that could address human needs**:

-
12. IPB, « Whose priorities? A guide for campaigners on military and social spending », IPB, 2007, p.17 <<http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/12/Whose-Priorities.pdf>>
 13. Pere Ortega and Camino Simarro, « The military industrial complex », Report 12, *Centre Delàs d'Estudis per la Pau*, 23 April, 2012 <<http://www.centredelas.org/en/publications/reports/2318-report-12-the-military-industrial-complex>>
 14. <http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/eisenhower-warns-of-the-military-industrial-complex>




Increasing Military-Industrial Complex activity results in **more arms** in all countries, including regions in conflict and nations that do not respect human rights. And the experience of the last decades tells us that there is a **positive correlation between the number of available arms and the number of violent conflicts**. As SIPRI states, “Tensions and conflicts were on-going in large parts of the world in 2016, and these often had direct links to arms acquisitions from abroad”,¹⁵ Arms and weapons make wars easier, and the victims of modern wars are mostly civilians.

However, the influence of the Military-Industrial Complex does not end at the arms trade alone. It helps to perpetuate a larger system of inequality, poverty, exploitation and abuse. Indeed, Military-Industrial Complex is the tool now used by corporations and governments

15. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

to secure their power and revenues, at the expense of human needs and rights. Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes very well argue this in a recent TNI book titled *The Secure and the Dispossessed*.¹⁶ During the last three decades, an inversion has taken place: while in the past, governments and military issued regulations for corporations, nowadays, transnational companies are the ones which are driving many government decisions. Corporations (most of them trans-national yet based in Northern countries, such as companies dealing with fossil energy, water, food, industry, internet and others, but (delete 'but' also including financial organizations) ask governments for protection; and **governments prioritize corporation interests over people needs**, by using their military power to secure, for instance, the extraction and transport of resources. As such, corporations continue extracting Earth resources from the Global South in a non-sustainable way with the basic goal of increasing revenues, while local communities get poorer and poorer.




16. *The Secure and the Dispossessed* (TNI, Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes, Eds.) : <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/the-secure-and-the-dispossessed>

During the last decades, private interests have prevailed over human needs. The book from Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes therefore advocates for **a move from military spending and private revenues to civilian needs, welfare, social policies, UN sustainable goals¹⁷ and human rights**. In the Conclusions Section, Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes declare that “It is the state that feeds the military-industrial complex, and the state that acts as the prime backer of the corporate takeover of land, water, food and energy, removing regulations and opening up markets to them, negotiating trade deals on their behalf, and creating what some scholars call an international legal ‘architecture of impunity’ for corporations, which has escalated human rights abuses and corporate crimes worldwide. This is because corporations have in many ways captured states; populating their ministries with staff, designing their policies, lobbying against regulation, and threatening boycott and withdrawal if any state dares to challenge them”.¹⁸

In summary, increases in military and armament spending feed the convergence in the Military-Industrial Complex, big corporations and governments, also amplifying Military-Industrial Complexes, arms trade, conflicts, poverty and humanitarian disasters. The result, instead of addressing human needs, is increased revenue for those individuals who (directly or not) are investing in the Military-Industrial Complexes. **The alternative is a discourse based on people needs and human needs**. Funding human needs contributes to the UN sustainable goals, being a clear factor for peace-building:

17. United Nations: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

18. The Secure and the Dispossessed (TNI, Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes, Eds., page 242) : <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/the-secure-and-the-dispossessed>



It is important to remark that **Milex is not about defence, and that Milex is not about pacification and conflict resolution.** Military actions in world areas with conflicts are not resulting in an improvement of their humanitarian situation, but in a **deterioration of their conflicts**: several researchers have concluded that some conflicts are in part perpetuated by the European sale of weapons to countries with unstable conditions like Syria or Yemen.¹⁹ Moreover, **Milex is feeding a network of private interests** (including transnational corporations,²⁰ the military-industrial complex and financial entities) aiming at business and benefits and being a source of wealth and enrichment for a minority. As stated by SIPRI, « all major global indicators for peace and security have moved in a negative direction: more military spending, increased arms trading, more violent conflicts and the continuing forward march of military technology »,²¹ In short, **Milex promotes violent actions that kill civilians while giving revenues to a few.** This is the reason why any strategy based on human needs should be based on **diverting military spending to human centred goals. Milex will certainly generate violence, while human security can only be constructed if violence is eradicated.**

19. Delas Center Report on European Arms that Foster armed Conflicts that cause Refugees to flee: http://www.centredelas.org/images/INFORMES_i_altres_PDF/informe32_refugiados_ENG_web_DEF.pdf

20. The Secure and the Dispossessed (TNI, Nick Buxton and Ben Hayes, Eds.), op. cit.

21. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

1.3 MILITARY SPENDING *versus* SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT & HUMAN NEEDS

Resources invested in the military are essential for the success of the UN's Development Agenda. In its report on Opportunity Costs,²² IPB states that "If civil society and its allies in government and parliamentary circles can make a convincing case for a profound shift in priorities, **then resources made available by military sector cuts could constitute one of the most important innovative mechanisms for development financing.** Such mechanisms will be essential in the coming years as the international community faces the growing challenge of finding sufficient resources to ensure human survival and security in the widest sense". In the same way, Ban Ki-moon, past-UN Secretary General, was also very clear: "**Let us dramatically cut spending on nuclear weapons, and invest instead in social and economic development,** which serves the interests of all by expanding markets, reducing motivations for armed conflicts, and in giving citizens a stake in their common futures. Like nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, such goals are essential for ensuring human security and a peaceful world for future generations", concluding that: "**Massive military spending and new investments in modernizing nuclear weapons have left the world over-armed and peace under-funded**"²³

According to the 2005 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program,²⁴ "**Insecurity linked to armed conflict remains one of the greatest obstacles to human development**". But human security and development should be the goal of every government and of everyone, as stated, among others, by IPB: "Decent housing, adequate health care, drinking water, jobs, education, etc., it's not nearly as expensive as maintaining nuclear weapons, designing new ones, or buying guns. Developing countries bought \$1.45 billion worth of small arms, light weapons and ammunition in 2003 alone.

22. Opportunity Costs Report, IPB: <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/document.pdf>

23. UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, 2012: <https://www.un.org/disarmament/update/20120830/>

24. UN Human Development Report 2005: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/266/hdr05_complete.pdf

There are 600 million small arms in circulation, the weapon of choice in 47 of the 49 major conflicts of the 1990's. That's how 500,000 people died in any given year, from someone shooting a gun".²⁵

A 2008 study from the William Davidson Institute of the University of Michigan²⁶ exploring relationships between military spending and human rights performance states that « military sector growth can affect the socioeconomic development in an economy at the expense of diminishing returns to social development sectors (...) because, to fund this ever increasing defense spending, the government would be forced to cut its expenditure on other sectors (most prominently related to development) ». Additionally, as the « fundamental responsibility of any government for its people is to provide basic public goods and services », this report underlines that « the failure to do so leads to economic and social dissatisfaction amongst the poor and middle class in the society. This paves way for economic insecurity and social unrest risking political stability and outbreak of conflicts thereby ». Because people become outraged when conditions become outrageous, **the choice to invest in the military at the expense of development creates, in the first place, conditions of social, human and economic insecurity and conflicts.** Many political discourses and scientific researches thus converge to raise a red flag about the negative impact of excessive military spending.

By redirecting part of worldwide military expenditure, we would be able to fund the needs of people and therefore, to build conditions for *real* and *lasting* peace: no poverty, zero hunger, a good healthcare system, quality education, gender quality, clear water and sanitation, affordable and clean energy for everybody, climate action, reduced inequality and many others, as clearly stated in the UN SDGs.²⁷ These are needs that focus on people and on their rights. However, at present the situation is the inverse one. We are suffering from a reduced amount of

25. IPB: <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Warfare-or-Welfare.zip>

26. University of Michigan: <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/64404/wp941.pdf?sequence=1>

27. United Nations: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

development funding and from an excessive military spending, that are resulting in more benefits for the military industry, in a more powerful Military Industrial Complex, in more powerful predating corporations, in an increased arms trade, in more lobbying and more influence on governments, in an increased number of arms worldwide, and in an increased number of arms in regions in conflict. All this being at the expense of people's life conditions and rights around the world - both in the Global South and the North.

More recently, the worrying link between military spending and sustainable development has become even more concerning since **some organisations have changed their definition of Foreign Aid to include some military spending**.²⁸ The change in wording was agreed for instance by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) after the UK and other countries **lobbied to be allowed to use overseas aid budgets to support the military and security forces in fragile countries**, with the argument that this promotes development goals¹⁶. However, the disproportionate support to the security sector reform, and the capacity building being provided to the armed and security forces in poor and fragile countries (especially where donors have interests to do so) at the expense of social, political and development-oriented projects is absolutely problematic and at best counterproductive.

Reduction of weapons and armament has a strong legal basis. The article 26 of the United Nations Charter²⁹ states "In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for... the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments". It should be remarked that promotion of peace and security is related with the "least" diversion for armaments. Moreover, the UN High Commission-

28. See: <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/feb/20/oecd-redefines-foreign-aid-to-include-some-military-spending>

29. <http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>

er for Human Rights' report to the UN Human Rights Council on the "Impact of arms transfers on the enjoyment of human rights" reviews relevant international and regional legal frameworks.³⁰ Which is clearly not the case in practice. For instance, many European countries continue to sell arms worth millions of euros to countries involved in deadly conflicts and violating human rights.

Moreover, peace and human security is essentially linked to gender issues and to the active role of women. On the fifth anniversary of the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of Res. 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, UN Deputy Secretary-General said, "Gender equality and women's empowerment are central to achieving major development goals... Unless attention is paid to the discrimination of women across all UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the achievement of these goals will be jeopardized". Most analysts of human security do give recognition to the threats to women's security arising from conflict, poverty and other sources. But few seem to view the problem as systemic.³¹ Women and other unarmed civilians are often the primary victims of modern armed conflicts, so they must be strongly involved in the solutions. Women must have an essential and primary role in the prevention and resolution of conflicts, peace negotiations, peace building and peacekeeping. They should be at the centre and the kernel of any initiative to redirect military funds to human needs.

1.4 MILITARY SPENDING *versus* SECURITY

The traditional security discourse creates the illusion that arms and additional military capabilities are necessary for our security - and the contemporaneous "war against terrorism" has fuelled this idea. But it is not true. In fact, quite the opposite is the case.

30. UN Document Index A/HRC/35/8: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/RuleOfLaw/ArmsTransfers/A_HRC_35_8_AEV_EN.docx

31. IPB: <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Warfare-or-Welfare.zip>

As stated by 2016 SIPRI Yearbook “all major **global indicators for peace and security have moved in a negative direction: more military spending, increased arms trading, more violent conflicts and the continuing forward march of military technology** ».³² Further, SIPRI explains that: “Increases in military expenditures do not necessarily guarantee an improvement in security”. On the contrary, « Excessive military expenditure can result in a loss of resources for development and humanitarian challenges. The latter contribute to human insecurity and are also frequently linked to national security threats. **A focus on human security, rather than national security, might generate a very different military expenditure portfolio and help governments to determine the appropriate balance of investment in military versus social spending, as it relates to improving security.** »³³

Arms exports to the Middle East increased by 86 per cent between 2007 and 2016, and Middle East has become the second largest importing region for that period.³⁴ The USA and several West European states continued to be the major arms suppliers to most countries in the region throughout 2012-16.³⁵ **And because during the same period, new regional conflicts have emerged and bogged down, “it is likely that arms imports have contributed to the instability, violent conflict and human rights violations in the region”**.³⁶ By investing more and more in weapons and military capabilities, our Governments are fuelling a new arms race and creating conditions for conflicts and global insecurity. In sum, the idea suggesting that military power can help build and preserve peace has still considerable support. However, the idea is basically destroyed by the facts. **We cannot build peace, security, stability and democracy with weapons.** That’s what we should learn from the current refugees crisis, from the Libyan situations, from the war and humanitarian crisis in Yemen.

32. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

33. <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2016-Forum-Policy-Brief-No-4.pdf>

34. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

35. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

36. SIPRI Yearbook 2016: <https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/yb17-summary-eng.pdf>

According to the United Nations definition, **human security** is a people-centered concept that places the individual at the centre of analysis: Human security “moves away from traditional, state-centric conceptions of security that focused primarily on the safety of states from military aggression, to one that concentrates on the security of the individuals, their protection and empowerment; drawing attention to a multitude of threats that cut across different aspects of human life and thus highlighting the interface between security, development and human rights; and promoting a new integrated, coordinated and people-centered approach to advancing peace, security and development within and across nations”.³⁷

With the concept of human security, a political consensus has emerged concerning an obligation to protect people from threats. Nevertheless, the human is still not the mere referent object of security. If it was the case, governments would spend hundreds of billions in health, education, employment, social justice, humanitarian assistance and environmental protection, not in the arms industry. The sums devoted to military spending worldwide, in addition to sorely lacking in terms of transparency, reflect the gulf between discourses and practices. And this, in spite of the evidence that “in a world of globally interconnected social, humanitarian, economic and ecological challenges, even the largest army cannot protect a single state from water shortages or economic crises, let alone global warming”.³⁸ This highlights once again that the choice to invest in weapons and military capacities is mostly independent from real world conflicts and people’s needs: it is driven by economic revenues.

The Global Campaign on Military Spending advocates for a human and social-based approach of security; it supports the broad concept of Human Security, “meaning **the security of people through development, not arms; through cooperation, not confrontation**”.³⁹ Both

37. UN, Human security definition : http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org/humansecurity/files/human_security_in_theory_and_practice_english.pdf

38. IPB : <http://www.ipb.org/human-security/>

39. IPB : <http://www.ipb.org/human-security/>

in global North and South, too many governments are cutting education, health, culture, justice and social assistance budgets while increasing their defence and military expenditure. But who benefits from these increases? The millions of people dying, or forced to flee their home in countries in conflict, the millions of people who are watching their salaries, rights and living conditions slide ever downwards?

The alternative, **instead of increasing military expenditure, is therefore reducing it while increasing the budget that can directly fund human needs.** A cut of 6% on the total World Military Spending would generate 100 billion dollars per year, and this could probably address the needs of developing countries in terms of climate change adaptation and mitigation by 2020 (UN's SDG number 13⁴⁰). And a cut of 3.2% on World Military Spending would generate 54 billion dollars per year, enough to address the 3rd UN's SDG⁴¹ by achieving pre-primary, primary and lower-secondary universal education by 2030. And yet, as stated by Malala Yousafzai, co-recipient of the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize: **"With guns you can kill terrorists, with education you can kill terrorism"**.⁴²

More military expenditure will not make us safer, happier, fulfilled or more equal. It just makes wars easier and longer, at the expense of global and human-oriented security, while giving great economic benefits to a small group of individuals worldwide. In 1945, just after a terrible world war, the **United Nations were founded under a statement asking for a minimum diversion of our resources to armaments.** Data between 1945 and nowadays shows exactly the opposite. Today, there is a clear opportunity to effectively address the needs of people and communities as well as environmental issues: **by reducing military spending and by reallocating at least 10% of this budget for this purpose.**

40. UN SDGs: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

41. UN SDGs, op. Cit.

42. <http://indianexpress.com/article/lifestyle/life-style/10-inspirational-quotes-by-malala-yousafzai-4747081/>

2. MILITARY SPENDING: DEFINITIONS AND MEASURES

2.1 WHY TO MEASURE MILEX

THE « MILITARY BURDEN MEASURE »

The most common measure of military effort is the **fraction expressing military expenditures as a share of GNP or GDP**. “The share of GDP is a rough indicator of the proportion of national resources used for military activities, and therefore of the economic burden imposed on the national economy” (SIPRI). This measure makes it easier to compare small countries with big ones, rich countries with poor ones, and it allows us to compare a country’s investments in education, health or employment and other areas of public interest with military spending.

Source:
SIPRI, “Sources and Methods”,
<https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex/sources-and-methods>

Measuring military spending can serve multiple purposes and multiple campaign objectives and actions. Generally speaking, measuring such expenditure allows to assess the economic burden of a country’s military spending on its economy – it is often referred to as “military burden measure” (see the box) – or to assess a government’s priorities, notably by and comparing spending on the military with spending on other sectors such as health, education or climate change⁴³ (comparative analysis). It also allows conducting research on “the effect of military expenditure on the risk of armed conflict”⁴⁴ (correlative analysis). More specifically, such information is essential in developing lobbying and awareness-raising strategies and promoting military expenditure

43. SIPRI Report by Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017, <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgrounder/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

44. SIPRI Report by Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017, <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgrounder/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

into public discourses. Indeed, **this type of comparison constitutes a clear, strong campaign tool** to remind people that they are directly affected, since “increases in military spending also mean reduced funding for social and human needs”.⁴⁵

For instance:

In 2016, worldwide military expenditure represented 2.2% of the world's total Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and reached \$1676 billion. Meanwhile, austerity has gained many countries, and the cut on social needs are frequent while the military spending doesn't stop growing. At a time where peace is threatened by the climate crisis and humanitarian crisis, one can only wonder about what could be found if we agree to reduce military spending. To use SIPRI's terms: what is the “opportunity cost” of worldwide military spending? Especially, the GCOMS campaign aims to show that if we reallocate 10% of military spending to fund the UN's Sustainable Development Goal, we could achieve them.⁴⁶


Indeed, SIPRI has shown that with only 10% of military spending, we could already achieve great progress on key UN's Sustainable Development Goals. The graphics below shows how much we need to achieve all those goals, which prove that with 10% of military spending reallocation, we could already achieve some of them, or at least to advance in the development of those Goals.

45. GCOMS, « The Global Campaign on Military Spending (GCOMS) Second Statement for 2017 », 24 April 2017, http://demilitarize.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/GCOMS_Second_Statement.pdf

46. SIPRI Report by Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, «The opportunity cost of world military spending », 5 April 2016, <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/blog/2016/opportunity-cost-world-military-spending>

What could the reallocation of global military spending achieve?

The annual cost of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a share of total global military expenditure in 2015.



Source: <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/blog/2016/opportunity-cost-world-military-spending>

2.2 HOW TO DEFINE, UNDERSTAND AND MEASURE MILITARY SPENDING

As is often the case with regard to awareness campaigns, GCOMS challenges an issue that is still largely unknown and misunderstood by the public - even though each and every one is concerned. Indeed, "there is a serious problem of perception, or rather of quasi-invisibility".⁴⁷ This is exacerbated by that fact that military spending is usually considered as a guarantee of security, and therefore as a condition for peace. For example, typical missions of the Army are to defend the nation, protect national interests and preserve the peace and security. But, on the contrary of this presumption, other analysis like the one promoted by

47. IPB, « Warfare or Welfare », 2005, <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Warfare-or-Welfare.zip>

GCOMS state that “we point to the dynamics of the military economic cycle as responsible for the difficulty of getting out of the inertia that leads to approving, year after year, military public budgets that generate much of the armed violence in the world”.⁴⁸

This perception problem is attributable, among other things, to the fact that the field of military spending is utterly lacking in transparency.⁴⁹ Accordingly, understanding the full scope of “military spending” is the first step into “tackling this largely contribution of public money to the global spread of arms”.⁵⁰

Military expenditure refers to **“the amount of financial resources allocated by a government to provide its military with weapons, equipment, and compensation for soldiers”**;⁵¹ in other words, it would refer to “the economic resources devoted to the military”.⁵² However, there is no consensus on what it includes exactly, thereby generating a lot of confusion. For instance, “media reports on military expenditure, including in specialist publications, tend to report simply the defence budget of the country in question, although many countries have significant military expenditure in other budget lines”.⁵³ Another common error “is to refer to military spending as arms spending”.⁵⁴ Military expenditure has a broader scope and covers a much more complex reality. More importantly, the definition of military expenditures is the result of **variable and subjective criteria for determining what does or does not belong to the military area**, and even more so of a **subjective definition of the very concept of security**. Overall, military-related expenditures’ review is facing many obstacles.

48. Chloé Meulewaeter, “Los dividendos de la paz: un estado de la cuestión” (in Spanish), *Revista de Estudios de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, num. 36 (2016), pages 57-63 (sentence in page 63), ISSN: 1575-2100.

49. IPB, « Warfare or Welfare », 2005

50. « Lessons from other campaigners », GCOMS website, <http://demilitarize.org/lessons-from-other-campaigners/>

51. « Global military spending », GCOMS website, <http://demilitarize.org/global-military-spending/>

52. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017 <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgroundunder/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

53. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017 <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgroundunder/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

54. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017, *op cit*

Obstacles

a) The transparency issue

In fact, military-related expenditures' review is often affected by the **lack of reliability and transparency of the military expenditure data**. Large portions of the military budget are not accessible to public control, and that holds also for countries with open political and parliamentary systems.⁵⁵ In countries with autocratic regimes and in countries located in areas of conflict, the access to the military sector is very limited.⁵⁶

- **TRANSPARENCY:** Transparency of information on military spending means « whether information of the military budget and actual spending is readily available to the public, and the level of reliability, detail and comprehensiveness of this information. Transparency of process refers to whether budgetary decision-making is open and visible, with the reasons for spending clearly outlined ». ⁵⁷ For instance, SIPRI was unable to publish military spending data for the United Arab Emirates, Lebanon, Qatar, Eritrea, Somalia and Cuba in 2016. It is a key issue given that the "lack of transparency creates high vulnerability for corruption".⁵⁸ It is observed that, in practice, "the military tends to be one of the most corrupt sectors of government, and arms procurement - domestic and international - is especially subject to corruption, in both developed and developing countries.»⁵⁹ In 2015, Transparency International published a *Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index* assessing the vulnerability of the military to corruption in the majority of countries worldwide. In sum, many countries provide only limited information on military

55. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 , *op.cit.*; Lucie Béraud-Sudreau and Bastian Giegerich, « Counting to two: analysing the NATO defence-spending target », *IJSS*, 14 Feb 2017 <http://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2017-edcc/february-7849/counting-to-two-67c0>

56. University of Defence, « Defence And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit.*

57. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, "Transparency and accountability in military spending », 3 August, 2016,

58. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, "Transparency and accountability in military spending », *op. cit.*

59. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, "Transparency and accountability in military spending », *op. cit.*

expenditure; the lack of transparency “makes it hard to know what is or is not included in military expenditure figures, whether definitions have changed over time and whether figures are for actual or budgeted expenditure”.⁶⁰

- **RELIABILITY:** In some countries, especially poorer countries or countries in conflict, the financial monitoring and control of the military sector may be weak, or even non-existent. Levels of military expenditures may be incompletely reported, obscured or falsified due to corruption or for other reasons.⁶¹ For instance, SIPRI’s military spending data for 2016 was unavailable for Syria and Yemen, which are both war-ravaged.⁶²

b) Hidden military expenditures & the ambiguity of the figures concerning national military spending

Just like individual governments can define the concept of “military expenditures” the way it suits their purposes,⁶³ the structure of governments’ budget is based on widely varying criteria. “Some budgets are grouping expenditures by functional lines (e.g. education, health and defence), other by organizational lines (i.e. by ministry). In some countries, the official defence budget is the budget of the Ministry of Defence (MoD), in other it is a number of items from several ministry budgets lumped together in a functional category of ‘National Defence’ and in many countries both of these exist in parallel”.⁶⁴ In almost all countries, military expenditure is funded from a number of **extra-budgetary** or **off-budget sources**.⁶⁵ This “covers all military expenditure outside the official defence budget, whether within the overall government budget and expenditure, or entirely outside the state budget”.⁶⁶

60. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », *op. cit.*

61. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », *op. cit.*

62. SIPRI, Fact Sheets, Trends in World Military Expenditures, 2016

63. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit.*

64. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit.*

65. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », *op. cit.*

66. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics »: Topic 3 *op.cit.*

- **Extra-budgetary spending** is “spending on the military from **other sections of the state budget**. This may include the science or infrastructure budgets, special Presidential funds, or loans whose repayments come from the Ministry of Finance. Such spending is often not clearly disaggregated and reported, making it hard or impossible to disentangle all elements of military spending”.⁶⁷ This includes military-related items in the budgets of non-defence ministries, for example expenditures for paramilitary forces in the budget of the interior ministry. Similarly, some “military activities are portrayed as ‘peace operations’ or ‘public security’ activities and get paid for by non-military departments such as the police or social welfare”.⁶⁸ Besides, budgets which are organized by ministry exclude those military-related items that are financed by other ministries. “Examples of military-related items that can be financed by other ministries include military construction, arms procurement, military pensions, received military aid and paramilitary forces, which all may come under other budget headings than defence”.⁶⁹ These can thus be difficult to identify when they are lumped together with non-military expenditure and impossible to separate from these.⁷⁰
- **Off-budget spending** comes from outside the state budget altogether. “This may include dedicated natural resource funds used for arms purchases, payments from the private sector for security, or military business activities. Off-budget finance may allow the military

TO KNOW:

Official data on military expenditure are usually provided in two major types of government documents, first in the defence budget as proposed by the government, and subsequently adopted by the legislature (parliament), and after the end of the year, when the money has been spent, in the public expenditure accounts of the government.

67. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, “Transparency and accountability in military spending », 3 August, 2016, *op.cit*

68. IPB, « Warfare or Welfare », 2005, <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Warfare-or-Welfare.zip>

69. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit*.

70. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit*.

to conduct procurement without going through the Parliament or the Ministry of Defence, so that purchases are not assessed against strategic needs. Off-budget spending means that **resources are allocated to the military outside of any general budget deliberations**, and in many cases automatically, without relation to an overall assessment of defence needs, and without the possibility of weighing them against other possible uses".⁷¹ For instance, many countries exclude expenditure on arms imports from their military expenditure figures.⁷² "Another example of extra-budgetary revenues is the various types of business activities by armed forces. In many countries the military runs factories, shops and other commercial activities from which they gain an income, which are used either to increase the personal income of the soldiers, or in a more organized form, for arms purchases and other collective expenditures".⁷³

In addition, "some countries include only allocations for the salaries and ordinary operations of their armed forces, while other countries include a broad spectrum of expenditure, including purchases of weapons systems, military construction, and military research and development".⁷⁴ However, in almost all countries, some military-related spending is excluded from the official figures.⁷⁵

The defence budget can also cover more than expenditures for strictly military purposes; in some countries "it covers **not only military defence but also civil defence**. In other countries, like Sweden, the defence budget covers also allocations related to "economic defence" and "psychological defence", where economic defence includes measures to protect oil reserves, food supplies and other important economic functions and psychological defence deals with the defence of people from hostile enemy propaganda".⁷⁶

71. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, "Transparency and accountability in military spending », *op. cit.*

72. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », *op. cit.*

73. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3, *op.cit.*

74. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 *op.cit.*

75. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), "Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad", Icaria: Barcelona, 2015 (in Spanish), 335p.

76. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 : *op.cit.*

“For these reasons, an examination of official defence expenditure most often does not provide the entire picture of the amount of public expenditure devoted to military purposes”.⁷⁷

Overall, “there is no authoritative source providing complete international statistic data on military expenditures; instead, there are number of separate institutionalized agencies that publish various military data series. And because these agencies work with **different definitions, assessment methods and sources of information**, analysts working with different data sources may arrive at different result”.⁷⁸

- ▶ *For instance, according to the US Government, the country’s military spending for the year 2013 reached 3,64% of GPD; according to the SIPRI, it reached 3,8% of GPD and according to the War Resisters League, US military spending reached 5,83% of GDP in 2013. Similarly, in Spain, military expenditure reached 0,65% of GDP in 2013 according to the Spanish government, 0,9% of GDP according to the SIPRI, 1,64% of GDP according to the centre for peace studies J M Delàs⁷⁹ and 9,8% of GDP according to Antimilitaristes-MOC.⁸⁰*

In order to build a good advocacy campaign and to lobby effectively for a global decrease in military spending, it is thus important to have an overview of the various definitions that exist, and **to adopt a common understanding of what military spending is, but also of which political and ideological assumptions it relies on.**

77. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 : *op.cit.*

78. University of Defence, « Defense And Security Economics : Topic 3 : *op.cit.*

79. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), “Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad”, *op. cit.*

80. Alternativa Antimilitarista-MOC, « El gasto militar y para “control social” rondó los 35.000 millones de euros en 2013 » April 2014, <<http://www.antimilitaristas.org/spip.php?article5401>>

2.3 VARIOUS APPROACHES / DEFINITION OF MILEX

There is no universal definition of military spending and what kind of expenditure it recovers. Also, this section aims to show the variety of definitions that do exist today in order to show, first, how difficult it is to compare different data on military expenditure. Secondly, that data concerning military's expenditure must be interpreted with caution. As a matter of fact, depending on the source (SIPRI or NATO for instance), researchers will achieve different results over a country's military spending. In order to gain a greater understanding of this issue, we will see below various definitions of military spending, these ranging from the SIPRI's definition to pacifists' one, also including NATO's definition.

a) SIPRI's approach of military spending⁸¹

The SIPRI Military Expenditure Database provides the only historically consistent series of military expenditure data with global coverage.⁸² The database is made from open sources that can be independently checked and updated annually, both with new data for the most recent year and with revisions to past data to take account of new information and ensure consistency over time.

SIPRI's definition of military expenditure

According to SIPRI, military expenditure includes all current and capital expenditure on the **armed forces**, including **peacekeeping forces**, spending on '**defence ministries and other government agencies engaged in defence projects**';

81. SIPRI - the *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute* - is an independent institute dedicated to research into peace, conflict, arms control and disarmament. See : « About SIPRI », <https://www.sipri.org/about>

82. More precisely, SIPRI's work is largely based around three comprehensive and open-access databases: the Arms transfers' database, the Arms industry database and the Military expenditure database.

'paramilitary forces - such as gendarmerie forces, border and coast guards, and interior ministry troops - when judged to be trained, equipped and available for military operations'.

The expenditures also include:

- All expenditures on current personnel, military and civil: retirement pensions of military personnel, social services for personnel and their families;
- Operations and maintenance costs (general supplies, fuel, repair and maintenance, travel, rent, utilities and payments for services; costs related to the membership to military organization (ex. NATO);
- Procurement;
- Military research and development;
- Military construction (expenditure for military bases and other military infrastructure);
- Military aid (in the military expenditures of the donor country)
- Military space activities.

However, for reasons of comparability between states, SIPRI data on military spending **does not include:**

- Civil defence;
- Current expenditure for previous military activities;
- Veterans' benefits;
- Demobilization;
- Conversion of arms production facilities or destruction of weapons.



The benefits of working with SIPRI's data are to **provide reliable, rigorous data** allowing **global comparisons** between States. However, the omission of some data (see above) means that a **large sum is not taken into account**. For instance, in the USA, the costs of veterans' benefits and the military share of interest on the national debt amount to 18% of government spending. Thus, the true overall costs of the military worldwide must be substantially higher than those published by the SIPRI. However without detailed reporting on these additional costs in each country a complete global tally is impossible.

Sources:

« SIPRI definition of military expenditures » <https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex/definitions>
Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », SIPRI, 11 janvier 2017, <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgrounder/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>
IPB, « Opportunity Costs: Military Spending and the UN's Development Agenda », 2012, <http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/document.pdf>

b) NATO's approach of military spending⁸³

NATO has recommended to States to spend, at least, 2% of their GDP in Defence. If at first it was only a recommendation, it became an obligation during the Wales Summit in 2014. In fact, in the Wales Declaration of Transatlantic Bond, Member States engaged themselves to spend at least 2% of their GDP, and have thus turned a simple commitment into an obligation. During the Wales Summit, Member States also agreed to increase defence expenditure in real terms as GDP grows.⁸⁴

83. NATO - *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* - is as an inter-governmental political and military organisation promoting cooperation on defence and security-related issues.

84. NATO, « The Wales Declaration on the Transatlantic Bond », 5 September 2014, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112985.htm?mode=pressrelease

NATO's definition of military expenditure

NATO defines defence expenditure as '**payments made by a national government specifically to meet the needs of its armed forces or those of Allies**'.

The expenditures include:

- All expenditures (operations, maintenance, procurement) related to the armed forces (Land, Maritime and Air forces) as well as 'Joint formations such as Administration and Command, Special Operations Forces, Medical Service, Logistic Command';
- Pension payments made directly by the government to retired military and civilian employees of military departments;
- Expenditure for peacekeeping and humanitarian operations;
- The destruction of weapons, equipment and ammunition and the costs associated with inspection and control of equipment destruction;
- Military Research and Development;
- Military aid (in the military expenditures of the donor country);
- Expenditure on NATO Common infrastructure.

War damage payments and spending on civil defence **are excluded**.

Since 2004, expenditures on paramilitary forces are excluded if they are not 'realistically deployable'.

However, there is a **grey area** concerning certain items that leaves much room for interpretation. For instance, expenditure for the military component of mixed civilian-military activities is included, but *only* when this military component 'can be specifically accounted for or estimated'. In addition, expenditures related to "Other Forces" (like Ministry of Interior troops, border guards, national police forces, customs, gendarmerie, carabinieri,

coast guards) should be included *only* 'in proportion to the forces that are trained in military tactics, are equipped as a military force, can operate under direct military authority in deployed operations, and can, realistically, be deployed outside national territory in support of a military force'.

Source, from NATO own definitions:

NATO, Defence Expenditure of NATO Countries (2009-2016), Presse Realease, 13 march 2017, p.14, http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2017_03/20170313_170313-pr2017-045.pdf
NATO - Information on defence expenditures, http://www.nato.int/cps/on/natohq/topics_49198.htm
For more information on NATO: Xavier Bohigas and Teresa de Fortuny (Coord.), « Treinta preguntas sobre la OTAN : Treinta años después del Referéndum », Centre Delàs d'Estudis per la Pau, Coll. «Paz y desarme», n°1, Barcelona, March 2016, http://www.centredelas.org/images/Llibres_pdf/paz-y-desarme_nato30_definitivo.pdf

Conclusion:

Those two definitions illustrate how different military expenditure's definition can be. As a matter of fact, even if they are show similarities, SIPRI's definition of military expenditure is much wider than NATO's one.

Items taken into account to determine countries' military expenditure	SIPRI	NATO
All current budgeted expenditures on armed forces and peacekeeping forces	X	X
Spending on 'defence ministries and other government agencies engaged in defence projects'	X	**
Spending on paramilitary forces*	X	***
All expenditures on current personnel, military and civilian, defence ministries and other government agencies engaged in defence projects	X	****
Operations and maintenance costs; costs related to the membership to military organization	X	
Procurement	X	X
Military research and development	X	X
Military construction	X	
Military aid	X	X
The destruction of weapons, equipment and ammunition and the costs associated with inspection and control of equipment destruction		X
Military space activities	X	

* Such as gendarmerie forces, border and coast guards, and interior ministry troops – when judged to be trained, equipped and available for military operations.

** NATO only takes into account expenditure on NATO common infrastructure.

*** These forces have been excluded since 2004, unless they are realistically deployable.

This is a grey area.

**** Only pension payments made directly by the government to retired military and civilian employees of military departments are considered.

c) Antimilitarist-MOC's approach of military spending

Antimilitarism⁸⁵ refers to an ideology rejecting any militarized conception of the society. Beyond the army itself, it rejects the overall influence of military values in the social sphere – such as obedience, discipline, hierarchy and the acceptance of violence as a means of resolving conflict. This ideology is thus based on the rejection of the process of militarization that naturalizes and legitimates values and “military-way of doing” in the whole society. Militarization can be de-

85. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), “Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad”, Icaria: Barcelona, 2015 (in Spanish), 335p.

defined as the process by which the military participate and has an impact on the society, in politics and economy and on education.⁸⁶ One of the core activities of antimilitarists' groups is to promote conscientious objection and challenge compulsory military training. However, antimilitarists' struggle goes beyond the mere question of the army and includes "social control" issues and bodies (related to lawful repressive tools), youth militarization through education as well as sexism, racism, xenophobia and nationalism values propagated by military structures and mentalities.

Accordingly, antimilitarist's groups generally provide a broader definition of military spending which includes both **civil defence** and **social control expenditures** - which refer to budget items devoted to police bodies, prisons and similar chapters⁸⁷⁸⁸.⁸⁹ Among the most significant international antimilitarist's movements, we must quote War Resisters' International, although many countries have national antimilitarist organizations. In Spain, for instance, the main antimilitarist movement is the AA-MOC - *Movimiento de Objeción de Conciencia* - that identifies and classifies Spanish military expenditure by organizational lines (i.e. by ministry).⁹⁰ This classification is highly relevant and interesting since it highlights the fact that many defence- and military-related spending are handled in various and unexpected budget lines.

86. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), "Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad", *op. cit.*

87. Alternativa Antimilitarista-MOC, « El gasto militar y para "control social" rondó los 35.000 millones de euros en 2013 » April 2014, (in Spanish) <http://www.antimilitaristas.org/spip.php?article5401>

88. WRI - Tara Tabassi, and Andrew Dey, «Police Militarisation is global », WRI, March 2016, <http://www.wri-irg.org/es/story/2016/la-militarizacion-policial-es-global?language=en>

89. Utopia Contagiosa: <https://fr.scribd.com/document/110517782/Presupuestos-Defensa-2013>

90. Gasto Militar 2016", *Utopia Contagiosa*, (in Spanish), May, 2016, <http://www.utopiacontagiosa.org/2016/05/06/el-gasto-militar-de-2016-nuevo-informe/>

Antimilitarist-MOC's definition of Milex - The Spanish Case

Antimilitarist-MOC defines military spending as “**all expenditure made by the State for the organisation of defence structure, whether the one allocated to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) budget or those from other budget lines**”. In addition to “military *spending*”, they highlight the importance of “military *costs*” that refer to non-financial costs of wars and military activities which place deep stresses on the society. These include human costs (in terms of deaths, injuries and mutilated people, refugees and displaced persons), the development and environmental costs of wars, the destruction (or requisition) of basic infrastructures and the overall global political, economical and social costs of the military activities.

Military-related expenditures include:

Ministry of Defence (MoD):

- All costs related to the operations and activities of the MoD's, to the armed forces and their support;
- War pension and retirement pensions of military personnel and social services for personnel and their families;
- Costs related to “Organismos Autonomos Militares” (ex. Instituto Social de las Fuerzas Armadas);
- Costs related to public companies in the defence sector;
- All costs related to the defence activities in public institutions (Congress, Senate, Casa del Rey, Cortes Generales...);
- Costs related to the Court of Auditors and intelligence services (CNI).

Ministry of the Interior:

- Costs related to the Civil Guard Headquarters (formation, public safety, actions in the field of drugs...);
- Costs related to the Police department.

Foreign Ministry:

- Transport costs;
- Costs related to adherence to international conventions and treaties (such as the Biological Weapons Convention, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies...);
- Costs related to OSCE, NATO and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization membership;
- Financial contribution to UN International Criminal Tribunal (Rwanda, ex-Yugoslavia);
- Financial contribution to UN peacekeeping operations;
- Voluntary financial contribution in the area of security, no proliferation and disarmament.

Ministry of Development:

- Costs related to civil-military coordination activities of the Aviation Safety Agency; the civil aviation in the Internal Security Programme; the Maritime Rescue's activities...

Ministry of Industry:

- Expenditures to support technological innovation of the defence sector;
- Various subventions related to special programs and projects (for instance, support to satellite observations, to the shipbuilding sector...).

Ministry of Employment and Social Security:

- Costs related to military medical ship (“Esperanza del Mar”) for instance.

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment:

- Costs related to the inspection and control of fishing activities by the Army and the Civil Guard;
- Costs related to fire-fighting activities;
- Costs related to the Spanish Meteorological Agency (AEMET).

Ministry of Finance:

- Costs related to the Tax Agency’s aircrafts and all other transport’s costs for Ministries of Defence and Interior;
- Costs related to the SEPI (*Sociedad Estatal de Participaciones Industriales*);
- Costs related to employment training in the public service.

Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality:

- Procurement of military uniforms suitable for women.

Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness:

- Subvention to research centres (ex. Real Instituto Elcano);
- Operating costs related to a Defence Ministry’s ship / a military base in Antarctic;
- Costs related to the Spanish Astrobiology Centre.

Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport:

- Costs related to the conservation of cultural goods of military nature.

Other costs related to several Defence University Centres

Extra-budgetary Expenditure:

- The ordinary military debt
- The extraordinary military debt (prediction of over-expenditure, PEAs, foreign operations and other multiannual spending and interests of the military debt)

Sources:

"Gasto Militar 2016", *Utopia Contagiosa - MOC*, May, 2016, <http://www.utopiacontagiosa.org/2016/05/06/el-gasto-militar-de-2016-nuevo-informe/> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2MSMB6UBOP90EszNTNoMG1QZDA/view>

Utopia Contagiosa (MOC): <https://fr.scribd.com/document/110517782/Presupuestos-Defensa-2013>


d) Pacifists' approach of military spending: Delas definition and War Resister League definition

Pacifism⁹¹ includes all currents of thought that aspire to lay down the conditions for the absence of war and violence to be a permanent state for human relationships, both between states, nations and people, and among persons. Pacifism rejects direct violence but also less visible forms of violence, such as structural and cultural violence, which are not carried out by individuals but hidden in societies' structures. Peace scholar Johan Galtung made an important contribution to the understanding of violence; he defined **direct violence** as 'physical harming other humans with intention' and **structural violence** as 'harm to humans as a result of injustices in our societies',⁹² such as poverty and economic justice issues. An example of this is the injustices of the worldwide system for the trade in goods, which creates more and more starving people every year. **Cultural violence** « refers to culturally based justifications of direct or structural violence - cultural violence is what makes direct and structural violence appear justified, and can take the form of stories, songs, language use, aspects of religions or traditions, assumptions or stereotypes ».⁹³ This includes flags, hymns,

91. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), "Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad", *op. cit.*

92. WRI, HANDBOOK, Jørgen Johansen, « Violence » (<https://www.wri-irg.org/en/story/2014/violence>)

93. WRI, HANDBOOK, Jørgen Johansen, « Violence », *op. cit.*



military parades, portraits of the leader and inflammatory speeches or posters. Peace movements have, traditionally, focused on the direct violence but in recent years, other forms of violence have been added to their agenda, such as the costs of wars reducing the budgets for health care and education, news weapon systems, gender-based violence or violence against nature and/or animals.⁹⁴

Nowadays, **pacifist movements**⁹⁵ bring together a variety of actors and social movements (ecologists, feminists...) that collaborate on certain issues and usually maintain connection with humanitarian, development or human rights circles. The antimilitarist movement and the pacifist movement, although they are united by some claims, are however different. While the former remains strongly and mostly focused on the fight against militarism, the latter has a broader spectrum of activities. Nowadays, through various international campaigns, pacifist movements concentrate their efforts on:

- Disarmament issues;
- The denunciation of wars, arms trade and the military economy cycle;

94. WRI, HANDBOOK, Jørgen Johansen « Violence », *op. cit.*

95. Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), "Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad", *op. cit.*

- The elimination of antipersonnel mines, cluster bombs, nuclear weapons as well as new weapons such as drones and military robots;
- The reduction of military spending (and its redirection to development projects);
- The demilitarization of the society and the promotion of a culture of peace (notably in the education field).

Below you'll find two others definitions from two pacifists' organisations: the War Resisters League⁹⁶ and the Centre Delàs of Peace Studies.⁹⁷ The methodology used by the Italian Observatory on Military Spending, which is similar to these two definitions, is available here: <http://milex.org/metodologia/>

The Delàs Centre definition of MILEX (Spain)

The Delàs Centre defines military spending as **the set of all economic contributions designed to ensure the defence and armed security in a state**. This definition is based on **the same criteria as the SIPRI, but includes additional criteria**, some of which are **specific to Spain**. As such, the Delàs Centre work provides a more precise, accurate and adapted definition and panorama of what constitutes military spending in Spain. However, as opposed to the SIPRI definition, this tailored approach is not necessarily transferable to another country, and as such, does not allow international comparisons.

The Delàs Centre definition of Spanish military spending also includes:

- ➔ The resources associated with UN peacekeeping mission involving a state's military forces as well as paramilitary forces;

96. The War Resisters League is an affiliate of War Resisters International, a network of activists that **works for a world without war**. They are a global pacifist and antimilitarist network with over 80 affiliated groups in 40 countries.

97. The J.M. Delàs Centre for Peace Studies is an independent Research Centre on issues related to peace and disarmament. The **mission** of the Centre is to strengthen the culture of peace and the construction of a disarmed society, making people aware of the negative effects of arms and militarism. The Centre combines the work of research and publication with divulgation and social mobilization.

- The resources associated with treaties to limit or prohibit of the use of ballistic missiles, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, mines and cluster bombs must be taken into account as military expenditure; Financial contributions to international organisations as part of disarmament agreements;
- The resources devoted to the Centro Nacional de Inteligencia (CNI), i.e. intelligence and secret services
- Interest on public debt associated with the defence sector;
- The forecast deviation between the initial military budget determined on the basis of the approved budget prior to the budget implementation, and the total military expenditure actually paid at the end of the period.

Unlike the antimilitarist approach, the Delàs Centre does not include expenditures related to police bodies and other forms of “social control”, except Spanish paramilitary police (Guardia Civil), which is considered as military spending.

Source:

“Gasto Militar” in: Jordi Calvo Rufanges and Alejandro Pozo Marin (coords), “Diccionario de la Guerra, la paz y el desarme: 100 entradas para analizar los conflictos armados, la paz y la seguridad”, *op. cit.* Chloé Meulewaeter, “Los dividendos de la paz: un estado de la cuestión” (in Spanish), *Revista de Estudios de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, num. 36 (2016), pages 57-63, ISSN: 1575-2100.

War Resisters League’s definition of Milex (U.S.A.)

The War Resisters League’s (WRL) definition of military spending is also broader than the SIPRI’s one. Actually, such as the Delàs definition, it includes features that are **peculiar to one specific country (the United States)**. Being more precise than SIPRI’s one for the U.S., it can be difficult to transfer to other countries having different ways to fund their military sector. WRL divide military spending in two categories: current military spending and past military expenditure.

The War Resisters League's definition includes:

→ As part of current military spending:

The total spending of the U.S. Department of Defence, which includes: Military personnel, Operation and Maintenance, Procurement, Research and development, Construction, Family Housing, Revolving Management, Overseas Contingency Operations.

The Non-Department of Defence Military Spending, which includes: Retiree Pay/Healthcare, Department of Energy for nuke weapons/clean-up, the NASA (50% of its budget), Internal Security Assistance, Homeland Security (military), State Department (partial), FBI military and the CIA.

→ As part of past military spending: **Veterans' Benefits and interest on national debt** (80% est. to be created by military spending).

Sources:

War Resisters League, "Where you tax money really goes? U.S. Federal Budget 2018 Fiscal Year", <https://www.warresisters.org/resources/pie-chart-flyers-where-your-income-tax-money-really-goes>

A comparison among the above five definitions

The following Table compares the five definitions. NATO's definition is the one including less items. Next, we have SIPRI's definition. Then, pacifist's definitions (WRI and Delas), and finally, the one from AA_MOC, which is the definition that includes the maximum number of expenditure aspects.

Items taken into account to determine countries' military expenditure	SIPRI	NATO	AA-MOC	DELAS	WRL
All current and capital expenditure on the armed forces and peacekeeping forces.	X	X	X	X	X
Spending on 'defence ministries and other government agencies engaged in defence projects'	X	{2}	X	X	X
All expenditure made by the State for the organization of defence <u>structure allocated to all budget lines involves in it in one way or another.</u>			X		X
Spending on paramilitary forces ^{1}	X	{3}	X	X	
All expenditures on current personnel, military and civil defence ministries and other government agencies engaged in defence projects	X	{4}	X	X	X
Operations and maintenance costs; costs related to the membership to military organization.	X		X	X	X
Procurement	X	X	X	X	X
Military research and development	X	X	X	X	X
Military construction	X		X	X	X
Military aid	X	X	X	X	
The destruction of weapons, equipment and ammunition and the costs associated with inspection and control of equipment destruction		X	X		
Military space activities	X		X	X	
All expenditure made by the State for the organisation of defence structure ^{5}			X		
Military costs ^{6}			X		
Cost of UN peacekeeping missions			X	X	X
Military debt and military interest in the national debt			X	X	X
Retirement pensions of military personnel, social service for personnel and their family	X	X	X	X	X
Defence activities in public institutions			X		
Police Department			X		

Items taken into account to determine countries' military expenditure	SIPRI	NATO	AA-MOC	DELAS	WRL
Cost related to adherence to international Conventions and treaties			X		X
Cost related to civil-military coordination activities			X		X
Cost related to public companies in the defence sector			X	X	
Resources devoted to Intelligence and secret services			X	X	X
Cost related to paramilitary forces			X	X	
The forecast deviation between the initial military budget determined by the approved budget and the total military expenditure actually paid.			X	X	

{1} such as gendarmerie forces, border and coast guards; interior ministry troops, when judged to be trained, equipped and available for military operations.

{2} Takes only into account NATO expenditure on common infrastructure.

{3} They have been excluded since 2004, unless these forces are realistically deployable. This is a grey area.

{4} Only pension payments made directly by the government to retired military and civilian employees of military departments are included.

{5} Items whether allocated to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) budget or those from other budget lines.

{6} These include human costs (in terms of deaths, injuries and mutilated people, refugees and displaced persons), the development and environmental costs of wars, the destruction (or requisition) of basic infrastructures and the overall global political, economical and social costs of the military activities.

3. THE GCOMS CAMPAIGN

3.1 What are the GCOMS objectives?

We have shown that increasing military expenditure has a negative impact on peace and on humanitarian crisis, while investment in the protection and implementation of human rights, peace and environment could aid to achieve global justice and peace. This is why the GCOMS campaign is calling to first, reduce worldwide military expenditure to reallocate it to fund human and environmental needs. Secondly, it promotes a new culture of peace by converting military economy into a civilian-oriented one. The main idea is that too much money is locked into the military sector while it could be used to deal with the world's broader humanitarian challenges.

More precisely, the GCOMS campaign is calling to a yearly 10% cut on military spending which would allow achieving major sustainable development and environmental goals including inter alia the UN's 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement objectives but also to address and reduce humanitarian crisis. But one can wonder, why 10%?

As a matter of fact, the cost of the achievement of the Paris Agreement objectives to reverse climate change and the UN's Sustainable Development Goals were budgeted. Actually, SIPRI has shown that with a reallocation of 10% of worldwide military expenditure, we could achieve some key Sustainable Development Goals.⁹⁸

98. SIPRI, « *The opportunity cost of world military spending* », 5 April 2016, <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/blog/2016/opportunity-cost-world-military-spending>.

Besides the reduction of military spending, the campaign calls for a real change of mentality regarding security. This is why it also calls for converting military economy into a social oriented-one and the ending of military research. At GCOMS, we promote a culture of peace where there's development, with cooperation and diplomacy rather than exploitation, unilateral action and threats to peace.

3.2 Who we are?

Nowadays, **more than 100 organizations from 35 different countries** have joined the campaign. GCOMS partners are distributed worldwide. A complete list of partner organizations and members of the GCOMS/GDAMS Steering Committee is available at the GCOMS website.⁹⁹

Geographical distribution of GCOMS partners:

AFRICA: Trees on Earth Development Foundation/ Umoja as One/ Resist AFRICOM/ Nouveaux Droits de l'Homme - Cameroun/ African Hungarian Union/ Gun Free South Africa

ASIA-PACIFIC: Peace Boat/ Center for Bangladesh Studies/ Suaram/ Rural Development and Youth Training Institute/ Rethink Afghanistan/ Peace Women Partners, Inc. - Philippines/ People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy/ Stop the War! Coalition (Philippines)/ Student Federation of Thailand/National Campaign to End the Korean War/ Food Not Bombs/ ChangeMaker - Society for Social and Economic Development/ globaldaysoflistening/ Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies/ Australian Peace Committee/ PeaceNetwork/ Peace Movement Aotearoa/ WILPF - Australian Section/ Conscience and Peace Tax International

EUROPE: Insumissia/ GSoA - Group for a Switzerland without an Army/ Fundi Pau/ Frauen fuer den Frieden Schweiz/ Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft-Vereinigte KriegsdienstgegnerInnen (DFG-VK)/ Le Mouvement de la Paix/ Mouvement Chrétien pour la Paix/ Netzwerk Friedenssteuer/ Norges Fredsrad/ Centre Delàs d'Estudis per la Pau/Association Suisse Birmanie/ Agir Pour La Paix/ INES/ International Association Of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA)/ Pax Christi International/ Peace and Neutrality Alliance/ Red Antimilitarista Noviolenta de Andalucia/ Tipping Point North South/ Strategic Concept for Removal of Arms and Proliferation/ Stop Fuelling War (France)/ Scientists for Global Responsibility/ Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space/ Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space/ Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR)/ APRED Participative Institute for the Progress of Peace/ Women In Black/ Vrede. be/ Veterans for Peace/Rauhanliitto - Peace Union of Finland/ Rete Italiana per il Disarmo/ Action des Citoyens pour le Désarmement Nucleaire.

99. GCOMS Partners: <http://demilitarize.org/global-campaign-on-military-spending/partner-organizations/>

AMERICA: Church Center for the United Nations/ CODEPINK: Women for Peace/ Ceasefire.ca/ Global Fund for Women/ United for Peace & Justice/ Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)/ Servicio de Paz y Justicia en América Latina/ USAction/ American Friends Service Committee/ Alianza Social Continental/ Wisconsin Network for Peace and Justice/ Acción Colectiva de Objetores y Objetoras de Conciencia/ War Resisters' International/ War Resisters League/ Win Without War/ War is a Crime .org/ Canadian Voice of Women for Peace/ Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament/ Better World Links/ Science for Peace/ School of the Americas Watch/ Religions for Peace/Reaching Critical Will/ Progressive Democrats of America/ PeaceMajority Report / Peace Bus/ Peace Action/ On Earth Peace/ Nuclear Age Peace Foundation/ New Priorities Network/ National Priorities Project/ National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee/ The National Network Opposing the Militarization of Youth (NNOMY)/ Marrickville Peace Group/ Just Peace Queensland/ Just Foreign Policy/ International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

3.3 How is GCOMS coordinated?

As the GCOMS campaign aims to raise public awareness over world-wide military expenditure and their opportunity cost, it is based on the involvement of activists from all over the world. Although it is a global campaign, it could not succeed without the mobilization of organizations and activists at a national or local level. As a matter of fact, even if military expenditure concerns the whole world, it is usually discussed at a local level, for instance during the budget vote period. The campaign thus requires a team to coordinate all activists and different activities organized all over the world. Since 2017, the GCOMS campaign is coordinated by the Delàs Centre for Peace Studies, which works as a decentralized office of the IPB.

The coordination team is composed of members of the Centre Delàs and local activists. It runs all necessary tasks in order to allow a correct implementation of the campaign.

The coordination team is driven by the steering committee of the campaign, which includes IPB officers and active GCOMS partners. The GCOMS steering committee is conducting several Skype meetings along the year to organize global actions during the GDAMS global days of action.

It also works to connect partners together. To do so, the coordination team is regularly sending emails to every member to inform them over the evolution of the campaign and organizes Skype meetings to plan for coordinated actions during the global days of action on military spending, GDAMS. Besides, it tries to expand the movement by searching new partner organizations.

A website has been developed where every GCOMS activist or future partner can learn about activities carried out during the year. Important work is also undertaken on social networks: every day, with the aim of ensuring the visibility while spreading the movement, news and comments are published on Twitter and Facebook.

Finally, the coordination team is also in charge of promoting, producing and spreading campaign material. A lot of tips, graphic material and toolkits are available on the website. All those materials can be directly download from the website by any activist wishing to participate in the GCOMS campaign.

3.4 When are GCOMS actions taking place?

GCOMS incorporates two main actions: **the Global Days of Action on Military Spending** (GDAMS) and **Cut Milex**, which are taking place in specific times during the year. GDAMS started in 2011 and is usually held in April. Cut Milex started in 2017 and aims to be held in autumn. We will describe briefly below each of them and how they are organised.

Those two activities are pursuing the same objective: to reduce military spending, but are addressing different audiences. GDAMS aims to raise worldwide public awareness on military spending issue. Also, the GDAMS has a strong international dimension. Cut Milex is rather a lobbying campaign. This second activity is targeting politicians rather than public in general (even if public are invited to put pressure on

their representatives). The distinction has an important impact on the moment choose to organize each action.

GDAMS is a spring action which takes place in April-May. These dates were carefully chosen. As this campaign aims to raise public awareness on the huge amount of public money used to fund military expenditure and on the necessity to redirect part of it to human needs, it was decided that the GDAMS actions would take place during a period including the U.S. Tax Day and the yearly publication of SIPRI data on worldwide military expenditure. This moment is particularly opportune: the biggest world spender on defence is collecting taxes, meanwhile the SIPRI is publishing its report on worldwide military expenditure and its evolution.

Worldwide GDAMS actions and partners 2017



The campaign is taking place in a particular context: States are facing new security issues such as humanitarian crisis, climate change and current conflict. Besides, welfare states are tested by the economic crisis austerity policies. Meanwhile, for the past twenty years, worldwide military expenditure has kept increasing.¹⁰⁰ Basically, a huge amount

100. SIPRI, « *World military spending : Increases in the USA and Europe, decreases in oil-exporting countries* », 24 April 2017, <https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2017/world-military-spending-increases-usa-and-europe>.

of money is devoted to military expenditure while it could be used to fund human and environmental needs which are **suffering cruelly from the lack of financial resources.**

The objective of the GDAMS campaign is precisely to alert the public about the fact that their money are used to fund military industry rather than education, health and culture. Moreover, with this campaign, **IPB aims to promote a new culture of peace**, where international tension could be solved by diplomacy and cooperation rather than with threat and violence. Where states could invest in health research and civil oriented economy instead of a military one.

To do so, the GDAMS campaign organizes public awareness activities all over the world. As these activities are targetting primarely citizens, and are invited them to become aware of the impact of military spending on they dely lives. A wide range of activities are taking place every year during GDAMS such as money polls, street marches, press conferences, and others. All partner organizations are preparing activities in their country. A final report on these actions is being prepared every year and the coordination team disseminates it as widely as possible through the website and social networks.

Cut Milex is a fall campaign, with actions mainly during **October and December**. It aims at **introducing the military spending debate in Parliaments**. It will be organized in October-December, coinciding with the **discussion period of National Budgets** in Parliaments. It is not only about raising awareness about military spending, but also to encouraging politicians in Parliaments to take actions against it and to redirect part of the Milex budget to human needs. Cut Milex has a global perspective, asking for a reduction and redirection of military expenses in the maximum number of countries. But it has also a local perspective, as annual budget debates in different countries have specific and distinct structures. Activists in each country must therefore craft their own approach, including how to organize debates with Parliamentarians and how to shape the messages and proposals for

them. Given that the political situation varies among countries, and given the lack of intergovernmental agreements and treaties to limit Military Spending, national-level action is vital.

The **Cut Milex campaign** includes several main messages:

1. To reduce military spending while redirecting its funds to social needs cooperation, conflict mediation and peace building.
2. To increase transparency and avoid opacity in official data on exports and military and defence industry.
3. To introduce criteria for addressing military spending in national budgets in a comprehensive and rigorous way.
4. To ensure that arms programs are audited and controlled by the nation's parliament.

The idea is to **generate powerful messages**, in order to impact politicians and decision-makers, and to **attract strong media coverage**. A handbook with lobbying strategies is already available. **Cut Milex 2017** actions took place between October and December.

3.5 How can I be involved in GCOMS?

We need to involve even more citizens and organisations in an open and robust debate on the counter-productive results of military expenditure. More than ever, we need new partners to work on the on-going Global Campaign on Military Spending (GCOMS), and to make the Global Days of Action on Military Spending (GDAMS) and the **Cut Milex** campaign a great success. For more information, **please visit the GCOMS webpage**: <http://demilitarize.org/>

4. DEVELOPING STRATEGIES FOR THE GCOMS CAMPAIGN

A campaign is a connected series of strategic activities and actions carried out to achieve specific goals with the aim of creating change.¹⁰¹ It is not a monolithic bloc but rather a compendium of several strategies, related to public-awareness actions, lobbying of politicians and other power-holders, online campaigning, media coverage and networking. Specifically, this chapter aims at providing some advice, ideas and inspiration in order to campaign for the reduction of military spending in the framework of GCOMS.

4.1 OPENING REMARKS

Before entering into the details about how to campaign on military spending, let's review some key points you should keep in mind while building your campaign strategy.

4.1.1 The importance of the national level

While many private military and security companies operate internationally, and governments are part of a web of interlocking global institutions, the fact is that the most accessible decisions take place at national level - and therefore this is the level that GCOMS campaigners need to focus on.¹⁰² Defence, military budgets and policies are designed and voted at the national level; armies are national bodies; arms export policy remains an issue for national governments.¹⁰³ Overall, most of the decision-making levels in the fields of security, military and defence are located at the national level. In addition, given that the political sit-

101. War Resisters' International, « Handbook for Nonviolent Campaigns », Second Edition, June 2014 http://www.wri-irg.org/sites/default/files/public_files/wri_handbook_2014_inner_AMENDED.compressed.pdf

102. International Peace Bureau, « Whose priorities? A guide for campaigners on military and social spending » 2007, p.17 <<http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/12/Whose-Priorities.pdf>

103. ENAAT, <http://enaat.org/network>

uation varies among countries, and given the lack of intergovernmental agreements to limit Military Spending, national-level action is vital.¹⁰⁴ That is why the establishment of community organisations and local groups figures among GCOMS campaign priorities. In addition, the larger number we are in as many countries as possible, the more we will be able to have a forum at the international level. Indeed, the adoption and implementation of several international arms control treaties - such as the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention, 1997 Mine Ban Treaty, the 2008 Convention of Cluster Munitions, the 2013 Arms Trade Treaty and the 2017 Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons - would not have been achieved without the crucial mobilization of thousands of ordinary citizens throughout the world.¹⁰⁵

Although your campaign will mostly focus on your country's military spending, it is however necessary to have an overview of the global - and regional - trends in military spending. This firstly permits your country's military expenditure to be put into perspective compared to other countries' and global spending. Secondly, both an increase and a decrease in world's military spending can be shaped as a powerful campaign argument. Thirdly, in a globalized world where security is perceived as a collective and shared issue, and where legal arms transfers know no boundaries, national military expenditures are not disconnected from each other. And that is why GCOMS is an international campaign, because the issue at stake need to be addressed worldwide, both at the national and the international levels.¹⁰⁶ In a nutshell, GCOMS is a *global* campaign relying on a network of *country* support groups.

On GDAMS 2017, over a hundred of actions were carried out in 30 countries - including in some of the world's leading military powers.¹⁰⁷ This is pretty good, but it is not nearly enough.

104. GDAMS 2017 Final Report

105. International Campaign to Ban Landmines, « The Treaty », ICBL website, <http://www.icbl.org/en-gb/the-treaty.aspx>

106. GCOMS Brochure - <http://demilitarize.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Brochure.pdf>

107. « List of GDAMS 2017: Events », GCOMS website, < <http://demilitarize.org/gdams-2017/>

4.1.2 The importance of the knowledge

As explained above, one of the main problems to address is the opacity of military spending in terms of amount raised as well as in terms of political and social impacts. Official military spending figures are hardly accessible and not always reliable, especially since military expenses are often hidden within non-defence budgets (or do not appear at all).¹⁰⁸ In addition, in many states, media give almost no coverage to this issue, and defence budgets are not democratically debated and solely justified on the basis of the so-called “national security”. That is why military spending issue is not widely known among the general public. Besides, there is a misperception of military spending issue that is generally not viewed as part of the development / social equation,¹⁰⁹ and mostly perceived as removed from the daily concerns of citizens. However, national citizens are directly affected: in many cases, military budgets are supplemented with funds diverted from unspent budgets from the social sectors, and military activities get paid for by non-military departments – such as education, health, renewables, police, development aid.¹¹⁰

For these reasons, you should undertake research in order to gather credible information you need on your country’s defence policy and military spending (cf. SIPRI database). Having a good research strategy is a very powerful tool because you gain knowledge, and knowledge is power. Precisely, information gathering may help you in several main ways:

- **to build your campaign strategy:** having a good knowledge of your country’s political and military situation allows you to identify, for instance, the right targets in order to pressure them, and give

108. SIPRI Report, Dr Sam Perlo-Freeman, « Monitoring military expenditure », 11 January 2017 <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/topical-backgrounders/2017/monitoring-military-expenditure>

109. International Peace Bureau, « Whose priorities? A guide for campaigners on military and social spending » op.cit., p.21

110. id21 Development Research Reporting Service, « Military spending and development », Insights 50, June 2004 <http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/1103/id21%20insights%2050.pdf>

you powerful argument to raise awareness of people, to promote military spending issue into public discourses and open the debate.

- **to have a robust lobbying strategy:** you must have a good understanding of the functioning of policy institutions in order to know who has the ability to influence and take decisions on military spending; on what grounds; where those decisions are taken; according to which procedure etc.
- **to be credible:** to lobby and pressure representatives, as well as to mobilize the public and attract media attention, you must demonstrate that you have an accurate vision of the current situation. You must be able to show who is affected, why and how, what the possible solutions are, and what could happen if nothing is done.

4.1.3 The importance of having a wide repertoire of actions

GCOMS is a multi-action campaign and as such, campaigners must rely on a wide repertoire of tactics for influencing public policies and mobilizing the public. For instance, as already mentioned, **GDAMS** and **Cut-Milex** are two GCOMS actions serving different purposes and requiring different type of campaigning tools. A common mistake is to only focus on one way of campaigning - such as the use of social media. However, your campaign will be most effective if your messages are delivered in a variety of ways which complement each other. In other words, complementarity is the key to success: advocacy or outreach activities, such as street performances and protests, petitions, organization of debates and seminars, digital and media-oriented actions should be back backed by lobbying actions. It is more than necessary to develop a comprehensive strategy to achieve a policy change and obtain the reduction of military expenditure.

4.1.4 The key components of a campaign's strategy

We can find various examples of successful campaigns and we benefit from many accessible media (books, films, websites) suggesting a variety of tactics of campaigning, explaining how to organise public event, how to write a press release, how to lobby decision-makers, how to build network or a membership database, how to raise funds and so on. Many of these aspects are fully discussed below in the following sections. This one provides a series of short and preliminary advices to plan, structure and implement your GCOMS campaign strategy.

The campaign's overall goal refers to a long-term, general outcome that we want to achieve - **the reduction and the reallocation of 10% military expenditures to alternative areas** such as health, education, peace, cooperation and sustainable development, climate change. However, the overall goal is divided into several short-term objectives - which vary amongst groups and partners. These objectives are both *external* (to successfully lobby decision-makers, to publicize GCOMS, to attract adherents, to get media coverage) and *internal* (for instance, acquiring human and capital resources). Internal and external objectives are interdependent: without internal resources, you cannot achieve your objectives. As GCOMS is an international campaign, each campaigning partner should define its own targets and approach, depending on national contexts and issues. GCOMS' coordination team and IPB's role is to provide an overall framework and give assistance in a variety of ways.

By building your strategy, you should **identify your audience** - i.e. the various actors that need to be influenced to reduce military expenditures in your country - **and craft your key messages**. Actually, you will have multiple target audiences: general public first, but also potential partner organisations, key decision-makers, media outlets, journalists, researchers in related fields, scientists, economists, educators or celebrities. Identify them will help you channel your actions and resources effectively.

Reaching these different audiences requires crafting a set of messages that will be persuasive and appealing. There are two types of message to be developed – the basic, core message underpinning the entire GCOMS campaign, and variations of this message, which are tailored to the specific audiences that you are trying to reach, to convince, to pressure and/or influence. That’s why you need to gather information in order to *know* your audiences. It is essential to achieve clarity about exactly what we wish to communicate about. However, let’s note that many campaigns fail when campaigners concentrate too much on the *content* of the message and not enough on events and actions that are precisely intended to *deliver* the message!

1. Governments spend billions on military structures and weapons. While maintaining/increasing their military spending, many countries are reducing social budgets (education, health, employment, social justice, and environment); similarly, international humanitarian, peace building and development efforts lack necessary resources. However, if we want to give peace a real chance, we also have to give it a real budget. Government’s spending priorities does not fit with people needs;
2. Those investments fuel insecurity, conflicts and arms race world-wide, undermining peace and human security;
3. The increasing of military spending affects people and the environment as every increase in military spending comes with a decreased in another budget such like health, education or fund for the climate change challenge.
4. It has been shown that with a cut of 10% of worldwide military spending we could deal with the climate change but also achieve the UN 2030 sustainable development goals¹¹¹ (end poverty and hunger, and more).
5. Every government should locally cut military spending in order to fund human and environmental needs.

111. SIPRI, The opportunity cost of world military spending: <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/blog/2016/opportunity-cost-world-military-spending>

Based on your GCOMS objectives, the target audiences and identified message, you can begin to determine a **list of concrete GCOMS actions** you can take to achieve your objectives. To this end, **brainstorming sessions** could be useful. It is also recommended to list them in a chronological order, and to develop a **campaign calendar** for implementing them.

GCOMS already has slogans that can be adapted and used by campaigners:

- *Move the Money! Welfare not Warfare!*
- *The world is over-armed & peace is under-funded!*
 - It only takes 10% to save the environment!
- Arm yourself with education not with weapons!
 - Less munitions for more education!
 - Less army for more Gender Equality!
- Less military investment to save the environment!
 - Stop military expenditure to fund culture!
- Let's reduce 10% of worldwide military assets to save our planet!

4.2 WAYS TO ADVOCATE AGAINST MILITARY SPENDING

Campaigns must use persuasion. However, the idea of demilitarization isn't yet very popular (because of the terrorism fear and official and militarized discourses). Therefore, GCOMS campaigners must use pedagogy and pragmatism to find the right arguments to adapt the discourse and tactics to every specific audience and reach a larger scale of people. You'll find below how to develop those arguments to make your GCOMS advocacy campaign a success.

4.2.1 GDAMS: THE PUBLIC-AWARENESS-RAISING STRATEGY BY MOBILIZING THE PUBLIC

The main objective of the GCOMS campaign is to raise awareness about military spending and their terrible effects on human and environmental needs. But, as explained before, this is not a simple task to do as pacifists' discourse not being popular because of terrorism and the obsession of armed security rather than human security. This may be the most difficult task of this campaign: to deconstruct persistent prejudice over how to ensure security. In other words, will we ensure security by producing more weapons or by reducing inequalities and investing in culture and education? A good public awareness campaign like GDAMS requires developing a clear and concrete message presented in a clear story line to a precise audience in a determinate time.¹¹² It is also important to diffuse this message in a large scope and variety of media, to use social media as media of reference but also not to forget the importance of direct relation and to organise also things directly in the street to make people to meet each other. That's the core issue of our campaign: organizing street actions to raise awareness! In the next pages, we show several examples of past GDAMS actions that were effective for this goal.

Ideas based on GDAMS actions already organized:

- Conduct a **Money Poll**: GDAMS' Activists conducted Penny Poll activity under the theme "*Move the money to social welfare!*". It is one way to have interaction with passers-by and to raise awareness of the huge proportion of public money spend on military items. For instance, in Halifax, Canada, *Nova Scotia Voice of Women for Peace* organized an action based on asking the public to identify their priorities as taxpayers. Passers-by were asked to place 25 cent quarters in jars labeled: Arts & Culture, Environment, Health and

112. Global Road Safety Partnership, « Elements of a good public awareness campaign : At a glance », <http://legacy.grsroadsafety.org/sites/default/files/PAC%20Elements%20-%20At%20a%20glance-%20ENG.pdf>.

Education, Military, Peace, and Women & Children, to remark their real interests and priorities.



- Be part of a “**Selfie-campaign**”; This action aims to raise awareness about the opportunity cost of worldwide military spending. Thus, for GDAMS 2017, a selfie-campaign was organized under the theme “If I Had 1.68 Trillion Dollars...”, which represented world military spending in 2016. Activists were invited to take a selfie and to choose in which area they would invest this budget if they had the choice.



- Launch **online petitions and/or online survey**: You may launch an online survey asking people where they want their taxes to be invested in (weapons purchase or schools, hospitals and other social services?). You may also launch a letter writing campaign to push governments to achieve major re-allocations of military expenditures. This was done during GDAMS 2017 by Israel activists:



- Organise **public cultural events** that involve music, theatre, arts, photo exhibitions and so on, to promote and support your work against military spending (public events such as film screenings, book or report launches). For instance, in Philippines, a street event with youth and students culminating with jamming with alternative artists was organized during GDAMS 2017. A talk by Colin Archer on the topic “Militarized States. What can we do from a Global Justice perspective?” was also organized in Barcelona.
- **Engage the media through opinion-editorials, interviews** (on television, radio & print media) and press releases
- Help on the **translation of GCOMS documents**: It is important to translate GCOMS statements, news, articles and newsletters, and to adapt them to your country’s political situation! It is fundamen-

tal; if we want to raise awareness worldwide, we need to be able to speak to everybody (language issue is essential). Help also by creating infographics and writing articles on military spending issue, or producing videos.

- Organise **street performances** such as name-and-shame exercises or walk of shame, leafleting, rallies, die-ins, marches die-ins, marches, boycotts (ex. bank), sit-in, or blockade of military establishment. Some GCOMS campaigners have been very creative organising kite-flying events, street meditation, night light action, tree-planting or sea action! Have a look at the GDAMS 2017 Report for examples and ideas: http://demilitarize.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/GDAMS_2017_Final_Report.pdf



Action in front of the Athens Parliament, GDAMS, April 2017

- **Produce campaign materials** such as t-shirts, flyers, leaflets, buttons, posters and stickers, videos. Produce video clips with disarmament as a theme. Create **photo opportunities**: show the gap between global milex (150 black balloons for instance) and what is needed to fulfil the SDGs - or some of them (ex. about 30 balloons).¹¹³

113. <https://fr.scribd.com/document/98156172/GDAMS-2012-Final-Report>

- Organise **social media campaign activities** (on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram & Thunderclap). Thunderclap example from the consortium of US NGOs : « Our Tax \$ should go to the programs we need, not to Pentagon waste» It reached more than 233.000 people on social media (2013)

#RECORTEMOSEL GASTO EN ARMAS ¡TÚ DECIDES!

2		=	1	
	Misiles tomahawk			Escuela
3		=	1	
	Tanques leopard			Hospital
1		=	25	
	Avión f-16			Escuelas
1		=	50	
	Portaviones			Hospitales

 **SERPAJ CHILE**
Servicio Paz y Justicia

Don't be afraid to make shows, or to be original! - Example from Belgium: activists from Agir pour la Paix dressed up as soldiers and, in a busy area, they approached passers-by. They showed them a catalogue of military weapons and asked them to donate money in a piggy bank... not everyone understood the joke immediately! (2013)

- Write a **statement**, organise a **press conference** to talk about military spending and disarmament issues. For GDAMS 2015, fifteen parliamentarians and 32 NGOs in South Korea endorsed the IPB's report "Welfare not Warfare" and gave a press conference in front of the Parliament building.
- Organise **seminars, workshops, panel discussions and meetings** on issues related to military spending and disarmament and invite speakers to discuss issues related to GCOMS campaign. You may try to work with high-profile personalities in order to publicize your event. For instance, as part of GDAMS 2017:



In **Bangladesh**, some members of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND) held a seminar that was attended by 350 university students and representatives of youth organisations at a forum on nuclear disarmament and sustainable development at Dhaka University.

Other ideas for activities:

- Organise a **GCOMS tribunal of opinion**; this is a very good way to raise the awareness about the issue of military spending, but also to develop new knowledge and argument on the military spending

issues, especially legal arguments which can be very useful for activists on the ground. They are a lot of examples of opinion tribunals like the Russell Tribunal on Palestine¹¹⁴ (which was organized in five sessions in five different places in the world), or more recently the International Monsanto Tribunal. This type of activities presents a lot of advantages. First, it allows learning more about the issue, especially about legal arguments you can use to advocate against military spending. Secondly, it 's opening opportunities for cooperation with University and brings the scope to that area. Finally, it highlights on the issue by **inviting media to cover the event** and to write about the judgement.

- Organise an **art contest** among students and artists. This has a double interest: first it's bringing the issue to a new audience: student and teachers or artists, who are not necessarily involved in the GCOMS campaign but who can discover, at this occasion, how far this campaign concerns them as student (and the issue of the education's funding) or as artist (issue of the culture's funding). Secondly, this offers new campaign material as artistic banners etc....

4.2.2 CUT MILEX; THE LOBBYING STRATEGY TO INFLUENCE DECISION-MAKERS

The Global Campaign on Military Spending (GCOMS) as a whole is an advocacy campaign - but lobbying is one specific form of advocacy. Lobbying involves giving views and information to decision-makers in order to influence them toward the action you want, which means contacting officials who make the laws and policies, communicating desires and opinions, challenging the arguments of opponents, and demonstrating wide support for an issue. The Cut Milex document on strategies for lobbying, available here,¹¹⁵ gives many hints on who to lobby and how to lobby.

114. Russell Tribunal on Palestine : <http://www.russelltribunalonpalestine.com/en/>

115. Lobbying strategies: Who to lobby, how to lobby: <http://demilitarize.org/cut-m/>

Always keep in mind that lobbying is about both convincing and building partnerships with policymakers. Indeed, good relationships are the foundation of lobbying and negotiating. Effective advocacy requires a clear sense of who these audiences are and what access or pressure points are available to move them. Knowing who can make it happen involves analysing stakeholders and corridors of power, identifying key targets, and understanding how they can make it happen. At least four categories of deciders can be approached: government officials, civil servants, political parties and leading political figures, as well as parliamentarians and local policymakers. You should identify those who are dealing with military related spending such as the ministry of defence or of foreign affairs. But don't forget others department that can have an interest in military issues, because they have undergone cuts in their own budget for instance.

Several activities can be organized to lobby such as advocacy meetings, informal meetings with policy makers, round table and workshops or letters and petitions. Each activity has its advantages; it could be good to use them all, which enable you to raise awareness of a wide range of policy deciders. (You'll find more tips in Annex 3 and 4).

The final objective is to encourage policymakers to engage themselves on military issues. The idea is to create a democratic debate on military spending issue which is unfortunately to often absent of the public debate.

4.2.3 THE DIGITAL STRATEGY: ONLINE CAMPAIGNING¹¹⁶

How to promote another culture of peace with the help of social networks? How to pressure governments and political representatives to invest in culture, health, education and social care rather than in weapons, defense and borders?

In fact, social networks can be a very useful tool to challenge political representatives on military spending issues. The idea is to use Twitter

116. Social Network Toolkit document: http://demilitarize.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CUTMILEX_SOCIAL_NETW_TOOLKIT.pdf

& Facebook, to challenge directly and publicly members of parliaments / ministers / or any other political representatives or groups on military spending issues. However, let's be clear: Twitter is the best option to lead a lobbying campaign on social media since it allows to directly question the main stakeholders by "mentioning" them alongside with some keywords. Indeed, Twitter has become a very important place of political debate and attracts much public and media attention.

The logic of the strategy is quite close to the "naming and shaming" strategy. The idea is to challenge directly and publicly your representatives about the military spending issues. Such a strategy aims to both create a responsibility feeling on the politician and to put the light on military spending issues. The idea here is to "tag" politicians in a tweet to challenge them to take a stand on our issue. The best way to do so is collectively. Indeed, the more people are challenging politics representative on social media, the more they may feel obliged to respond. It is thus their public image which is at stake!

The Budget vote debate period is particularly favourable to do such action. Indeed, the media are particularly attentive to public opinion during this period, what may be an advantage for the campaign. Also the message has to be short and clear to impact the wider scale of people and encourage them to challenge politician too on social networks.

**REDUCING 10% OF MILITARY ASSETS
WILL HELP SAVING OUR PLANET.
TAKE ACTION!**

If you can involve a public personality into this campaign it will allow you to reach more people, especially people who are not usually into this kind of activism. For instance, the Global Partnership for Education campaign (which fights for access to education) used this kind of digital strategy, and **asked a celebrity to challenge ministers of different countries**. As they were particularly exposed, a lot of them responded positively to the campaign and have kept in touch with campaigners.

4.2.4 THE MEDIA STRATEGY

The media are both a **tool** and **target** of advocacy. Media advocacy is the strategic use of media to communicate with large numbers of people to advance a social or public policy objective or influence public attitudes on an important public matter.¹¹⁷ Effective campaigning often means making media engagement a **priority**.¹¹⁸ However communication's tools have diversified with the rise of social media. An effective communication strategy thus requires a distinction to be made between the media that we produce ourselves (websites, Facebook pages, tweets or leaflets and newsletters) and media produced by others (including news websites, newspapers, radio and television).¹¹⁹ Both will be useful in order to campaign on military spending, but the strategies are different.

Media engagement is about getting our message across through media that others produce.¹²⁰ Engaging with the media is a great way to have your campaign make a big splash; it also can be a useful tool to pressure governments to pay attention to our message, to build public awareness about the impact of military spending, and the need for their reduction and to generate publicity for GCOMS and your campaign's activities.¹²¹ (See details on how to organize your media strategy in Annex 1)

117. UNICEF Campaign Toolkit

118. WRI handbook for non violent campaign: <https://www.wri-irg.org/en/pubs/NonviolenceHandbook>

119. WRI handbook for non violent campaign: <https://www.wri-irg.org/en/pubs/NonviolenceHandbook>

120. WRI handbook for non violent campaign, op. cit.

121. « Getting coverage: a practical media guide for CMC & ICBL campaigners », *ICBL & CMC*, 2010, <http://www.icbl.org/media/699811/CMC-ICBL-Media-Guide.pdf>

4.2.5 THE NETWORK STRATEGY: Work in coalition

One of the key objectives of GCOMS is establishing a series of national networks focussing on the theme of “Disarmament for Development” and developing partnerships with groups and communities in many different countries. Working together will strengthen our voice and give us the support needed to meet the campaign goals.¹²² **GCOMS is a promising avenue and one that’s innovative in the way it combines human rights, sustainable development, environmental with peace and disarmament issues.** This large scope provides a window of opportunity that must be fully exploited in order to gather people and organisations from diverse horizons. Indeed, the main message of the GCOMS campaign is to cut military spending but foremost to reallocate military spending to fund human and environmental needs as it has been defined in the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 by the UN.

WHY “BRIDGING”?

Coalitions are formed around a common interest with the aim to create strategic connectivity by building linkages and trust between several stakeholders. Thus, forming a network composed of several people, groups and/or organisations from diverse backgrounds, different places (cities, regions, countries) and different sectors is an asset to strengthening a voice, uniting resources, increasing reach and demonstrating broad support for your aims in order to achieve a common goal. In order to achieve change we must take to the streets worldwide, and to do so, we need to be many, and to have relays in each country and each international forum.

A coalition may be set up locally, nationally or internationally, as it might be a short or a longer-term coalition, with formal and less formal structures. In fact, there are no general rules but some elements and/or advices that should be considered.

122. Cluster Munition Coalition, « Building a campaign network » <http://www.stopclustermunitions.org/media/330828/Campaign-Toolkit-Chapter-2-Building-a-Campaign-Network-low-res-.pdf>.

WHO TO COLLABORATE WITH?

As stated below, the large spectrum of the GCOMS allows various communities of activists to interact and work together. Before committing a partnership however, it might be useful to consider both the targets you need to influence and your current strengths and weaknesses as this will help you to identify people and groups that may help you. Secondly, you should first identify individuals and organisations that already have a reputation for working on similar issue (**take a look on our existing partners on the GCOMS website**). Otherwise, you can research who is talking about this issue in the media (via social media, like Twitter), in academia or in policy fora. One last thing, remember it is worth spending a little time examining the background of the organisations you want to work with - or those that approach you - to ensure your campaign integrity is not at risk.

- **Organisations:** This could include any organisation working on military spending and disarmament or on thematic areas related to human rights, social justice, environment, peace and security, arms trafficking/trade, civil and military nuclear issues, children and women's rights or conflict/post-conflict issues. Also consider working with religious platforms, trade unions, youth organisations, universities, think tanks or research centres.
- **Individuals:** Each single voice counts. Individuals can be members of the network; they can be volunteers (what implies a certain level of investment) but also some concerned citizens (who compose your supporter base and collaborate, but not necessarily as members) providing additional support to the cause, for instance, by participating in your campaign actions or relaying your messages on social media.
- Also think about **other people and entities** you may want/ need to collaborate with, such as media outlet and journalists, political scientists and economists, political parties, civil servants,

labour unions, educators, advocacy groups, celebrities. At a more official level, you can engage in dialogue with parliamentarians, governments/diplomats, international/UN agencies, and (ex-) military officials.

You'll find in Annex 2 a checklist to insure your networking to be a success.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: HOW TO BUILD YOUR MEDIA STRATEGY

→ Choose the right media

To have an effective GCOMS communication strategy, it is important to get to know the media landscape in your country. Which are the influential newspapers or broadcasting channels and what are the different editorial approaches? Which media outlets are influential among politicians and decision-makers?¹²³ However, the most prominent media are not always the most important; it is a misconception that only national media counts, **local and regional media** are important too, as what happens in people's backyard directly affects their lives. They tend to be read, watched or listened to with more attention and to stick in people's minds more than national media stories.¹²⁴ In the same way, political leaders may be more concerned about coverage in the local papers in their constituency than what's said in the national media. Finally, don't forget youth, ethnic and alternative media that could help you to reach a public who is likely to engage itself in the GCOMS campaign.¹²⁵

TIPS

- Try to contact journalists with personal emails / calls (press releases rarely generate media coverage; it's the personal contact that works best)
- Provide your contact with background materials about military spending/ disarmament issues, key arguments, visual material, statistics and other useful documents.
- Identify key moments that could generate media interest for your local/national context and send pitches to journalists about these events in advance.

Source: ICANW

123. CMC Toolkit Campaign ; CAAT website

124. « CAAT Media Guide » : <https://www.caat.org.uk/get-involved/how-tos/caat-local-media-guide.pdf>

125. The Praxis project, « Planning for Media advocacy », p.4, http://www.unnaturalcauses.org/assets/uploads/file/UC_MediaAdvocacy.pdf

→ Create a contact-list & maintain relationships

Find the names and contact details of newspapers, magazines, blogs, television and radio stations/programmes to compile your media list. Identify a number of journalists that write or broadcast stories about disarmament, humanitarian and social issues, domestic or international politics, defence, security and foreign affairs in your country, and try to build relationships with them (you can usually find journalists' email addresses on the websites of the publications or channels they work for).

Remember that journalists need you as much as you need them, and that a good relationship with a few of them is worth a thousand press releases.¹²⁶ You may also want to develop relationships with writers, photographers, artists, bloggers and some high-profile people who have visibility and can bring attention to your campaign message and actions.¹²⁷

→ **Create your own content.** Be a source for journalists, you will become an expert on Milex for media.

→ **When should we contact media?**¹²⁸

Here are examples of when the media could be interested in publishing a GCOMS message with your help:

- Release of the annual update of the SIPRI Military Expenditure Database (generally in April), or other nationally relevant research or statistics - media likes striking figures;
- International, regional or national conferences you participate in, or local events - a fundraising event, a religious ceremony, a public debate or a civic protest;

126. WRI Handbook

127. CMC Toolkit

128. « Getting coverage: A practical media guide for CMC & ICBL campaigners », <http://www.icbl.org/media/699811/CMC-ICBL-Media-Guide.pdf>

- A development in your government's defence and military policies;
- The launch of an action / event by your organization. Invite policy makers to participate in global days of action for instance. As well as helping to engage them, media presence can encourage them to speak positively on the issue;
- Every commemoration can be a good moment to contact media such as : International Day of Peace (21 September), Human Rights Day (10 December) International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons (26 September), World Day of Social Justice (20 February), International Day for Preventing the Exploitation of the Environment in War and Armed Conflict (6 November); International Day of Non-Violence (2 October) ; World Refugee Day (20 June) or other days such as Children's Day, Women's Day or Earth Day. It is useful to prepare a calendar at the beginning of the year with an overview of all important dates/events to come;
- The budget vote is also right time for raising the military spending issue to the media by highlighting the area where military spending could be reallocate such as education, culture, health and the environment, to mention just a few. Particularly on those periods of austerity where people and media are particularly sensitive to these issues.
- Breaking news: When a news' story (such like a trial of activists) is already getting public attention or rising indignation , it could be useful to bring the scope on military issues in the media.

For small events that do not have national impact, you may get coverage in smaller media such as a local radio station or newspaper.

→ Making news

What tools to use? ¹²⁹

TYPE	CONTENT	TIPS
MEDIA ADVISORY	It is a short and sweet alert sent to media to invite them to attend and report on an upcoming event.	<p>A media advisory is a short announcement that should include what the event is, who is involved in the event and will be available for interviews (experts, personalities), when & where it will take place, why the event is interesting for media or how it relates to a current event / news trend as well as your contact information.</p> <p>Media advisory are sent out to the media between one week and three days before an event, and again the day before as a reminder.</p> <p>It is generally advised to paste the text of the advisory or press release directly into the email (with other relevant links) rather than including attachments to avoid your email be blocked by SPAM folder.</p>
PRESS RELEASE	It is a statement issued to media giving some information on a new/important/breaking subject.	Headlines are very important. Press release should be limited to one single page, and the core information must be provided in the first paragraph. You may also include a quote from a member of the campaign case journalists doesn't have time to do an interview. Press release should be sent to media outlets in the morning.
INTERVIEW		Most of the time, interviews are used by journalists to get information and understand an issue, or to complete/legitimate the story they want to tell. Before agreeing to an interview, be sure to know their position regarding military spending, the angle of the article as well as whether you will be recorded (live/in advance). To make a successful interview, prepare in advance your key messages, try to build bridges (by linking your answers to the journalist's questions to what you really want to say), don't use so negative words and use simple language, give some examples and striking facts/

129. CMC/ICBL

TYPE	CONTENT	TIPS
PRESS CONFERENCE	A press conference is a voluntary presentation of information on newsworthy subject to the media.	<p>The advantage of a press conference is that you decide what information is presented, how and by whom. So, you get widespread media coverage and show the strength of your group. But to attain these goals, they have to be strategically organized. You should also pay attention to clearly state a good reason for organizing it (such as news that hasn't got media coverage yet or an important new issue). Decide what message you want to deliver through the media.</p> <p>Set the date and time of the press conference by taking into account reporter's deadlines and potential competing news event already scheduled.</p> <p>If you are not sure to attract press or without a solid news for reporters, avoid press conference and look for other press event on which you can intervene.</p>
LETTER TO THE EDITOR / OPINION EDITORIAL	It is an opinion written on a newsworthy subject.	Newspapers and blogs accept opinion editorial from public personalities or experts for raising public awareness on important issues. In fact, elected officials are paying special attention to those letters and opinion editorial published in newspapers or blogs. It can be a good way to both influence politics and raise public awareness on military spending issue.

Sources:

ICAN : Nuclear Ban Treaty Negotiation Handbook, <http://www.icanw.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Handbook.pdf>

Jesse Firempong (Greenpeace), "Getting Media for your Campaign or Grassroots Action", September 22, 2017, <http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/blog/Blogentry/getting-media-for-your-campaign-or-grassroots/blog/60294/>

The Praxis project, « Planning for Media advocacy », p.4, http://www.unnaturalcauses.org/assets/uploads/file/UC_MediaAdvocacy.pdf

WORC, *How to hold a press conference*, <http://www.worc.org/media/Hold-a-Press-Conference1.pdf>

Annex 2: HOW TO BUILD AN ADVOCACY COALITION

- **Establish the basic principles** your coalition will support. Keep it simple and limit it to 1-3 points.
- **Write up a simple, powerful, short coalition letter** and sign your own organization on.
- **Get signers!** (This step generally takes between 2 days to 2 weeks). Make a list of all the possible organizations that might want to sign on. Use your professional contacts and Internet searches to seek out organizations that work on similar issues.
- Contact the appropriate decision maker at each organization. Explain the issue and ask them to sign on. It is your duty to follow-up! Try sending emails and count on phone calls for crucial follow-ups.
- Always approach large organizations early. Large organizations may have bureaucracy in place which is slowing decision-making down. A large organization may also request slight changes to your guiding principles; you'll have to weigh these requests on a case-by-case basis.
- Once you get an organization to sign on, ask that organisation who else you should contact. Ask for email introductions where possible.
- Ask all your co-signers to help circulate an email to other possible signers.
- Publish your press release, your guiding principles or letter, and a list of everyone in the coalition on a public website.
- Tell people how they can join the coalition. Add new signatories to the site as you hear from them.
- **Set up a mailing list for everyone from the coalition to exchange news and updates.**

Sources:

Electronic Frontier Foundation, *Basic Steps and Tips to Building a Coalition*, https://www.eff.org/files/filenode/basic_tips_building_coalition_fnl.pdf

Annex 3: Example of letter to be sent to parliamentarians

Dear Mrs/ Mr ...

In this period of budget negotiations and vote, I would like to draw your attention to our military and defence spending. According to SIPRI data, military spending has increased steadily in recent years; in 2001 world's military spending amounted to USD 1.088 billion while amounted to USD 1.088 billion in 2001.

In (name of the country), military expenditures have reached (amount) in (year considered), what represent an increase of (amount). We are troubled by the heightened increase of our country's military spending. Indeed, increases in military spending result in more arms, more benefits for the military industry, more lobbying on our government, an increased arms trade and number of arms worldwide and in regions in conflict - with all its consequences on human rights. In addition, it has been shown that military spending is ineffective for creating job (unlike other domestic investments such as education, healthcare or climate change). Moreover, all expenses being devoted to the military are not used for our human and social needs such, as health, education or job creation. We want schools, hospitals, cultural sites, not warships, bombs and weapons! We want a welfare state, not a warfare state.

For all these reasons, we are respectfully asking you to take into account these issues during the budget vote and to keep in mind that it is possible and necessary to:

- Reduce military spending while redirecting its funds to social needs, cooperation, conflict mediation and peace building;
- Increase transparency and avoid opacity in official data on military and defence industry, as well as on arms export and import ;
- Introduce criteria for addressing military spending in our national budget in a comprehensive and rigorous way;
- Ensure that arms programs are audited and controlled by our Parliament.

We want [country name] to be a leader for peace, sustainable development, common and human security in the world, and not a war dealer.

Please accept, Mrs/Mr..., the expression of our highest consideration.

We are looking forward to your answer.



**CENTRE DELÀS
D'ESTUDIS
PER LA PAU**



With the support of:

