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In 2014, UK military spending was $61bn: 2.2% of GDP (SIPRI, 2015) – in 2015, it was projected to fall to 2.0% GDP (ORG, 2015)

Highly militarised nations include USA and Russia. In 2014, US military spending was $610bn (3.5% GDP) and Russia’s was $85bn (4.5% GDP) (SIPRI, 2015)

Average industrialised nations – military spending around 1.4% GDP, limited/no involvement in recent wars (ORG, 2015)

UK greenhouse gas emissions per person is approx 8.5t (CO2 equivalent) – world average is approx 6.5t (WRI, 2014)
New UK Strategies and Policies

• Published 23 November 2015
  – National Security Strategy
  – Strategic Defence and Security Review
• New policies on climate change
• Changing priorities caused by:
  – Change in UK government
    • Conservative-Liberal Coalition has become Conservative
  – Changes in international/ national situation

Russia

• More concern due to:
  – Ukraine war
  – More Russian aircraft and submarines detected near UK/ NATO airspace/ waters

• Government response
  – Continue with replacement of nuclear-armed subs
  – New marine patrol aircraft
  – New ‘rapid reaction’ forces
  – Lower priority for non-military options

• More info in HM Government (2015)
• NB ‘concern’ especially means UK government/ Conservative Party concern, especially since last NSS/SDSR in 2010
• No consideration of the role of post-Cold war expansion of NATO to Russian borders and recent NATO military exercises in fuelling Russian security fears
• One non-military option which is being given greater priority is increased efforts to exploit UK gas sources (both conventional and shale) as Russian supplies to European mainland increase – but this has implications for climate change (see later)
Middle East (and other ‘hotspots’)

• More concern due to:
  • Rapid rise of IS and other extreme groups
  • Syrian war
  • Refugees

• Government response
  • More ‘force projection’ through offensive weapons systems
    – Commissioning of second aircraft carrier
    – Speed up deployment of new military aircraft
  • Completion of new military base in Bahrain
  • Increased promotion of arms exports to ‘allies’
  • Greater aid focus on ‘fragile states’

• More info in HM Government (2015)
• Force projection often referred to by military as ‘expeditionary capability’ which hides aggressive role
• New military aircraft includes accelerated introduction of F-35 Lightning fighter-bombers and more armed drones
• Non-military preventative action is missing, e.g. restricting arms exports to authoritarian regimes, recognising past failures of Western military action, strengthening border controls to prevent foreign fighters entering conflict zones, financial restrictions to cut off funding to IS from elsewhere in Middle East, greater diplomatic efforts to achieve local humanitarian ceasefires, prioritising carbon reductions to prevent climate change which drives instability
Climate change etc

- UK government concern falling
- Government response
  - Major reduction in effort/ support for energy conservation and renewable energy
    • Many successful programmes cut
  - Greater focus/ more subsidies for natural gas
    • Especially UK sources in North Sea and fracking for shale gas on land
  - Greater focus/ more subsidies for nuclear power
    • Large plants + R&D on small modular reactors
  - Encourage more international emissions reduction

- Examples of cuts to UK green energy programmes are given in Parkinson (2015)
- Current UK energy and climate policy summarised in a recent ministerial statement (DECC, 2015)
- UK is the only G7 nation which is increasing fossil fuel subsidies (ODI/OCI, 2015)
- Lack of appreciation of current failings in international nuclear industry and its inability to deliver on promises (see, eg, Dorfman, 2015)
- Phase-out of coal for electricity generation by 2025 is one new positive policy – but it has loop-holes
UK military equipment spending

• £178bn over next ten years
  – Additional £12bn in Defence Review
• Major programmes
  – Submarines & nuclear weapons (1/4 of budget)
  – Warships
  – Combat planes
  – Armoured fighting vehicles
  – Long-range support aircraft
  – Weapons

• Submarines & nuclear weapons - incl. Trident replacement (4 x nuclear-armed subs – total cost risen to £31bn); completion of 7 x Astute Class conventionally-armed subs – approx ¼ of total equipment budget
• Warships – incl. completion of 2 x Queen Elizabeth Class aircraft carriers; Type-26 Global Combat Ship
• Combat planes - incl. F-35 Lightning II fighter-bombers (accelerated introduction); Typhoon fast jets (lifetime extension); more armed drones
• Armoured fighting vehicles - incl. Warrior, Scout
• Long-range support aircraft - incl. Voyager & A400M for heavy lift, air-to-air refuelling; 9 new marine patrol aircraft
• Weapons - incl. missiles, torpedoes and bombs
• Helicopters - incl. Chinook, Apache, Puma and Wildcat
• More details in HM Government (2015)
Some observations...

• NSS/ SDSR acknowledge roots of conflict including climate change
• But less focus on reducing UK carbon emissions
• More focus on energy security via UK gas and nuclear
• More focus on military force/ equipment to try to ‘control’ security threats
• Overseas aid increasingly focused on states which might pose a future threat to UK

• Essentially military resources are being increased to try to deal with security problems (despite marked lack of success), while key preventative action – ie reducing carbon emissions (which has been successful) – is being cut back
More observations...

- Current policies benefit:
  - Military corporations
  - (Oil and) Gas corporations
  - Nuclear corporations
- Scientists/ engineers in these areas
- Growing budgets for Research and Development (R&D) in these areas

More discussion of these issues is given in SGR (2013)
UK Military R&D

• In 2013/14, SGR carried out detailed review of UK publicly funded R&D related to security
  – Freedom of Information requests revealed detailed 2008-11 data from Ministry of Defence
  – Public databases revealed detailed data on civilian work
    • Broadly covering areas which help to tackle roots of conflict

• Research published in SGR (2013); SGR (2014)
• List of research areas which tackle roots of conflict in slide 13 – broader termed ‘sustainable security’
• Other areas of interest include missile systems, communications systems, warships, cyber-security, body armour, chemical/biological/radiological/nuclear defence, emerging technologies etc
• These are minimum figures – 1/4 of MoD R&D spending not clearly documented at programme level
• In public relations, the ‘life-saving’ contribution of military R&D projects is often emphasised, e.g. soldier armour, although in practice this is a small proportion.

**UK Military R&D: Top 4 areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Public R&amp;D spending 2008-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Nuclear weapons systems</td>
<td>£980m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warheads; ‘Successor’ submarines;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear propulsion for submarines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Strike planes</td>
<td>£771m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typhoon, F-35 Lightning II, Tornado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Attack helicopters</td>
<td>£599m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly Future Lynx/ Wildcat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Unmanned aerial vehicles</td>
<td>£195m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Drones’, including Mantis, Taranis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SGR (2013; 2014)*

• All have major role in ‘force projection’, i.e. offensive
• These are minimum figures due to incomplete Ministry of Defence data
• Classifications based on military/ academic literature – discussed further in SGR (2013)
• Sustainable security R&D spending includes: international development and poverty alleviation, climate change impacts, sustainable energy technologies, food security, international relations, natural resource management, biodiversity, environmental risks and hazards, sustainable consumption and other measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change
• The concept of sustainable security was defined in ORG (2006)
Conclusions

• Need a major shift from military approaches to non-military preventative action
  – Both funds and expertise
• Very difficult to achieve in current climate
  – Due to powerful political and corporate interests
Recommendations

• Carry out more work on links between climate change and conflict
  – Research, public education, campaigning
• Build on significant political/public opposition to military options
• Signs of hope from UK
  – Prince Charles spoke out about links between Syrian war and climate change
  – Labour leader opposed to nuclear weapons and air-strikes

• Recommendations aimed at researchers and campaigners
• Numerous organisations working on these issues including Scientists for Global Responsibility, International Peace Bureau, Transnational Institute, Oxford Research Group etc – please support us!
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