



The Pentagon Has a Weight Problem. Let's put it on a diet.

A Peace Action Primer

IS IT DEFENSE OR AN ADDICTION TO MILITARISM?

DEFENSE SPENDING AT HOME = 58% of the 2009 discretionary funding request was allocated for defense.¹

According to the National Priorities Project, the median income family in the United States paid \$2,628 in federal income taxes in 2007. Here is how that money is spent.

Military	\$1,109
Health	\$581
Interest on Non-military Debt	\$269
Anti-Poverty Programs	\$228
Education, Training & Social Services	\$115
Government & Law Enforcement	\$102
Housing & Community Development	\$88
Environment, Energy & Science	\$69
Transportation, Commerce & Agriculture	\$40
International Affairs	\$27

US DEFENSE SPENDING IN THE WORLD = US defense spending accounts for 48% of the world's total.

- “The United States spends more than the **next 45 highest spending countries in the world combined**.
- The United States accounts for **48 percent of the world's total military spending**.
- The United States spends on its military **5.8 times more than China, 10.2 times more than Russia, and 98.6 times more than Iran.**”
- The United States and its strongest allies (the NATO countries, Japan, South Korea and Australia) **spend \$1.1 trillion on their militaries combined, representing 72 percent of the world's total.**”²

WHAT DOES DEFENSE AND SECURITY SPENDING GO TOWARDS? = 87% goes towards military forces.

The figures of US military spending beg the question: What is being done with these resources? Ostensibly, spending on “defense” goes towards protecting American citizens against harm. A closer examination of defense spending reveals a mindset stuck in the Cold War. Excessive and unnecessary weapons spending on a global military footprint expanding beyond any reasonable defense justification or historical precedent, and misplaced priorities and investments that project an antagonistic foreign policy of a nation with enough armaments to go to war with the entire world.

Not even including spending on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan 87% of all US security spending goes towards military forces, while only 8% goes towards homeland security and 5% to non-military international engagement (Unified Security Budget).³

NUCLEAR & COLD WAR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Though the Soviet Union collapsed nearly twenty years ago, defense contractors and security hawks continue to successfully advocate for high tech weaponry intended to fight a massive global war with a nation that no longer exists. Programs like the Star Wars missile defense, the F-22 Raptor, more submarines and aircraft carriers which cost over \$50 billion a year.

The Joint Strike Fighter, also known as the F-35 and built by lead contractor Lockheed Martin Corp., is designed to replace many of the current warplanes flown by the Marine Corps, Navy and Air Force. A total of 2,456 planes will be bought for roughly \$300 billion, with another \$760 billion expected to be required to maintain the planes during their life spans.

Nuclear Weapons = \$52.4 billion for all nuclear weapons related activities

Arguably the most egregious of so called defense spending, nuclear weapons cast a shadow across civilization, reflecting a mindset that views the world as a threatening and dangerous place, where the greatest strength is the potential to completely annihilate your enemies, even at the risk of destroying yourself.

According to a Carnegie Endowment report published January 2009, total appropriations for nuclear weapons and weapons related programs for fiscal year 2008, was at least \$52.4 billion. The report reveals a nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons related budget that is far larger than what is typically thought of as US expenses on nuclear weapons programs. The majority of the spending goes towards “nuclear forces and operational support” which includes the maintenance, operation and upgrading of the nuclear weapons arsenal, delivery systems, and infrastructure while only 10% goes towards limiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Key findings:

* Nuclear weapons and weapons-related programs account for at least **67 percent of Department of Energy’s budget**, 8.5 percent of the FBI’s budget, 7.1 percent of the Department of Defense budget, and 1.7 percent of the Department of Homeland Security’s budget.³

* Only 1.3 percent (\$700 million) of the nuclear security budget was devoted to preparing for the consequences of a nuclear or radiological attack.

* Another 56 percent of the total went toward operating, sustaining, and upgrading the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

* Nuclear security consumes \$13 billion more than international diplomacy and foreign assistance; nearly double what the United States allots for general science, space, and technology; and 14 times what the Department of Energy (DOE) budgets for all energy-related research and development.

Costs of Iraq and Afghanistan = \$68.5 billion in FY 2009 (does not include money yet to be allocated for the 2nd half of '09)

The costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost American taxpayers an estimated \$872 billion to date in direct appropriations for military operations. This does not include related costs such as veteran’s health care and interest on the debt accumulated by the wars. When considering those figures the costs of just the Iraq war reach \$3 trillion.

President Obama announced plans to draw down troops in Iraq and end the war, but has also announced an increase in troops in Afghanistan. And the timeline of the withdrawal has been extended from his campaign pledge of sixteen months to nineteen. A bigger concern however, is the residual force of 30,000 to 50,000 he intends to leave there.

In Afghanistan, the President is calling for a troop surge that would increase the cost of the occupation – currently about \$2 billion a month – by about 60 percent this year. Yet, as long as the levels of extreme poverty in Afghanistan and Pakistan (recent United Nations development data ranks Afghanistan 173rd out of 178 countries; Pakistan is 136th) the ranks of the insurgents will continue to grow. Diplomacy and economic aid should be the priority.⁵

Excerpts from Nick Turse's new book "The Complex: How the Military Invades Our Everyday Lives" (Metropolitan, 2008).

“Back in 1975, Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin) decried the fact that the Department of Defense spent nearly \$14 million each year to maintain and operate 300 military-run golf courses scattered across the globe.”

“Today, the military claims to operate a mere 172 golf courses worldwide...”

“A closer examination indicates that the DoD counts the 3 separate golf courses, a total of fifty-four holes, at Andrews Air Force Base in Washington, D.C, as 1 course...its Admiral Baker Golf Course in San Diego, which boasts 2 eighteen-hole courses, as a single unit. Similarly, while the DoD claims that the army operates 56 golf facilities, it appears that this translates into no fewer than 68 actual courses, stretching from the U.S. to Germany, Japan, and South Korea.”

Foreign Military Bases = \$100 billion in 2009

Another relic of the Cold War that has received far too little attention in public debate, even when compared to other security spending issues, is the global footprint of US military bases on foreign soil. The United States maintains 227 bases in Germany, costly remnants of a bygone era when Germany was split between East and West and the Cold War dictated US military planning. Currently, the US spends \$100 billion a year operating and maintaining over 900 foreign military bases in 63 countries. No other nation comes close with the US accounting for 95% of the world's foreign military bases.⁶

ENERGY SECURITY = \$100 billion in 2009

In the lead up to the invasion of Iraq a common protest sign, and chant heard at rallies was “no blood for oil”; alluding to the idea that a primary driver for the invasion of Iraq was the amount of oil supplies under Saddam Hussein's control. The extent to which oil was the cause for the invasion is an ongoing debate, but considering official national security policy, and the Pentagon's own analysis, it's increasingly clear that the challenge US fossil fuel dependency presents to national security will continue unless there is a serious reformulation of both national energy policy and national security.

Recently the connection between energy and security has been made even clearer by research published by the National Priorities Project, January 2009.

The report “The Military Costs of Securing Energy” found that up to 30% of United States military spending goes towards securing energy supplies around the world, and in 2009 it is estimated that the **US will spend \$100 billion on securing energy access through the military, in contrast investing only \$1.26 billion in renewable energy**⁷

This disparity of investments and misplaced priorities is a natural extension of the Carter Doctrine, articulated by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 in response to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan which states. “An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on

the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.” Though Carter renounced this position in the lead-up to the Iraq war, the policy was reiterated as recently as 2008 in the National Defense Strategy issued by the Department of Defense and remains a central concept in US energy security policy”...current trends indicate an increasing reliance on petroleum products from areas of instability in the coming years, not reduced reliance. The United States will continue to foster access to and flow of energy resources vital to the world economy.”⁸

Ironically, the Department of Defense is the largest oil consuming government body in the United States and the world. If the DoD were a nation it would rank about 38th in oil consumption, in the world. The latest available figures report that in 2004 the DoD spent approximately \$8.2 billion directly on energy, seven times more than the United States spent on energy efficiency.

The Pentagon itself raises the alarm on the prospects of climate change fueled conflict. In 2003 the Pentagon issued a report detailing the security threat posed by climate change determined climate change to be more of a security threat than terrorism. The report also raises the prospect of nuclear war, widespread famine and riots over food and water. The consequences of the United States misplaced priorities on energy issues are clear. The US continues to increase military spending to secure energy supplies while under-funding renewable energy and energy efficiency creating a feedback loop in which the very practices and policies meant to address energy issues are actually making them worse.

1. Christopher Hellman & Travis Sharp, *The FY 2009 Pentagon Spending Request – Discretionary* (Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation - February 4, 2008) http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/securityspending/articles/fy09_dod_request_discretionary/
2. Christopher Hellman, Travis Sharp, *The FY 2009 Pentagon Spending Request - Global Military Spending* (Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation - February 22, 2008) http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/securityspending/articles/fy09_dod_request_global/
3. Lawrence Korb, Miriam Pemberton, *A Unified Security Budget for the United States FY 2009* (Foreign Policy in Focus – September 2008)
4. Stephen I. Schwartz, Deepti Choubey, *Nuclear Security Spending: Assessing Costs Examining Priorities* (Carnegie Endowment Report, January 2009) <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=22601&prog=zgp&proj=znpp>
5. Christopher Hellman, Travis Sharp *Total Iraq and Afghanistan Supplemental War Funding To Date Spending* (Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation – July 23, 2008) http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/iraq/articles/supplemental_war_funding/
6. Prof. Jules Dufour, *The Worldwide Network of US Military Bases: The Global Deployment of US Military Personnel* (Global Research - July 1, 2007) <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5564>
7. Anita Dancs, Mary Orisich, Suzanne Smith, *The Military Costs of Securing Energy* (National Priorities Project – October 2008)
8. President Jimmy Carter, *Third State of the Union Address*, 1978