

Submission To The Garnaut Climate Review Is there a need for new emissions scenarios?

Submitted by:
May Kentish
Mornington, Vic.

Preamble

Proposals to combat carbon producing emissions must take into the equation military spending, weapons of war and armed conflict. These factors along with obligations under the United Nations Charter (UN Charter), Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD Conv), Geneva Convention and Protocol I, 1977 are relevant to climate change and the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Military Spending

Article 26 of the UN Charter, requires it to deliver a plan for the 'least diversion of human and economic resources to armament.' The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates World Military spending 2006 at US\$1204 billion at constant (2005) prices and exchange rates. Over the ten year period since 1977 there has been a 37% increase in this spending. One year of global military spending could buy 600 years of the United Nation's regular budget. Clearly, not what the framers of the UN Charter intended.

In 2006 the 15 countries with the highest spending accounted for 83% of the total. The USA is responsible for 46% of the world total, distantly followed by the UK, France, Japan and China with 4-5% each. Australia is in 12th position with 13.8 billion. (SIPRI)

The above figures are not disaggregated to reveal costs associated with mining raw materials, power and energy expended in production, labour and highly skilled intellectual input to research and development. All inputs draw on power and energy and are greenhouse gas producing activities, and need be calculated as such.

Weapons of War

Twenty-six thousand nuclear weapons, 'conventional' bombs, cluster bombs, land mines (UN Conference on Disarmament 2008) will not remove the threat of global warming, climate change, environmental,, social and economic dislocation. Climate Change is the real security threat of our times. It recognizes no borders, flags or uniforms.

Sustainable Development has become part of the language used by political economists, who now acknowledge the threat posed by Climate Change. Investment in 'clean coal', alternative energy sources, the race is on. Budget figures 2007-2008: CSIRO A\$ 2.8 billion over 4 years; Establishment Australian Centre for Climate Change (ACCC) A\$126 million over 5 years; Drought Relief A\$424.5 million. The current drought, seen as the worst 'in the decade', 'living memory', 'recorded history' has been a factor in setting up the ACCC. One year's expenditure Drought Relief is 5 times greater than spending on the ACCC. What of the elephant in the room: Military Spending 2006 USD13.8 billion.

Investing US\$602 billion, half of 2006 global military expenditure, in R&D and the implementation of existing programs to address Greenhouse producing activities would better serve global security. Investment finance to combat carbon producing emissions is a matter of will to change current budget and political priorities.

The NPT entered into force 1970. Its objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons technology and further the goal of achieving general and complete disarmament. Article VIII para 3 envisages a review of the operation of the Treaty every 5 years. The provision was reaffirmed by all States parties in the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, who agreed that the NPT should continue in force indefinitely (2002 UN Department for Disarmament Affairs). The UN Special Conference 2005 dropped the section on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament from the Outcomes Document. Multiple amendments to the Document led by US Ambassador John Bolton ensured that the additional protocol to the IAEA safeguards on the standard for compliance with the NPT, and the commencement of negotiations on banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons did not go forward.

Military spending has surged since June 2002 with US withdrawal from the 1972 Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty with the former USSR. The US has recommenced developing missile defence systems, the Star Wars Program. Large amounts of US investment are related to this program, while the US blocks negotiations on the treaty for the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS). To date the missile defence program has proved inefficient, ineffective and hideously expensive. Space-based nuclear weapons would undermine existing arms control treaties, at a time when India, Pakistan and probably Israel enter the nuclear arms race, with others waiting in the wings. Presumably Russia has recommenced investment in nuclear technology.

This massive spending on nuclear technology, and the resources it consumes will make no positive contribution toward climate change programs. It will further aggravate global warming and accelerate global insecurity. The possibility of a nuclear pre-emptive strike in the current unstable political environment cannot be discounted.

Armed Conflict

The steady erosion of post 1945 treaties has seen the development of weapons both resource expensive and expensive of human health and life. These new generation weapons come at a cost to the environment, and feed into global warming.

Depleted Uranium Weapons (DUW) are of the new generation. Used initially by US tanks in Gulf War 1991 chosen for their ability to sharpen on impact, pierce the target, and simultaneously release massive heat and energy. On explosion 20-40% of the DU tank shell becomes very fine aerosol particles of chemical and radiological toxic dust.

A DU tank shell fired from an Abrams tank can create from 2-7 lbs of uranium oxide dust. DU dust can be and is dispersed by the wind. Sixty per cent of the penetrator retains its initial shape, leaving a landscape littered with solid pieces of DU, which depending on the terrain may erode into dust or leech into the groundwater. *No available technology can significantly change the inherent chemical and radiological toxicity of depleted uranium. These are intrinsic properties of uranium* (US Army Environmental Policy Institute Report 1995).

Depleted Uranium weapons currently used in Iraq and Afghanistan range from small calibre ammunition through to tank shells, ordinance used by A-10 Thunderbolts which can deliver Bunker Busters or Mini Nukes with a payload of up to 1,550 kg. These new generations weapons leave in their wake a stealthy legacy of radiological and chemically toxic dust for generations to come.

Governments and their military forces, suppress, refuse or are reluctant to provide data about the extent of DU weapons used in Iraq and Afghanistan and their effect on the environment. Radiation levels measured in Baghdad April 2003 by Scott Petersen of the Christian Science Monitor registered 1,000-1,900 higher than normal background radiations levels.

In February 1980 National Lead Industries of Upper State New York, manufacturers of DU cannon penetrator shells for the US Air Force were closed by order of New York State Government Department of Environment. The closure followed monitored detection of 4-6 micron dust particles 26 miles from the plant.

Dust particles within the atmosphere are not new, dust and smoke from burning forest fires, and burning oil fields. Dust and smoke from armed conflict add to atmospheric pollution. Environment pollution arising from armed conflict has the double cost of resources used in weapons production and resources destroyed in weapons delivery. Congressional Budget Office October 2007 new estimates put the cost of Iraq, projected out through 2017, at US\$1 trillion plus 705 billion interest payments. Estimated total cost of Iraq and Afghanistan combined could reach US\$2.4 trillion. Ninety percent of the budget is Department of Defence appropriation.

Protocol I I Additional to the Geneva Convention, 1977, states with respect to the Natural Environment:

Care shall be taken in warfare to protect the natural environment against widespread long-term and severe damage. This protection includes a prohibition of the use of methods or means of warfare which are intended or may be expected to cause such damage to the natural environment and thereby prejudice the health or survival of the population.

This submission takes the view that Military spending and its outcomes are significant factors contributing to Global Climate Change. Military spending should be re-allocated to finance investment in programs that contribute to reduction of Green-house producing activities, and promote global environmental health and stability.

May Kentish
Convener for International Relations
Australian Federation of University Women-Vic