



PANEL DISCUSSION: With military emissions now on the climate agenda, should global military spending be part of the climate finance and Loss and Damage debate? If so how?

In collaboration with:

Perspectives Climate Group, Germany and the Taiwan Climate Partnership



6 December 18.30-20.00



Green x Digital Pavilion

Zone B7 BLDG 88 (First Floor Thematic Arena 3)

The panel will discuss how military emissions link to military spending; the scale of need for both climate finance and Loss and Damage fund; and why, practically, the time has come to elevate those calls to prioritise funding for the climate emergency over that of war spending.

This event is dedicated to the memory of Professor Saleemul Huq.



PROFESSOR NETA CRAWFORD

Montague Burton Professor of International Relations, Oxford University



TASNEEM ESSOP

Executive Director, Climate Action Network



LINDSEY FIELDER COOK

Quaker UN Office, Representative for the Human Impacts of Climate Change



KATRIN GEYER

Environment Advisor, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom



DEBORAH BURTON

Co-Founder, Tipping Point North South

CONTEXT

With military emissions now on the climate agenda, should global military spending be part of the climate finance and Loss and Damage debate? If so how?

The military emissions data gap is finally gaining attention at COP and Bonn climate conferences, IPCC meetings and the Global Stocktake process. The global military and its supply chain combined are estimated to be responsible for – on patchy and partial data – 5.5% of global emissions. And while this figure does not include conflict-related emissions, wars in Ukraine and now Gaza reveal why the impact of *conflict* related emissions is also a matter of grave concern.

But military emissions are linked to something else: excessive military spending.

The G20 accounts for 87% of \$2.2trillion p/a (2022) military spending, much of which is spent on fossil fuel reliant hardware. Broadly speaking, military emissions positively correlate to military spending. The more you spend on big ticket weaponry, the more you emit greenhouse gases.

And all the while, rich countries spend 30 times more on militaries than climate finance. Are we seeing climate 'fair shares'? Support for loss and damage? Properly funded climate finance? The answer is no.

In 2018 the United Nations Report – *Securing our Common Future* said

“More than \$1.7 trillion was spent on militaries and their equipment. This is vastly disproportionate with contemporary sources of national and human insecurity, which include climate change...pandemics... involuntary migration. Not only is much of this spending economically unproductive, but excessive military spending by one nation also multiplies throughout the international system, prompting excessive spending elsewhere.”

[Note \$1.7tr is now \$2.2tr]

Even the IPCC reference military spending in its 2022 *Mitigation of Climate Change* report, recognising that moderate reductions could mean that resources are available for reallocation for the Sustainable Development Goals

Can we start to meet some of this 'vast potential' by considering mechanisms to reduce and redirect runaway military spending? Has the time come to seriously address the ways in which runaway global military spending can help plug huge climate finance gaps?

The clear lesson of the climate crisis is that extreme weather knows no national boundary and does not distinguish by ethnicity or religion. There is no military tank, naval ship or fighter jet that can protect us from climate breakdown.

Contact:

Deborah Burton

Deborah@tippingpointnorthsouth.org

+44 7779 203455

www.tippingpointnorthsouth.org

www.transformdefence.org

