

But there are alternatives

The current threats to our very existence show clearly that real security has much more to do with human and planetary well-being and with international co-operation than with military might.

Let's seize the opportunity to

- ✓ take stock and welcome ways of doing things differently, more sustainably, in all areas of life.
- ✓ question deeply-embedded assumptions about the acceptability and inevitability of armed conflict as a way of resolving disputes.
- ✓ strictly enforce proper controls on the arms trade.
- ✓ divert some of the trillions of dollars of global military spending into climate transition needs (which often yield much better value for money).
- ✓ honestly address the underlying causes of conflict, demanding serious funding for non-military security and nonviolent conflict prevention and resolution.
- ✓ support and strengthen the UN and existing international laws and treaties.

For the sake of humanity and the planet, isn't it time to find better ways than warfare of resolving our disputes?

Movement FOR THE
Abolition of War

WAR is bad for the planet too!



We already know that war is a humanitarian catastrophe but we must recognise that it is an environmental catastrophe too.

"The atmosphere certainly counts the cost of carbon from the military, therefore we must as well."

Stephen Kretzmann, then Director of Oil Change International

Around 6% of global greenhouse gas emissions result from military-related activity (estimated by Scientists for Global Responsibility www.sgr.org.uk), yet there is no obligation on nations to count these emissions nor to include them in reduction targets.

Join us in demanding that COP26 sets limits with

- **no exceptions for military-related emissions**
- **no reliance on offsetting schemes and**
- **a requirement for independent verification.**

Climate change makes war more likely

It is now well recognised by major charities, policy makers and senior military personnel that climate change can lead to soil degradation, competition for scarce resources, mass migration and instability, thus greatly multiplying the threat of war.



and war contributes to climate change

Still barely acknowledged, though, is that **war itself contributes significantly to climate change** through the whole cycle: ore extraction and manufacture of equipment and weaponry; trials and training with massive fuel use; the maintenance of vast numbers of buildings; the use of fuels and explosives in warfare,



plus resulting fires; and, often overlooked, extensive rebuilding of devastated infrastructure with its reliance on carbon-hungry cement and steel.

Why are military emissions ignored?

At this time of climate crisis, surely we need to know the facts and figures of ALL pollution?

“What gets measured gets managed”

Mark Carney, former Governor of the Bank of England, speaking of greenhouse gas emissions generally

At the Kyoto climate conference in 1997 it was decided, under pressure from US negotiators, that there would be no obligation on countries to disclose military-related emissions nor to include them in reduction targets. At Paris in 2015 the rather vague agreement was that countries no longer have automatic exemption but neither are they obliged to declare them.



Disclosure is only the first step towards the real goal: REDUCTION of these emissions.

The UK Ministry of Defence takes the climate crisis seriously and accepts that its carbon footprint must be reduced. Its plans for this, though, lie not in reducing warfare but in increasing the efficiency of the existing system: in finding alternative fuels for war planes, low carbon manufacturing methods in its supply chains etc.