

multilateral reductions.

Purchase of sophisticated weaponry merits one sort of response, but civic reconversion should merit another. And reconversion needs to be supported both in principle and by funding, particularly where it may include reduction in the number of troops and consequent demobilization, indemnification, pension, retraining and support for reintegration into civilian life. Experience has shown that rushed and poorly planned demobilization, along with the absence of serious reintegration support strategies, may do more to imperil stability and development, than the maintenance of a large standing army.

What this means in practice is that budgetary allocations for military reconversion may well serve the purposes of sustainable development and democracy, particularly if viewed as a contribution to political stability and as a long term investment in human capital, albeit at present in military guise.

Militarism and Citizen Security

In the final analysis, the issue is not the military budget, nor the military itself, or even the distinction between civil and military regimes, but rather the use of force in the process of governing.⁸ The demilitarization of politics is a strategic precondition for democratization and development.

More concretely, how to limit the use of force in the face of the modern onslaught on citizen's physical security witnessed in so many countries. In many respects, taming defense budgets entails taming violence. If military expenditures are to be reduced, this cannot be perceived as taking place at the expense of citizen's security. In the so-called transition countries, the spiraling crime rate is rapidly giving rise to calls for enhanced or renewed internal security

⁸See the arguments made by Anthony Giddens in *The Nation-State and Violence* (Cambridge, 1985).