

Preface

There is growing recognition in the post-Cold War era, that security can no longer be defined solely in the narrow military sense of the word. Security also depends on the pace of development and respect for human rights and democratic freedoms. The legitimacy of governments is increasingly challenged when their institutions are unable to provide for the well-being of their people. In order to establish conditions conducive to peace and stability, authorities must therefore promote sustainable economic development, based on national consensus. In many countries, this may require a reallocation of resources previously dedicated to the military establishment toward more productive developmental uses.

Despite a reduction in global military expenditures over the past few years, current levels often remain in excess of legitimate security and defence requirements. Such expenditures in developing countries also reduce the share of scarce public resources available for sustainable development, and can reduce the effectiveness of development assistance. Moreover, the use of the military to maintain corrupt or dictatorial regimes and violate human rights also runs counter to Canada's efforts to promote good governance and democracy. Curtailing military expenditures would free up resources which might then be applied to economic or social development, thus adding to the effectiveness of Canada's development assistance. Developing country governments can also benefit by such reductions in demonstrating non-aggressive behaviour to contending domestic groups or neighbouring states, thus reinforcing internal and regional security.

This study was undertaken as part of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's efforts to explore the policy implications flowing from the relationship between sustainable development and military expenditures in developing countries. A key difficulty in this area is developing a methodology for identifying countries that may suffer from an excessive military burden. The report focuses in particular on whether an analysis based on regions and drawing upon existing publicly available data can prove insightful for determining countries with an excessive military burden.

This report is being made available to assist officials and researchers in their work on this subject, as part of the Department's policy to share the results of independent research undertaken by the Department's Verification Research Program. The views presented in this report are the author's alone, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department or of the Government of Canada.

Acknowledgements

The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade wishes to acknowledge the work performed concerning this report under contract by Professor Keith Krause of the Graduate Institute of Strategic Studies, Geneva, Switzerland. The work on this report was completed in the autumn of 1996.

Professor Krause, for his part, wishes to point out that this report had its genesis in the findings and discussion generated by one part of a previous report, *Constraining Conventional Proliferation: A Role for Canada*¹. It also benefitted from the discussions at a Department of Foreign Affairs consultative meeting held in March 1996. He received feedback on parts of the report from Alan Crawford, James Moore and Hal Klepak. Alan Crawford in particular provided materials, suggestions and extensive comments. Responsibility for any errors of fact or judgement rests with Professor Krause alone.

¹ Keith Krause, Kenneth Epps, William Weston and David Mutimer, *Constraining Conventional Proliferation: A Role for Canada*, (Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, March 1996).