

and extra-regional states, especially with respect to security-conflict-development questions.<sup>9</sup> Although the armed forces can (and have) played a role in combatting civil strife and communal conflict, and in providing the basic secure conditions for commerce, the negative internal consequences of high levels of military expenditures can also be fairly easily discerned in a wide variety of places. In states such as Pakistan, Ethiopia, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Angola or Mozambique, historically high levels of spending (to deal with a wide range of internal or external threats or wars), have made difficult such things as the transition to civilian rule or post-conflict peace-building efforts. Again, however, the *direction* of causality is not easy to determine: do severe internal conflicts create high levels of military spending, or do high levels of spending exacerbate conflicts that could otherwise be ameliorated if resources were distributed differently? Only a careful case-by-case analysis could disentangle this question.

Finally, the concept of societal and human security attempts to capture the concerns of citizens, for whom "security symbolizes protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards."<sup>10</sup> Although the armed forces seldom has a direct role in such matters, it can (especially in the developing world) often play a role in combatting crime, engaging in infrastructure projects (road building, agriculture), and disaster relief. These latter roles are often assumed because the military represents one of the few highly organized pools of efficient labour. But a state that devotes a high level of resources to the armed forces in the absence of credible or pressing external threats, or severe problems of internal conflict, may still end up sacrificing progress towards developmental and human welfare goals, either because of the opportunity costs of security expenditures, or the often negative side-effects. In many cases (such as in Myanmar, Central America, Algeria, or Pakistan, for example) a peaceful transition to representative or democratic government, or towards greater respect for human rights, appears to be rendered more difficult by the strong societal role of the armed forces. Likewise, although Figure 2 above suggests that no general relationship between military expenditures and human welfare exists, when relatively resource-rich or high-potential states such as Myanmar or Kenya score relatively low on the Human Development Index (125 and 130 respectively), it raises the suspicion that even moderately high levels of military expenditure (3.5 and 3.8 percent of GNP respectively) can have deleterious consequences.

These numerous determinants and consequences produce a large number of possible causal pathways through which regional wars and conflicts, institutional or political weaknesses, repressive rule, or inter-communal friction, can lead to excessive military spending or other deleterious consequences. Some

<sup>9</sup> For a strong analysis of broader conceptions of security that includes regional, internal and societal dimensions, see Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, second edition (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991).

<sup>10</sup> United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1994* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 22.