

AS A GLOBAL PROBLEM WAR INDUSTRY AND UNJUST ECONOMIC DISTRIBUTION

Dr. Mustafa KÖYLÜ*

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bilim ve teknolojik alanındaki gelişmeler insanoğluna büyük avantajlar sağlamıştır. Ancak bu gelişmelerden tüm dünya ülkeleri eşit bir şekilde istifade edememiştir. Daha çok gelişmiş ülkeler lehine olan bu bilimsel ve teknolojik gelişmeler kendini iki alanda bariz bir şekilde ortaya koymuştur. Bunlar savaş sanayi ve ekonomik güçtür. Dolayısıyla bu teknolojik gelişmelere sahip olan ülkeler, bir taraftan gittikçe daha çok zenginleşirken, diğer taraftan da dünyanın en güçlü silahlarına sahip olarak adeta dünyanın büyük bir kısmı için tehdit unsuru haline gelmiştir.

Bu bağlamda, bu makale küresel bir problem olarak görülebilecek olan iki önemli konuya değinmektedir. Birinci kısım, günümüzdeki savaş ve barış kavramlarını, yirminci yüzyıl savaş ve silahlarının özelliklerini, silahlanma ve savaşların hem gelişmiş hem de gelişmekte ya da geri kalmış olan ülkelerin sosyo-ekonomik yapılarına olan etkilerini ve örnek olarak iki çağdaş savaşı--İran-Irak ve Körfez Savaşları--içerirken; ikinci kısım da dünyadaki dengesiz ekonomik gelir dağılımını ve bu dağılımın sonuçlarını kapsamaktadır.

Savaşların insanoğlunun ayrılmaz bir parçası olduğu tarihi bir gerçektir. Ancak bugün hem savaş anı hem de barış olarak adlandırılan, ancak bir bakıma muhtemel bir savaşa hazırlık olan sulh anı, silahlanma, insan hayalinin alamayacağı korkunç boyutlara ulaşmıştır. Özellikle İkinci Dünya Savaşından sonra hem savaşların sayısı artmış, hem de bu savaşlarda ölen insanların sayısı artmıştır. Bugün dünya ülkeleri aktif savaş yapsınlar ya da yapmasınlar, gereğinden fazla askeri harcamalar sonucu ekonomik açıdan son derece olumsuz yönde etkilenmektedirler. Örneğin, 1987'de dünya askeri harcamaları bir trilyon Amerikan dolarını geçmiştir ki, bu yeryüzünde yaşayan toplam 2.6 milyar insanı oluşturu-

* The Faculty of Divinity, Ondokuz Mayıs University

ran 44 fakir ülkenin toplam bir yıllık milli gelirine eşitti. Diğer bir hesaplama ile, dünya ülkeleri her bir dakika sadece savunma için 1.900.000 dolar para harcamaktadır.

İşin daha garip tarafı bu aşırı silahlanmaya yapılan harcamaları hemen hemen her türlü temel insan ihtiyaçlarını karşılamış olan gelişmiş ülkeler değil, daha temel insan ihtiyaçlarını karşılamaktan uzak diğer ülkeler de yapmaktadır. Oysa bu durum tamamen geri kalmış ya da gelişmekte olan ülkelerin aleyhinedir. Çünkü onlar savunmaya yönelik ne kadar para harcarsa harcasınlar, hiçbir zaman gelişmiş ülkelerin silah sanayilerine erişmeleri mümkün olmayacaktır. Kendi aralarında da bir üstünlük sağlayamayacaklardır. Özellikle bu durum İslâm ülkeleri için çok daha açıktır. İran-İrak savaşıyla Körfez savaşında yaşanan durumlar dışa bağımlılığın acı neticelerini çok açık bir şekilde ortaya koymuştur.

Dünya insanlığını tehdit eden ikinci bir husus da adil olmayan ekonomik dağılımdır. Daha 200 sene önce, sanayi devriminden önce, ortalama olarak tüm dünya ülkelerinde kişi başına düşen milli gelir 200 dolar civarındayken, bugün bu gelir dağılımındaki dengesizlik korkunç boyutlara ulaşmıştır. Elbette bu milli gelirdeki adaletsiz dağılım sadece milletleri zengin ya da fakir olarak ikiye ayırmamış, etkilerini sosyal ve ekonomik hayatın her alanında da göstermiştir. Dolayısıyla zengin ülkeler ya da fakir ülkelerdeki zengin tabakalar gittikçe daha çok zengin olup, tüm dünya nimetlerinden daha çok faydalanırken, fakir ülkelerle onların halkları da gittikçe daha çok fakirleşip daha kötü durumlara maruz kalmaktadırlar.

Sonuç olarak şunu söyleyebiliriz ki, bazılarının savunduğu gibi dünya huzurunu bozan, ya da sosyal ve ekonomik gelişmeyi olumsuz yönde etkileyen temel neden hızlı nüfus artışı değil, aksine mevcut dünya kaynaklarının ve insan gücünün büyük oranda savaş sanayine kanalize edilmesi ve dengesiz ekonomik dağılımdır. Dolayısıyla gelecek dünya mutluluğu da bu iki global problemin çözümüne bağlıdır.

Introduction

Developments in science and technology have brought many advances to human beings, however, at the same time, have caused them many serious problems. The conflicting results of the technological and scientific developments in the last two centuries are most apparent in two major fields: the armament industry and economic distribution. Thus, while those nations which excel in technological developments both become richer and richer and possess the most powerful and destructive

weapons, those who cannot adopt themselves to these developments become poorer and poorer. Worse, it seems likely that this disparity between rich and poor nations will not narrow but rather continue to widen to the detriment of the majority of the earth's population.

In this context, the main purpose of this article is to seek what is going on in the world in general in terms of two important topics: war and peace and socio-economic justice. Thus, this article consists of two major sections: The first includes a brief treatment of war and humanity, the economic cost of militarization, the relationship between military expenditures and both employment and social welfare of countries, some features of new weapons, and two contemporary wars (the Iran-Iraq and Gulf War) which indicate the result of new weapons. The second part discusses socio-economic justice around the world including unjust economic distribution of resources both between and within nations, and consequences for the poor living in the developed and underdeveloped countries.

War and Humanity

War, which has been the most well-organized and destructive form of violence in which human beings have engaged, has been an inseparable character of humankind through its history. Both the *Bible* and the *Qur'an* record its continuance.¹

Why have human beings fought throughout history? What are the reasons for such wars? Why have the number of wars and conflicts increased in the twentieth century? Will this situation continue forever?

A first answer derived from a historical study of relationships between the west and the east, or between Christians and Muslims, might be that religion is a main reason for war. However, reducing the causes of war to only one explanation is not correct. As Quincy Wright points out, there are many reasons for war. He writes:

To different people war may have very different meanings. To some it is a plague which ought to be eliminated; to some, a mistake which should be avoided; to others a crime which ought to be punished; and, to still others, it is an anachronism which no longer serves any purpose. On the other hand, there are some who take a more receptive attitude toward war and regard it as an advantage which may be interesting, an instrument which may be useful, a proce-

¹ The Bible: Exodus, 24; Numbers, 3; Deuteronomy, 2, 7, 30; Joshua, 6, 8; Matthew, 10:34. The Qur'an: 22:40; 2:216.

...dure which may be legitimate and appropriate, or a condition of existence for which one must be prepared.²

As it is seen, there is no single reason for war, but rather many--political, social, psychological and economic. John Huddleston lists among the causes of twentieth century wars the following: the nature of human beings, nationalism, racism, extremes of wealth and poverty, religious fanaticism and strife, male domination of public affairs, and competitive arms races.³ Whatever the reason, it is a fact that wars have continued both between and among nations.

However, as Betty A. Reardon points out, "physical or direct violence, particularly military violence, in the twentieth century, appears to be more varied and certainly more destructive than it has ever been."⁴ It can be asked why the twentieth century's wars are so destructive, dangerous, and inhumane. The following facts may give an answer to this question.

Scholars estimate that from 1480 to 1940 there were 244 important wars with which the nations of the world participated with 2,659 important battles fought only by European nations alone.⁵ It must be noted here that contrary to common belief, most of these wars were between nations which followed religions other than Islam.⁶

² Quincy Wright, *A Study of War 2nd* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 3.

³ John Huddleston, *Achieving Peace by the Year 2000: A Twelve Point Proposal* (Oxford, England, Chatham, N.Y.: Oneworld, 1992), 10-45. See also Betty A. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), 16; Henry A. Atkinson, "Religion as a Cause of War," in *The Causes of War*, ed. Arthur Porritt (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1969), 118.

⁴ Betty A. Reardon, *Militarization, Security and Peace Education* (Valley Forge, Pa.: United Ministries in Education, 1982), 39.

⁵ Wright, *War*, 626, table 22; see also David P. Barash, *Introduction to Peace Studies* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1991), 33.

⁶ R. C. Johnson says: "With the single exception of Islam the other great world religions are all irreconcilably opposed to war and the things war involves." In "The Influence of Religious Teaching as a Factor in Maintaining Peace," in *Paths to Peace: A Study of War Its Causes and Prevention*, ed. Victor H. Wallace (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 347. Whereas according to Quincy Wright's research, the important participants of these wars between 1480 to 1940, were: Great Britain, 74; France, 63; Spain, 59; Russia, 57; Austria, 51; Turkey, 43; Poland, 28; Sweden, 25; Italy, 25; Netherlands, 22; Germany, 22; Denmark, 20; the United States, 12; China, 9; and Japan, 9, see Wright, *War*, 641-647; tables 31-41.

Since World War II there have been 149 wars.⁷ According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of major wars (those that kill at least 1,000 persons) rose to 34 in 1993, after having dropped from 36 in 1987 to 30 in 1991.⁸

As a result of these wars, just since the sixteenth century, some 142 million people have died. Of that number 108 million, or 75 percent, have died in wars during the twentieth century.⁹ Overall, according to William Eckhardt's estimation, 73 percent of all war-related deaths since 3000 B.C. have occurred in the twentieth century¹⁰. In addition to this direct killing, some 40 million people died as a result of war-related famine or illness. One analysis asserts that "more than twice as many people have been killed in wars in this supposed postwar period than in the entire nineteenth century, and seven times as many as in the eighteenth century."¹¹

Another important feature of twentieth century wars is that the larger number of conflicts and killings have occurred in the developing countries. From 1945 through 1992 over 92 percent of all conflicts were in the developing countries.¹² By contrast the more industrialized and democratically governed states have constituted a vast zone of relative peace for their more than three quarters of a billion people.¹³

The Economic Cost of Militarization

It is a fact that, especially since World War II, both the developed countries which solved most of their basic human needs, and the developing even underdeveloped countries that are far from meeting their peoples'

⁷ Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1993* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1993), 20.

⁸ Michael Renner, "Budgeting for Disarmament," in *State of the World 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London, W. W. Norton, 1995), 151.

⁹ David Krieger and Frank K. Kelly, "Introduction," in *Waging Peace II: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank K. Kelly (Chicago: Noble Press, 1992), xv.

¹⁰ William Eckhardt, "War-Related Deaths Since 3000 BC," *Peace Research* 23, no 1 (February 1991), 83.

¹¹ Hal Kane, "Wars Reach a Plateau," in *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995), 95, 110.

¹² Sivard, *Expenditures 1993*, 20.

¹³ Bruce Russett, "Politics and Alternative Security: Toward a More Democratic, Therefore More Peaceful World," in *Alternative Security Living Without Nuclear Deterrence*, ed. Burns H. Weston, (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1990), 108.

basic needs, compete fiercely for superiority in destructive power. Although there has been a slight reduction recently in worldwide military expenditures, they still make up an important proportion of the Gross National Product (GNP) of most countries. In 1987 world military expenditures totaled more than US \$1 trillion equaling the total income of the 2.6 billion people of forty-four of the poorest nations in the world.¹⁴ As of 1993, the developed countries spent as much on military power in a year as the total income of the poorest 2 billion people on earth.¹⁵ Overall, since World War II, global military spending has added up to a cumulative \$30-35 trillion.¹⁶ Today, globally, between 5 and 6 percent of the world's total annual product is spent on military affairs.¹⁷ This means that the world spends \$1,900,000 each minute for the purpose of defense.¹⁸

Who spends excessively for military defense? The irony is that not only the developed countries who can better afford military expenditures but also developing, and even underdeveloped countries, with great foreign debts and unmet basic human needs, spend significant amounts of their GNPs for military defense.¹⁹ During the seventies and eighties, three quarters of the global arms flow went to the developing countries.

However, the Middle East countries became the world's largest arms market as they waged war against each other since the half of this century. According to Shimon Peres, since Israel's recognition in 1948, Arab countries have fought six wars with Israel and another six among themselves.²⁰ Between 1977 and 1987, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates the cumulative military spending of all the countries of the Middle East to be approximately \$615 billions. As a share of the GNP, military expenditures in the region averaged 17 percent between 1978 and 1985, and represented nearly 40 percent of all

¹⁴ Barash, *Introduction*, 265. All the costs which follow are calculated in U.S. dollars.

¹⁵ Sivard, *Expenditures 1993*, 5.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 152.

¹⁷ Huddleston, *Peace*, 27; Sivard, *Expenditures 1993*, 43-50.

¹⁸ Annabel Rodda, *Women and the Environment*, Women and World Development Series (London and N.J.: Zed Books, 1991), 38.

¹⁹ For the effects of excessive militarization on these countries' social welfare see George Kim, "The Arms Race and Its Consequences for Developing Countries," in *A Peace Reader: Essential Readings on War, Justice, Non-Violence and World Order*, ed. Joseph Fahey and Richard Armstrong (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 148 ff.

²⁰ Shimon Peres and Arye Naor, *The New Middle East* (New York: Henry Holt, 1993), 87.

arms imports in the world.²¹ While there was a worldwide economic recession and Third World debt crisis during the 1980s, "Iran and Iraq accounted for more than half of the arms purchased by Third World nations in the mid-1980s, with total purchases in excess of \$100 billion over the course of decade."²² When we add the nations of United Arab Emirates and Kuwait, this figure rises to \$150 billion.²³ A report to the U.S. Congress indicated that U.S. arms sales to the Middle East from 1978 to 1988 represented two-thirds of total foreign sales.²⁴ Figures show that investments in military equipment in that region consumed between 21 and 26 percent of all government expenditures.²⁵

Therefore, the U.S. diplomats see the Middle East countries in general, and Saudi Arabia in particular, as a "great milk cow." In the words of William Quandt, a former Middle East specialist on the National Security Council, "It takes King Fahd about 10 seconds to write a check. It takes Congress weeks to debate the smallest issue of this sort."²⁶

Developing nations, despite severe food shortages, use five times as much foreign exchange to import arms as for agricultural machines. In developing countries, while there is one soldier for every 250 persons, there is one doctor for every 3,700.²⁷

Escalating debts are one result of this excessive military spending. By 1985 the external debt of the Third World countries was about \$750 billion--330 percent higher than in 1975.²⁸ By 1993 the debt of the world's developing countries rose to \$1.77 trillion,²⁹ and to \$1.9 trillion in 1994.³⁰ It is estimated that on average about 40 percent of developing

²¹ Ishac Diwan and Nick Papandreou, "The Peace Process and Economic Reforms in the Middle East," in *The Economics of Middle East*, ed. Stanley Fischer and others (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), 19-20.

²² William D. Hartung, *And Weapons for All* (New York: Harper Collins, 1994), 205.

²³ *Ibid.*, 203.

²⁴ Charles A. Kimball, *Religion Politics and Oil: The Volatile Mix in the Middle East* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), 82.

²⁵ *Ibid.* See also Peres and Naor, *Middle East*, 89.

²⁶ Hartung, *Weapons*, 213.

²⁷ Ernie Regehr, *Militarism and the Word Order: A Study Guide for Churches* (Geneva: Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, 1980), 4.

²⁸ Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1986* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1986), 20.

²⁹ Kane, "Wars," 74.

³⁰ Gary Gardner, "Third World Debt Still Growing," in *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and Lon-

countries' debts result from the importation of arms.³¹ While these Third World countries continue to militarize themselves, they are not likely to repay their debts anytime soon. Usually, they make occasional payments of interest rather than paying off the principal. Hal Kane points out that "developing countries pay \$180 billion every year in debt service. Taken as a whole, the Third World owes an amount equal to about half of its yearly income."³²

Although Third World countries, including Muslim countries, spend billions of dollars on militarization, when we compare them with the developed nations, they are (and will be) always at a disadvantage in terms of their economies, their societies, and military powers. Why? Hilan Rizkallah suggests three reasons: 1) These countries are obliged to spend money on imports to build their arms and defense system. These expenditures use part of the country's meager hard currency resources and waste the beneficial effects that these resources would normally have exercised on industrial and economic growth within those countries. The result is a growing external debt and overall economic decline. 2) The essential needs of the "poor" countries go generally unsatisfied. Therefore, any military expense constitutes a heavy burden to support and a kind of useless luxury. 3) Much more so than in advanced countries, the effect of militarization can be particularly dangerous because militarization favors the installation of a political-military authority structure, the effects of which are precarious for development in general.³³

Besides these negative effects of excessive spending for military purpose on the economy and society of the Third World countries, other factors keep these countries at a perpetual military disadvantage. We can list them as follows:

First, they lack the resources for military development, research and manufacturing of the developed. The money that the U.S. spends for the purpose of militarization every year--an average of \$300 billion--exceeds the total collective GNP of most of the developing countries. Even if the Third World countries buy the newest and latest weapons, they are quickly obsolete. This was the case for Iraq during the Gulf War. Although the U.S. had sold Iraq billions of dollars worth of planes, tanks and missiles of various sorts during the Iran-Iraq conflict, Iraqi soldiers

don: W. W. Norton, 1995), 72.

³¹ Rizkallah Hilan, "The Effects on Economic Development in Syria of a Just and Long-Lasting Peace," in *The Economics of Middle East*, ed. Stanley Fischer and others (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), 59.

³² Kane, "Wars," 74.

³³ Hilan, "Economic Development," 58-59.

and forces could not respond well against America and allied bombings in the Gulf War. While the United States was selling weapons to Iraq, she was spending trillions of dollars on more sophisticated military machines. Since Iraq had the old military machines, and the U.S. had the new ones against which the old ones wouldn't be very effective, Iraq lost, and America won the war.³⁴

Second, military organizations around the world do not sell all parts of the weapons such as airplanes, "so that some proportion of the nominal order of battle must always be unavailable."³⁵ For example, one Western military expert asserted that only ten percent of the Iranian Air Force's F-14s were battle ready when the war with Iraq started.³⁶

Third, in an arms race there is no end. New purchases of arms systems by one group of countries automatically will elicit similar moves in neighboring countries. As George Kim observes, "This is a kind of chain reaction resulting in permanent expansion, an uninterrupted replenishment of military arsenals, a kind of race in the quantitative and qualitative accumulation of arms."³⁷

Fourth, since the manufacture of modern weapons and arms needs an outlet, the war industry requires field testing for new weapons, warplanes, and other sophisticated devices. Therefore, as Naji Abi-Hashem asserted "the heavy production of weapons and the substantial economic value they can generate may at times cause powerful governments to manipulate tender spots around the globe or to feed regional conflicts in order to market their products."³⁸

The following two examples substantiate the attitudes of the developed nations toward developing nations in terms of arms sales before, during, and after a war.

The first example is related to the Iran-Iraq War. During the 1979-81 Iranian hostage crisis, the U.S. imposed a total economic and

³⁴ Linus Pauling, "Reflections on the Persian Gulf War," in *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank Kelly (Chicago: Noble Press, 1992), 31.

³⁵ Thomas H. Etzold, *Defense or Delusion? American Military in the 1980s* (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), 17.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

³⁷ Kim, "Arms Race," 148.

³⁸ Naji Abi-Hashem, "The Impact of the Gulf War on the Churches in the Middle East: A Socio-cultural and Spiritual Analysis," *Pastoral Psychology* 41 (Spring 1992), 14.

military blockade on Iran. President Carter invoked the Emergency International Economic Powers Act for the first time since its inception. Under the provisions of this law, any U.S. citizen or corporation doing business with Iran was subject to felony prosecution of up to ten years of imprisonment and a \$50,000 fine. However, Iran was totally dependent on U.S. weapons and spare parts. The former Shah had spent some \$20 billion on U.S. weaponry between 1973 and 1978. On one of their trips, Charles Kimball and a small group met with President Bani Sadr of Iran. In the course of their conversations, Kimball asked Bani Sadr about the impact of the U.S. embargo on Iran's military. Bani Sadr smiled and said:

We can get anything we need. In spite of the embargo, we are currently doing business with over one hundred American companies. We can get any piece of military hardware we require. We must go through third parties and pay excessively high prices. But, *if the money is there, plenty of sellers can be found.*³⁹

The second example is related to the Gulf War. While on the one hand President Bush counseled restraint in weapon sales to the Middle East in May 1991, on the other hand the United States alone sold \$8.5 billion in arms to that region during the year after the Gulf War excluding sales to Israel and Egypt, representing two-thirds of all arms sales in the region.⁴⁰

Fifth, while sellers of weapons such as the U.S. see the Middle East countries as the "great milk cow," they are not happy about selling their products. For example, a U.S. diplomat says: "But, in order to keep the *great milk cow* happy, the flow of advanced U.S. arms to the Saudis has to continue virtually uninterrupted, regardless of how these arms may ultimately be used by the Saudi Sheikdom or a successor regime."⁴¹

Consequently, it can be said that the Third World countries in general, and Muslim countries in particular, must know that the true aim of the developed nations is not to keep peace in the globe, but to sell their weapons and gain benefit even at the cost of millions of peoples' lives. During Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the attitude of the President George Bush of the U. S. showed this fact when he argued for U.S. involvement saying: "Our jobs, our way of life, our own freedom and the freedom of friendly countries around the world would suffer if control of the world's

³⁹ Kimball, *Religion Politics*, 85-86. Italics mine.

⁴⁰ Ramsey Clark, *The Fire This Time: U.S. War Crime in the Gulf* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1992), 218.

⁴¹ Hartung, *Weapons*, 213.

great oil reserves fell into the hands of Saddam Hussein.⁴²

The Effects of Militarization on Development, Employment and Social Welfare

I have already spoken about some disadvantages of militarization from the point of developing countries that are importing their weapons from the developed countries. What about the developed countries? What effect does excessive militarization have on both developed and developing countries in terms of employment and unemployment, and the social welfare of their people? Although the answers to these questions differ somewhat from country to country, the fact is that excessive militarization in both developed and developing or underdeveloped countries is not an economic advantage, but rather an economic burden on the people.

Let's look first at the relationship between employment and militarization. Contrary to common belief continuation of the arms race creates unemployment, since disarmament and reallocation of money into the civilian sector would create more jobs and reduce unemployment.⁴³ Many economists see arms spending as subtracting from a nation's total resources. The first economist, Adam Smith, presented this position in his famous book, *The Wealth of Nations*:

[T]he whole army and navy, are unproductive laborers. They are the servants of the public, and are maintained by a part of the annual produce of the industry of other people. Their service, how honorable, how useful, or how necessary soever, produces nothing for which an equal quantity of services can afterwards be produced.⁴⁴

It is a fact that military expenditures employ some people; there can be no doubt about that. However, this does not mean that military spending creates more jobs than equivalent money spent for the domestic economy. Spending for defense not only produces nothing that consumers can buy, but also is a very poor way of creating jobs. According to one account given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in America "every \$1 billion spent on military creates on average 75,000 jobs. The same \$1 billion spent on mass transit creates on average 92,000 jobs; construction,

⁴² Kimball, *Religion Politics*, 71.

⁴³ Birgit B. Utne, *Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1985), 11.

⁴⁴ Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (New York: Modern Library, 1937), 315.

100,000; health care, 139,000; education 187,000.”⁴⁵

Military expenditure not only creates few jobs compared with alternative civilian expenditure, but also uses the most highly skilled, scarce, and best educated people. For example, in 1989 in the U.S. “21 percent of all engineers, 24 percent of all electrical engineers, 32 percent of all mathematicians, and 34 percent of all physicists went to the military industries.”⁴⁶ Meanwhile globally, 25 million soldiers were serving in the armed forces of different nations, more than 500,000 scientists and engineers were engaged in research and development for military purposes, and another 5 million workers were involved in weapons production.⁴⁷

While both developed and underdeveloped countries spend billions of dollars for defense, and hire the most skilled and educated persons for the military sector, most of the poorer nations have not met the basic needs of their people for food, health and literacy. According to the World Development Report of 1994, one billion people in the developing countries still lacked to clean water and nearly two billion people lacked adequate sanitation.⁴⁸ As a result of the lack of clean water, adequate sanitation and ample nutrition, in 1993 infectious diseases which are preventable accounted for an estimated one-third of all deaths in the world—16.4 million out of 51 million. More than 99 percent of deaths from infectious diseases occurred in developing countries, most of which spend much more money for militarization than for health.⁴⁹ In addition in 1993 seven million adults died of conditions that could have been inexpensively prevented or cured.⁵⁰

Illiteracy is also a serious problem in the developing countries. According to Ruth Leger Sivard “one-quarter of the adults in the world

⁴⁵ Michael J. Sheehan, *Arms Control: Theory and Practice* (Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 68.

⁴⁶ Lourdes Beneria and Rebecca Blank, “Women and the Economics of Military Spending,” in *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*, ed. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989), 195.

⁴⁷ Peter S. Henriot, “Disarmament and Development: The Lasting Challenge to Peace,” in *Peace in a Nuclear Age: The Bishops’ Letter in Perspective*, ed. Charles J. Reid, Jr. (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986), 231.

⁴⁸ *World Development Report 1994* (Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1994), 1.

⁴⁹ Anne E. Platt, “Infectious Diseases Return,” in *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), 130-31.

⁵⁰ *World Development Report 1993* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 1.

cannot read and write, and most of them are in the low-income countries. Over half of the adults in South Asia and in Africa are illiterate, and almost half of those in the Middle East as well.⁵¹

As a result we can say that the ancient Roman's maxim *Si vis pacem, para bellum* (if you want peace, prepare for war), does not work in our times. Contrary to this famous dictum, as Renner points out, "the accumulation of unprecedented military power has brought not eternal peace but massive destruction during war and high economic and environment costs in preparing for it."⁵²

The Features of New Weapons and Wars in the Twentieth Century

When we compare modern conflicts and wars with earlier ones, we see that they have declined in average duration but have enormously increased in frequency, intensity, magnitude, and severity.⁵³ One judgment is that modern weapons and wars are "more ruthless, more immoral and more inhumane than ever conceived in past history."⁵⁴ Why is this so? The following comparison summarize the judgments of scholars on this question:

Non-combatant fatalities: In the past, there was always the possibility that wars could be fought between the armed forces of the nations without including civilian men, women and children. But today this is not possible. While just at the beginning of the twentieth century approximately one-half of all war-related deaths were civilians, by the 1980s the percentage of civilians killed in warfare rose to 75 percent; in the active wars in the 1990s the percentage of civilian war-related deaths has exceeded 90 percent.⁵⁵ UNICEF claims that during the last decade, 2 million children have died in civil wars--wars in which more children than soldiers were killed.⁵⁶

Environmental destruction: While in the past environmental damages from wars were limited, such destruction has reached a new magnitude in our

⁵¹ Sivard, *Expenditures 1993*, 31.

⁵² Michael Renner, "Preparing for Peace," in *State of the World 1993: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1993), 139.

⁵³ John Kiang, *One World: The Approaches to Permanent Peace on Earth and the General Happiness of Mankind* (Notre Dame, Ind.: One World, 1984), 353.

⁵⁴ M. L. Oliphant, "The Threat to Civilization from Atomic Warfare," in *Paths to Peace: A Study of War Its Causes and Prevention*, ed. Victor H. Wallace (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 220.

⁵⁵ Krieger and Kelly, "Introduction," xv.

⁵⁶ Kane, "Wars," 110.

time. Robert McAfee Brown points out that "today's weapons and wars not only kill people and destroy cities, but also destroy forest, vegetation, arable land, and may upset the ecological balance for generations to come."⁵⁷

No winners: While in the past, when the weapons were bows and arrows or even guns and bombs, there were ways in which one side could be considered the winner and the other side the loser. However, now there would be no winners if nuclear weapons were used.⁵⁸ That's why General Douglas MacArthur said, regarding a possible nuclear war: "If you lose, you are annihilated, if you win, you stand only to lose. [Nuclear] war contains the germs of double suicide."⁵⁹

The above-mentioned differences are just a few in terms of comparing the past with the present warfare. However, the most significant difference between past and present wars is the nuclear weapons and nuclear wars which emerged in the twentieth century.

Now we must speak of the nuclear weapons which threaten all of the world's nations whether they have them or not, and their possible effects when they are used. It is a fact that nuclear weapons are the most dangerous of weapons, the most destructive, and have the longest effective power. It is well known that human beings first experienced nuclear weapons in 1945 in Japan's two cities: Hiroshima and Nagasaki. With very small atomic bombs, compared with those later developed, 200,000 people of Hiroshima were killed; 62,000 out of the city's 90,000 buildings were completely destroyed, and 6,000 other buildings were damaged beyond repair.⁶⁰ The explosive power of the bomb on Hiroshima was just about 12.5 kilotons.⁶¹ Today most of the modern nuclear weapons are 3 to 50 times as powerful as the bombs of 1945.⁶² The number is beyond of human imagination. At its peak in 1982, the global stockpile had almost 25,000 strategic warheads and more than 30,000 tactical ones (those that

⁵⁷ Robert McAfee Brown, *Making Peace in the Global Village* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 48-49.

⁵⁸ The Harvard Nuclear Study Group, *Living With Nuclear Weapons* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983), 32.

⁵⁹ Williard J. Jacobson, "The Last Day of Civilization," in *Education for Peace and Disarmament: Toward a Living World*, ed. Douglass Sloan (New York: Teachers College Press, 1983), 245.

⁶⁰ Kiang, *One World*, 359-60, n. 19.

⁶¹ Dietrich Fischer, *Preventing War in the Nuclear Age* (London and Canberra: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984), 12.

⁶² Harvard Nuclear Study Group, *Nuclear Weapons*, 4.

travel 3,000 miles or less),⁶³ with over 50,000 megatons.⁶⁴ This was the equivalent of 16 thousand million tons of TNT (or three tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth) or enough to erase the human race several times over.⁶⁵

Although the strategic arms reduction treaties (START I and II) reduced the number of nuclear warheads by 6 percent in 1993 (from 52,875 to 49,910), by 3 percent in 1994 (from 49,910 to 45,100), and by 9 percent in 1995 (from 45,100 to 40,640), there remains still the equivalent of 9,700,000,000 tons of TNT destructive power.⁶⁶ Even if the two START treaties were fully implemented by 2003, the United States and Russia together would remain with 6,500 warheads containing enough firepower to annihilate all life on earth. Therefore, Michael J. Sheehan points out that "the essential objective of arms is to make the world safe for nuclear deterrence. It assumes that 'nuclear weapons cannot be eliminated and that the world must therefore learn to live with them.'"⁶⁷

Why are nuclear weapons so destructive and dangerous? What are their effects on people, environment, and generations to come? What would happen if nuclear weapons were used in another war? Although nobody knows exactly what would happen if these weapons were used,⁶⁸ the consequences can be predicted: A report by the office of Technology Assessment (1979) concluded that "the most important thing we know about the nuclear war is that we don't know enough to make any confident

⁶³ Michael Renner, "Military Expenditures Falling," in *Vital Signs 1992: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1992), 86.

⁶⁴ Kiang, *One World*, 380.

⁶⁵ Freda Rajotte, "Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation," *Religious Education* 85, no. 1 (Winter 1990), 8; see also different estimations in Fischer, *Preventing War*, 12; Sivard, *Expenditures 1993*, 10; and Michael Renner, "Cleaning Up After the Arms Race," in *State of the World 1994: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1994), 138.

⁶⁶ Michael Renner, "Nuclear Arsenals Decline Again," in *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995), 106; Michael Renner, "Nuclear Arsenals Continue to Decline," in *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), 100-101.

⁶⁷ Sheehan, *Arms Control*, 10.

⁶⁸ Francis X. Winters, "The Nuclear Arms Race: Machine Versus Man," in *Ethics and Nuclear Strategy?* ed. Harold P. Ford and Francis X. Winters (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1977), 146.

judgments. Complex systems can be extremely vulnerable.”⁶⁹ However, there are some accounts concerning what it would be like if they were used. We can mention some of them as follows:

1. *Massive loss of life*: According to the World Health Organization, in a major nuclear war, 2.2 billion persons could be killed outright.⁷⁰ Existing nuclear weapons are enough to kill 58 billion people, or every person living in the world 12 times.⁷¹ As Kiang points out: “no nation could expect to survive unscathed and thereby inherit the earth.”⁷²

2. *Ozone depletion*: Ozone is a chemical form of oxygen that exists in the upper atmosphere. It absorbs much of the sun’s ultraviolet light. Since nuclear explosions produce large amounts of nitrogen oxides, they could deplete the ozone layer by perhaps 50 percent within about six months, depending on the size and number of detonations. Such a substantial ozone depletion would lead to a significant increase in skin cancer and blindness, the latter being especially severe among animals. Pollinating insects, such as bees, which use vision to locate flowers, might well be unable to function, the result would be severe and widespread ecological destruction, and possible collapse.⁷³

3. *Nuclear winter*: A nuclear war would produce not only an immense amount of dust but also enormous fires, which in turn would generate huge quantities of smoke and soot. Rising into the upper atmosphere this material would absorb incoming heat and light from the sun, thereby making the earth cold and dark.⁷⁴ Temperatures would drop so dramatically that virtually all crops and farm animals would be destroyed, as would most of the uncultivated and undomesticated food supplies. Most survivors of heat, blast, and radiation would starve.⁷⁵

4. *Nuclear contamination*: According to the scientists, radiation can contaminate air, soil, groundwater and vegetation, with dire conse-

⁶⁹ Fischer, *Preventing War*, 12.

⁷⁰ Leon Vickman, “Why Nuclear Weapons Are Illegal?” in *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank K. Kelly (Chicago: Noble Press, 1992), 89.

⁷¹ Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1985* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1985), 5.

⁷² Kiang, *One World*, 372.

⁷³ Barash, *Introduction*, 112.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 112-13.

⁷⁵ Larry Agran, “A Peace Conversion Program,” in *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank K. Kelly (Chicago: Noble Press), 63-64.

quences for nearby populations and wildlife. Lethal effects would persist for up to 240,000 years, some fifty times the span of all recorded human history.⁷⁶ Since radioactive particles can be carried for long distance by clouds, winds and waterways, they can be exported to other regions and there enter the food chain. They cause cancers, genital defects, immune deficiencies from reduced monocyte levels in white blood cells, and consequently increased incidence of diseases.⁷⁷

As a result it can be said that human beings are now confronted with a dilemma: (in the words of George Kim) "Either to find ways to ease international tensions through the joint efforts of nations or to let the world slide down at an increasing speed toward the abyss of a nuclear conflict. A third alternative simply does not exist."⁷⁸

Two Contemporary Wars: The Iran-Iraq and the Gulf War

So far I have talked about the global economic cost of militarization, its effects on economy, development, and social welfare, and the features of the new weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, and wars. However, I have not talked about a real war and its consequences. In order to understand better the consequences of war, I would like to give two examples of war--the Iran-Iraq War and the Gulf War. Both occurred in the last decade and directly concerned not only the countries in which the wars were fought, but all Islamic nations. I will not attempt to judge here who was right or wrong, but rather to indicate their economic costs and social consequences.

The Iran-Iraq War

Since World War II, one of the most dramatic and costly wars was the Iran-Iraq war. The number of killings reached one million people and the wounded perhaps twice as many. In addition the war turned more than five million Iranians and Iraqis into refugees in their own countries and imposed severe economic dislocation and environmental damage.⁷⁹

During the War, in order to keep its military staying power, Iraq

⁷⁶ Agran, "Peace," 63-64.

⁷⁷ Rodda, *Women*, 37.

⁷⁸ Kim, "Arms Race," 153-54.

⁷⁹ Michael Renner, "Iran-Iraq War Produces Only Losers," *World Watch* (November-December, 1988), 9; Geoff Simons, *Iraq: From Sumer to Saddam* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1994), 283; Samir al-Khalil, *Republic of Fear: The Inside Story of Saddam's Iraq* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990), 259.

spent far more money on imported weapons than it received from oil sales. According to Michael Renner some 40 percent of its GNP went to military expenditures.⁸⁰ The ultimate cost of that war is staggering. Abbas Alnasravi, professor of economics at the University of Vermont, estimated that the total cost came to \$416 billion in the years from 1980 to 1985⁸¹ --an amount which surpasses the two countries' combined earnings of \$364 billion from oil sales since they first started exporting "black gold" in 1919 and 1931, respectively.⁸²

Some economists estimated the damage to oil fields, refineries, pipelines and export terminals at \$28 billion for Iran and \$8 billion for Iraq. Both countries may well have lost an additional \$100 billion in potential oil reserves because of the damage.

Besides human tragedy and monetary values, half of the population in both nations remains illiterate and over one-third lacks access to safe drinking water. In Iran the infant mortality rate remained 42 percent higher than the world average while life expectancy in both countries runs several years below the world average of 62 years.⁸³

The Persian Gulf War

Despite the ravaging effects of its war with Iran, Iraq was making considerable economic progress before the Gulf crisis. In 1991 Adeb Abd and Gaurielle Gemma, traveled widely in Iraq and reported on pre-Gulf War conditions:

Although it varied in different parts of the country, again and again people described to us the following: the entire country was electrified ... Since 1982, eighteen major hospitals had been built. Some were renewed in the Middle East. Medical care was basically free with a token payment of half a dinar upon admission and one dinar each day regardless of care. Illiteracy had been substantially reduced; education was universal and free through college. Water was supplied to all parts of the country. Prenatal and post-natal care and vaccinations for children were available throughout the country, including rural areas. The social position of women was advancing. Food was abundant and inexpensive... Low interest loans were provided by the gov-

⁸⁰ Renner, "Iran-Iraq War," 9.

⁸¹ Renner, "Iran-Iraq War," 44.

⁸² Renner, "Budgeting," 153.

⁸³ Renner, "Iran-Iraq War," 9, 45.

ernment, which had also started a program to give land to people who promised to produce within five years. Doctors had not seen cases of malnutrition in Baghdad for over a decade.⁸⁴

What followed this time of growth, prosperity and development was a war that brought misery, distress, and poverty. Concerning the war's devastation Gemma and Abed reported:

In every city we visited, we documented severe damage to homes, electrical plants, fuel storage facilities, civilian factories, hospitals, churches, civilian airports, vehicles, transportation facilities, food storage and food testing laboratories, grain silos, animal vaccination centers, schools, communication towers, civilian government office buildings, and stores. Almost all facilities we saw had been bombed two or three times, ensuring that they could not be repaired. Most of the bridges we saw were bombed from both sides.⁸⁵

In fact, not only the infrastructure of the city and life support systems were bombed several times, but also thousands of Iraqis were buried alive during the Gulf War. Pentagon spokesman Pete Wilson did not dispute published estimates of 8,000 Iraqi's buried alive; rather, agreeing that a horrible situation existed he stated, "There is no nice way to kill people."⁸⁶

While 300,000 Iraqi soldiers, most of them "essentially defenseless soldiers, soldiers withdrawing without weapons, and soldiers seeking surrender," were killed by the use of technologically superior weapons, just 150 American soldiers were killed.⁸⁷ In fact, not only were soldiers killed, but also, according to an estimation of the Red Crescent, 112,000 civilians were killed, 60 percent of whom were children.⁸⁸ Even worse the deaths of both soldiers and civilian people did not end with the War, but have continued especially among the children. As a result of economic crises child mortality tripled through 1991 and in some areas quadrupled. The Harvard International Study Group which visited Iraq in August and September 1991 concluded that 1 million Iraqi children were malnourished, with 120, 000 suffering severe and acute malnutrition. Hyperinfla-

⁸⁴ Adeb Abd and Gavrielle Gemma, "Impact of the War on Iraqi's Society," Report on Commission Trip to Iraq from April 3, 1991 to April 14, 1991; quoted in Clark, *Fire*, 60.

⁸⁵ Abd and Gemma, "Impact of the War," quoted in Clark, *Fire*, 64.

⁸⁶ Kimball, *Religion Politics*, 22-23.

⁸⁷ Clark, *Fire*, 178; Pauling, "Reflections," 32, 37.

⁸⁸ Eckhardt, "Deaths and Destruction," 35.

tion in food prices rose as high as 2,000 percent.⁸⁹ In early 1992 it was widely reported that 5,000-6,000 civilians were dying every month as a direct result of the bombing compounded by shortages of food, medicine, and medical services caused by the sanctions.⁹⁰

Iraq, of course, not only lost her people but also had a big economic cost. According to the Arab Monetary Fund, compared with America's cost of \$5 billion,⁹¹ the cost to the states of the Persian Gulf region was \$676 billion, not including the devastation to the Kuwaiti and Iraqi environments and lost economic growth in these and other Persian Gulf states.⁹² In addition to this immediate cost, economy experts estimate that the cost of rebuilding Iraq back to pre-war levels would be at least \$300 billion.⁹³

Besides economic consequences of the war, according to Naji Abi-Hashem, the Gulf War strongly fed the anti-West and anti-Christian movement in the region. He asserts that "one of the most significant outcomes of the Gulf War is the rise of strong waves of anti-western feelings and fundamentalist movements throughout the Arabic world and Moslem nations."⁹⁴ To him the western military confrontation brought to the mind of most Muslims the vivid memories of crusaders and European armadas. Therefore, while for the western mind the efforts, effects, and worriers in the Gulf War ended with "Operation Desert Storm," from a Muslim perspective the agony, ordeals, and uncertainties have just begun. Abi-Hashem cites the dismay of Christian workers in the Middle East about the consequences of the War. One predicted that "this could hurt Christian-Muslim relationships for 100 years." Another feared that "the Christian ministry would be so limited, and is in some places reduced, as to be virtually nonexistent."⁹⁵

In addition to the social, cultural and economic consequences of war, there are significant psychological and emotional consequences. Research studies show that some of the victims exposed to the stress of war will never completely recover, experiences of violence and severe stress, personal and communal losses and tragedies, and being subject to con-

⁸⁹ Clark, *Fire*, 80.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 177-78.

⁹¹ James F. Dunnigan and Raymond M. Macedonia, *Getting It Right: American Military Reform After Vietnam to the Gulf and Beyond* (New York: William Morrow, 1993), 247.

⁹² Youssef M. Ibrahim, "War is Said to Cost the Persian Gulf \$676 Billion in 1990 and '91," *New York Times*, April 25, 1993; Peres and Naor, *Middle East*, 89-90.

⁹³ Hartung, *Weapons*, 205.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 17.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 19.

stant threats and fear of death, can have long-lasting and damaging effects on young, middle aged, and older people.⁹⁶

People in the developed or underdeveloped countries have been affected adversely not just only from these wars, conflicts, and arms races, but also from unjust economic distribution. Now, we can pass on to this second problem threatening the poor in the world today.

Socio-economic Justice Around the World

History by its very nature includes periods both of relative stability, and those characterized by instability, change, and crisis. However, as Mexican social scientist Velaquez has said: "Today's crisis is different from any previous history because it is global, progressive and could possibly be terminal."⁹⁷ Our world has never seen such economic oppression, unjust economic distribution, and poverty as we have today. The following estimations show how the gap between the rich and the poor is widening. Fernand Braudel has given the following figures:

In 1700, on the basis of the 1960 exchange rate of the dollar, the gross national product per inhabitant ranged from 150 to 190 in England and from 250 to 290 in the British colonies in America (the future U.S.A.). In 1750, it was 170 to 200 in France, 160 to 210 in India (140-180 by 1900!), and 228 in China (but 170 by 1950!). Globally speaking by about 1800, the GNP per person in Western Europe was about \$213; in North America, \$266; in what is known as the Third World, about \$200. In 1976, however, on the basis of the same 1960 exchange rate, the Western European GNP had reached \$2.325, but the Third World's only \$355.⁹⁸

In short, less than two centuries ago "before the Industrial Revolution, the life standard was almost the same everywhere in the world, approximately \$200 a year on the basis of the 1960 exchange rate, with a slight advantage in favor of the ancient Asiatic civilizations".⁹⁹ So while two centuries ago the average per capita income of the richest countries was perhaps just a few times greater than that of the poorest, today's

⁹⁶ Abi-Hashem, "Impact of the Gulf War," 10; John Kelsay, *Islam and War: A Study in Comparative Ethics* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 11.

⁹⁷ Jerry Folk, *Doing Theology Doing Justice* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 7.

⁹⁸ Fernand Braudel, *Capitalism and Material Life, 1400-1800*, trans. Miriam Kochan (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), 92.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 93.

average, for some rich countries, is almost one hundred times more than that of its counterparts in Bangladesh, for example.

In fact there has been a great economic growth in the worldwide. According to Lester R. Brown the world economy has expanded from \$4 trillion in output in 1950 to more than \$20 trillion in 1995. In just ten years from 1985 to 1995 it grew by \$4 trillion, which is more than from the beginning of civilization until 1950. Again, since 1900 the value of goods and services produced each year worldwide has grown twenty fold, the use of energy thirty fold, the products of industry fifty fold, and the average distance traveled perhaps a thousandfold.¹⁰⁰

However, the benefits of this rapid global growth have not been evenly distributed. Living conditions for roughly 20 percent of the world population have remained at subsistence level, essentially unchanged. As a result of this unevenly distribution of wealth and income, "The ratio between income in the richest one fifth of countries and the poorest one fifth has widened from 30 to 1 in 1960 to 61 to 1 in 1991."¹⁰¹ Because of this unevenly economic distribution, over one billion people, one in five of the world's population, still live in absolute poverty.¹⁰² In other words, while the third world nations contain 76 percent of the world's population, they earn only 27 percent of the world's income.¹⁰³ Worse, this economic gap is not only between the rich and the poor countries, but also within countries. According to Alan T. Durning between 60 and 70 percent of the people in most countries earn less than their nations' average income. Almost nowhere does the poorest fifth of households earn above 10 percent of national income, while the richest fifth mostly receive more than half.¹⁰⁴

Unevenly economic distribution within countries is found in both developed and developing nations. For example, with 6 percent of the world's population, U.S. consumes as much as 40 percent of the world's resources, including 33 percent of the world's oil and 63 percent of its natural gas.¹⁰⁵ The *average* American spends as many resources as it

¹⁰⁰ Alan T. Durning, "Income Distribution Worsening" in *Vital Signs 1992: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1992), 110.

¹⁰¹ Lester Brown, "The Acceleration of History," in *State of the World 1996: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), 3-4.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁰³ Folk, *Doing Theology*, 31.

¹⁰⁴ Durning, "Income Distribution," 110-11.

¹⁰⁵ A. Frazer Evans, Robert A. Evans and William B. Kennedy, *Pedagogies for the*

would take to sustain ninety Indians in one year.¹⁰⁶ But that does not mean that every American is rich, or that wealth and income is equally distributed. While the top 1 percent of the people own about 23 percent of all wealth, and the richest ½ percent own fully 18 percent of the national wealth, the lowest twenty percent of U.S. families get only 4.6 percent of the total income.¹⁰⁷ If homes and other real estate are excluded, the concentration of ownership of “financial wealth” is even more glaring. More than 35 million Americans, about one in every seven people in the U.S., are poor by the government’s official definition, and tens of millions are without adequate medical care.¹⁰⁸

However, the most acute result of poverty and malnutrition globally is seen among the infants and young children of the underdeveloped countries. Sivard notes that between 1700 and 1987 there have been 471 wars in which 101,550,000 people were killed,¹⁰⁹ whereas just between 1977 and 1987, at least 136,000,000 children have died from preventable poverty conditions--more children dying in ten years than all killed in all wars in 287 years.¹¹⁰ As a whole, 70 percent of deaths recorded each year in the Third World countries are due to hunger or to problems arising from hunger.¹¹¹ In addition to child mortality death, each year 250,000 children, including 150,000 in Bangladesh alone, become permanently blind due to the lack of vitamin A.¹¹² For the number of people who die every two days of hunger and starvation is equivalent to the number who were killed instantly by the Hiroshima bomb.¹¹³ Thus, as Reardon points out, “indeed, the children

Non-Poor (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1987), 260-61; Folk, *Doing Theology*, 33.

¹⁰⁶ Folk, *Doing Theology*, 33.

¹⁰⁷ Paul A. Samuelson and William D. Nordhaus, *Economics*, 13 th ed, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book, 1989), 644-51.

¹⁰⁸ National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1986), 83; Agran, “Peace Conversion” 65.

¹⁰⁹ Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1987-88* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1988), 28.

¹¹⁰ James P. Grant, *The State of the World’s Children 1987* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 109.

¹¹¹ Folk, *Doing Theology*, 32.

¹¹² John Ronsvalle and Sylvia Ronsvalle, *The Poor Have Faces: Loving Your Neighbor in the 21st Century* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1992), 36; Barash, *Introduction*, 542.

¹¹³ The Hunger Project, *Ending Hunger: An Idea Whose Time Has Come* (New York: Praeger, 1985), 7.

of the world are already living in the rubble of World War III."¹¹⁴

Although the remaining people in the Third World countries do not die because of hunger or starvation, their social welfare is very low when compared with that in developed countries. For example, in 1990 as a whole the world health spending was about \$1,700 billion or 8 percent of total world product. However, while developed nations spent almost 90 percent of this amount, for an average of \$1,500 per person, developing nations spent about \$170 billion, or 4 percent of their GNP, for an average of \$41 per person. U.S. alone consumed 41 percent of the global total.¹¹⁵ Again, while in 1985 the Third World countries spent an average of \$150 on the education of each school-age child, the industrialized countries spent an average of \$2,250.¹¹⁶ As a result of this big gap in spending for education, the literacy rates are 37 percent in the least-developed countries, 63 percent in the less developed countries, and 97 percent in the developed countries.¹¹⁷

Another big injustice, I think, is not between developed and underdeveloped nations, but rather between men and women. A recent United Nations' survey reported that women in the world represent 50 percent of the world's adult population, one-third of the official labor force, and do two-thirds of the world's work hours. However, they receive just a tenth of the world's income, and own less than a hundredth of the world's property.¹¹⁸

Faced with the big gap between the rich and poor nations concerning poverty, starvation, death due to hunger, poor health, and illiteracy, we ask: Why do so many people, especially children, die? Why cannot the poor receive at least a rudimentary level of education and health care? Overpopulation is a common answer given. Others respond that the real reason is not overpopulation or the lack of food, but rather the misuse or abuse of resources both by developed and developing nations. Since I have already talked about how much money is spent for the purpose of defense, I do not want to repeat it again, but I want to mention some observations regarding the adequacy of food in the world, when used appropriately.

First of all, according to God's creative design, there is room and

¹¹⁴ Reardon, *Women*, 96-97.

¹¹⁵ *World Development Report 1993*, 4.

¹¹⁶ David, *Introduction*, 528.

¹¹⁷ Folk, *Doing Theology*, 33.

¹¹⁸ Barbara Omolade, "We Speak for the Planet," in *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*, ed. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989), 177; Huddleston, *Peace*, 22-23.

food for all living creatures in the world.¹¹⁹ This is explicitly mentioned in the Qur'an.¹²⁰ Second, some research also supports this fact. For example, specialists estimate that current world food production is enough to provide every human being in the world with 3,600 calories a day.¹²¹ The World Bank has also agreed that world grain production alone could provide 3,000 calories and 65 grams of protein for every person per day, more than the highest estimates of minimum nutritional requirements. Therefore experts estimate that if only two percent of the world's grain output were redirected toward those who need it, hunger would essentially be eliminated.¹²²

Since the production of most things consumed by the world's population has been increasing at a rate higher than the 1.9 percent per year increase of population, there is no problem with the growing population in the world. At this point, Nathan Keyfitz writes as follows:

Even allowing for the 1.9 percent increase in population, we seem to be getting better off individually at about 3 percent per year. Projecting on this basis, real goods per head would double every 23 years; each generation would be twice as well off as the preceding one. To dispose of twice as much wealth as one's parents, four times as much as one's grandparents, surely cannot be regarded as unsatisfactory; the world, such figures seem to show, is moving toward affluence.¹²³

Several researchers have shown that even in a number of major famines, such as the great Bengal famine of 1943, the Bangladesh famine of 1974 and the Ethiopian famines of 1972-4, there was no significant fall in the supply of food grains. In the words of Keith Griffin, "Acute hunger was caused not by a sharp drop in production but by a rapid change in the distribution of income."¹²⁴ Even today, the world wealth is enough for

¹¹⁹ Caroline Thomas, *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations* (Boulder: Colo.: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987), 92.

¹²⁰ Q: 11:6: "There is no moving creature on earth but its substance dependeth on Allah: He knoweth its resting place and its temporary deposit: all is in a clear Record." See also 6:151; 7:54; 13:16-17; 21: 30-33; 66: 2-3.

¹²¹ Frances M. Lappe and Joseph Collins, *World Hunger: Twelve Myths* (New York: Grove Press, 1986), 9; Barash, *Introduction*, 542; Sivard, *Expenditures 1985*, 27-28.

¹²² Barash, *Introduction*, 542-43; Kiang, *One World*, 451-53.

¹²³ Nathan Keyfitz, "World Resources and the World Middle Class," in *Toward a Just World Order* Vol. 1, ed. Richard Falk and others (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1982), 300.

¹²⁴ Keith Griffin, *World Hunger and the World Economy* (New York: Holmes and

everyone to meet their basic needs. The world average of GNP in 1995 per person was not less than \$675, but was \$3,629.¹²⁵

As a conclusion it can be said that the problem of poverty, starvation, health, and illiteracy prevailing widely in the world today are not due to the lack of resources, but rather due to the misuse and abuse of resources and unjust wealth distribution. For example, one of America's best-known educators, Theodore Hesburg, president emeritus of Notre Dame University, observed that by the year 2000 one third of the U.S. minority population will be unemployable because of lack of education. Then he said: "Give me the two billion dollar budget for one Trident submarine and I can turn around the education of minorities in this century."¹²⁶

Globally speaking, as Renner points out that "If governments pursued the building of a peace system with the same seriousness as they built military muscle, in all likelihood many violent conflicts could be avoided and the problem of health, education, housing, poverty, and environmental sustainability could be solved."¹²⁷ He maintains: "A comparatively small investment--perhaps \$20-30 billion per year--could make a tremendous difference in the global war and peace balance."¹²⁸ However, although some reduction in the number of nuclear weapons worldwide has taken place, as well as peacekeeping negotiations between and among nations, expenditures for the United Nations' peacekeeping operations reached just an estimated \$3.36 billion in 1995 which was "equivalent to less than half of 1 percent of global military spending."¹²⁹

Conclusions

Overall we can say that today both war and conflicts are more expensive, more destructive, more ruthless, and more immoral than in the past. Wars and conflicts between and within nations destroy countries' economies, environment, and the social welfare of people. But peace (the

Meier, 1987), 9.

¹²⁵ See Lester R. Brown, "World Economy Expanding Steadily," in *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), 74-75.

¹²⁶ Quoted in Mairead C. Magurie, "A Nonviolent Political Agenda for a More Humane World," in *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank Kelly (Chicago: Noble Press, 1992), 55.

¹²⁷ Renner, "Budgeting," 153.

¹²⁸ Michael Renner, "Peacekeeping Expenditures Level Off," in *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), 101-103.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 102-103.

absent of armed conflict) has not brought relief. Excessive military expenditures continue to destroy economies of nations and deprive millions of people of basic human needs in both developed and underdeveloped nations. While developed nations may still consider such expenditures to be advantages, underdeveloped countries and their people are placed economically at an absolute disadvantage due to excessive militarization.

Today many people in both developed and underdeveloped countries suffer not only from the cost of excessive militarization with its related wars and conflicts, but also from unjust economic systems. As a result of economic injustices in the world, very few people live with a humane standard of life, while the majority are far from meeting their basic human needs.

Excessive militarization and unjust economic systems affect many other nations including Muslim countries and their peoples. For instance, the Iran-Iraq and the Gulf wars are the most striking example of this. They not only caused the deaths of millions of Muslims and left another million widows and orphans, but also devastated their countries' past, present, and future economies, thereby affecting the welfare of both present and future generations.

I believe that the prosperity and welfare of the nations depend on true peace and socio-economic justice. Then every county, every nation, and every person should strive for the peace and try to share the goods of the world with others. They should remember that the food is enough for every creature in the world as long as it is used appropriately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agran, Larry. "A Peace Conversion Program." In *Waging Peace Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank Kelly, 59-69. Chicago: Noble Press, 1992.
- Atkinson, Henry A. "Religion as a Cause of War." In *The Causes of War*, ed. Arthur Porritt, 114-18. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.
- Barash, David P. *Introduction to Peace Studies*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1991.
- Beneria, Lourdes and Rebecca Blank. "Women and the Economics of Military Spending." In *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*, ed. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King, 191-203. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.
- Braudel, Fernand. *Capitalism and Material Life, 1400-1800*. Translated

- by Miriam Kochan. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Brown, Lester R. "The Acceleration of History." In *State of the World 1996: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke, 110-11. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- _____. "World Economy Expanding Steadily." In *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 74-75. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1996.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. *Making Peace in the Global Village*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Clark, Ramsey. *The Fire This Time: U.S. War Crime in the Gulf*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1992.
- Diwan, Ishac, and Nick Papandreou. "The Peace Process and Economic Reforms in the Middle East." In *The Economics of Middle East*, ed. Stanley Fischer and others, 227-55. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993.
- Dunnigan, James F., and Raymond M. Macedonia. *Getting It Right: American Military Reform After Vietnam to the Gulf and Beyond*. New York: William Morrow, 1993.
- Durning, Alan Thein. "Income Distribution Worsening." In *Vital Signs 1992: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 110-11. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1992.
- Eckhardt, William. "Deaths and Destruction in the Gulf War." *Peace Research* 23, no. 2-3 (May 1991): 33-36.
- _____. "War-Related Deaths Since 3000 BC." *Peace Research* 23, no. 1 (February 1991): 80-86.
- Etzold, Thomas H. *Defense or Delusion? American Military in the 1980s*. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.
- Evans, A. Frazer, Robert A. Evans and William B. Kennedy. *Pedagogies for The Non-Poor*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1987.
- Fischer, Dietrich. *Preventing War in the Nuclear Age*. London and Canberra: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984.
- Folk, Jerry. *Doing Theology Doing Justice*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Gardner, Gary. "Third World Debt Still Growing." In *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 72-73. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995.
- Grant, James P. *The State of the World's Children 1987*. New York: Ox-

- ford University Press, 1987.
- Griffin, Keith. *World Hunger and the World Economy*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1987.
- Hartung, William D. *And Weapons for All*. New York: Harper Collins, 1994.
- The Harvard Nuclear Study Group. *Living With Nuclear Weapons*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Abi-Hashem, Naji. "The Impact of the Gulf War on the Churches in the Middle East: A Socio-cultural and Spiritual Analysis." *Pastoral Psychology* 41 (Spring 1992):3-21.
- Henriot, Peter S. "Disarmament and Development: The Lasting Challenge to Peace." In *Peace in a Nuclear Age: The Bishops' Pastoral Letter in Perspective*, ed. Charles J. Reid, Jr, 227-37. Washington: D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986.
- Hilan, Rizkallah. "The Effects on Economic Development in Syria of a Just and Long-Lasting Peace." In *The Economics of Middle East*, ed. Stanley Fischer and others, 55-79. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993.
- Huddleston, John. *Achieving Peace by the Year 2000: A Twelve Point Proposal*. Oxford, England; Chatham, N.Y.: Oneworld, 1992.
- The Hunger Project. *Ending Hunger: An Idea Whose Time Has Come*. New York: Praeger, 1985.
- Ibrahim, Youssef M. "War is Said to Cost the Persian Gulf \$676 Billion in 1990 and '91," *New York Times*, April 25, 1993.
- Jacobson, Williard J. "The Last Day of Civilization." In *Education for Peace and Disarmament: Toward a Living World*, ed. Douglas Sloan, 240-54. New York: Teachers College Press, 1983.
- Johnson, R.C "The Influence of Religious Teaching as a Factor in Maintaining Peace." In *Paths to Peace: A Study of War Its Causes and Prevention*, ed. Victor H. Wallace, 336-49. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970.
- Kane, Hal. "Wars Reach a Plateau." In *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 110-11. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995.
- Kelsay, John. *Islam and War: A Study in Comparative Ethics*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Keyfitz, Nathan. "World Resources and the World Middle Class." In *Toward a Just World Order*. Vol 1, ed. Richard Falk and others,

- 297-314. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1982.
- Al-Khalil, Samir. *Republic of Fear: The Inside Story of Saddam's Iraq*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1990.
- Kiang, John. *One World: The Approaches to Permanent Peace on Earth and the General Happiness of Mankind*. Notre Dame, Ind.: One World, 1984.
- Kim, George. "The Arms Race and Its Consequences for Developing Countries." In *A Peace Reader: Essential Readings on War, Justice, Non-Violence and World Order*, ed. Joseph Fahey and Richard Armstrong, 145-54. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Religion Politics and Oil: The Volatile Mix in the Middle East*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- Krieger, David, and Frank K. Kelly. "Introduction." In *Waging Peace II: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank K. Kelly, xv-xxii. Chicago: Noble Press, 1992.
- Lappe, Frances M., and Joseph Collins. *World Hunger: Twelve Myths*. New York: Grove Press, 1986.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1986.
- Oliphant, M.L. "The Threat to Civilization from Atomic Warfare." In *Paths to Peace: A Study of War Its Causes and Prevention*, ed. Victor H. Wallace, 217-34. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970.
- Omolade, Barbara. "We Speak for the Planet." In *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward A Feminist Peace Politics*, ed. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King, 171-89. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.
- Pauling, Linus. "Reflections on the Persian Gulf War." In *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank Kelly, 29-33. Chicago: Noble Press, 1992.
- Peres, Shimon, and Arye Naor. *The New Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt, 1993.
- Platt, Anne E. "Infectious Diseases Return." In *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 130-31. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Rajotte, Freda. "Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation." *Religious Education* 85, no.1 (Winter 1990): 5-14.
- Reardon, Betty A. *Militarization, Security, and Peace Education*. Valley

- Forge, Pa.: United Ministries in Education, 1982.
- _____. *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Regehr, Ernie. *Militarism and The World Order: A Study Guide for Churches*. Geneva: Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, 1980.
- Renner, Michael. "Iran-Iraq War Produces Only Losers." *World Watch* (November-December: 1988): 9, 44.
- _____. "Military Expenditures Falling." In *Vital Signs 1992: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 84-85. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1992.
- _____. "Preparing for Peace." In *State of the World 1993: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke, 139-57. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1993.
- _____. "Cleaning Up After the Arms Race." In *State of the World 1994: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke, 137-55. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1994.
- _____. "Arms Trade Continues Decline." In *Vital Signs 1994: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 110-11. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1994.
- _____. "Nuclear Arsenals Decline Again." In *Vital Signs 1995: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 106-107. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995.
- _____. "Budgeting for Disarmament." In *State of the World 1995: A World Watch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society*, ed. Linda Starke, 150-69. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1995.
- _____. "Nuclear Arsenal Continue Decline." In *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 100-101. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- _____. "Peacekeeping Expenditures Level Off." In *Vital Signs 1996: The Trends That Are Shaping Our Future*, ed. Linda Starke, 101-103. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Rodda, Annabel. *Women and the Environment*. Women and World Development Series. London and N.J.: Zed Books, 1991.
- Ronsvalle, John, and Sylvia Ronsvalle. *The Poor Have Faces: Loving*

- Your Neighbor in the 21st Century*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Russet, Bruce. "Politics and Alternative Security: Toward a More Democratic, Therefore More Peaceful World." In *Alternative Security Living Without Nuclear Deterrence*, ed. Burns H. Weston, 107-36. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1990.
- Samuelson, Paul A. and William D. Nordhaus. *Economics*. 13th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book, 1989.
- Sheehan, Michael. *Arms Control Theory and Practice*. Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Simons, Geoff. *Iraq: From Sumer to Saddam*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1994.
- Sivard, Ruth Leger. *World Military and Social Expenditures 1985*. Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1985.
- _____. *World Military and Social Expenditures 1986*. Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1986.
- _____. *World Military and Social Expenditures 1987-88*. Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1988.
- _____. *World Military and Social Expenditures 1993*. Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1993.
- Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: Modern Library, 1937.
- Thomas, Caroline. *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*. Boulder, Colo.: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987.
- Utne, Birgit Brock. *Educating For Peace: A Feminist Perspective*. The Athene Series. New York: Pergamon Press, 1985.
- Vickman, Leon. "Why Nuclear Weapons Are Illegal." In *Waging Peace: Vision and Hope for the 21st Century*, ed. David Krieger and Frank Kelly, 89-101. Chicago: Noble Press, 1992.
- Winters, Francis X. "The Nuclear Arms Race: Machine Versus Man." In *Ethics and Nuclear Strategy?* ed. Harold P. Ford and Francis X. Winters, 144-55. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1977.
- World Development Report 1993*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- World Development Report 1994*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Wright, Quincy. *A Study of War*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.