War and Militarism: A Leading Cause of Environmental and Climate Crises

Manabendra Nath Bera*

Introduction

The climate and environmental impacts of war and military operations are often neglected in global climate negotiations. The climate agreements either excluded military emissions from greenhouse gas reduction targets or treated military emissions as voluntary reporting. This has allowed the true environmental and climate costs of war to be downplayed. As a result, the climate impact of military activities is often underreported, even though the military-industrial complex plays a major role in global warming.

War causes extensive and long-lasting environmental damage, affecting landscapes, ecosystems, biodiversity, and vital resources. Modern warfare not only results in human casualties but also leaves a trail of environmental damage that can persist for decades or even centuries. Although the human toll of war is widely acknowledged, ecological destruction is often overlooked despite its profound, long-term effects on the planet's ability to sustain life.

In this era of modern civilization, democratic methods and political means must be explored and exhausted to settle disputes instead of military means, as war causes the destruction of life and property and irreparable environmental damage.

This article highlights how war, being the most profitable and lucrative business for imperialist nations, adversely impacts the environment and climate, such as deforestation, pollution, the destruction of ecosystems, greenhouse gas emissions, and climate change, all of which contribute to the long-term global crisis. The article also explores how war results in profound human costs, including the loss of lives, the displacement of communities, and the long-lasting psychological trauma experienced by victims. By drawing attention to these various facets, the article stresses the far-reaching consequences of war, far beyond the immediate battlefield, and calls for a deeper consideration of its true costs.

Imperialism and War

War is not just an act of violence, but a profitable business that has become increasingly apparent, especially in the context of imperialist nations. War has long been linked to economic interests—whether for sustaining global and regional markets for the industrial-military complex, plundering natural and human resources, geopolitical control, or strategic dominance. The sheer scale of the military budget, alongside the military interventions by the imperialist countries, paints a stark picture of how imperialist motives continue to cause war and conflict across the globe.

*Manabendra Nath Bera is an Assistant Professor at IISER Mohali, an international organizing committee member of the International Union of Scientists (IUS) Against Militarism and Destructive Use of Science and Technology, and an all-India Secretariat member of the Breakthrough Science Society.

The US military spending was $916 billion in 2023 [1]—the highest in the world. This figure is not only the largest military expenditure in the world, but it also exceeds that of the next largest spender, China, by more than three times. In fact, the US military spending is larger than that of the following 20 nations combined—including Russia, India, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom, and Germany. This massive spending has enabled the US to maintain a global military presence, with military agreements and bases spanning the globe. Since the end of World War II in 1945, the US has used this network to invade or intervene in more than 96 countries [2]. The US, in particular, has invoked several 'excuses' to intervene militarily around the world, many of which have little to do with the actual interests of the affected populations.

During the Cold War, the primary justification for US military intervention was the need to prevent the spread of communism. The ideological struggle with the communist East prompted the capitalist West to wage numerous proxy wars and military interventions, from Korea to Vietnam to Latin America. The US framed its interventions as part of a global battle for democracy and freedom, although the actual motivations often involved securing strategic resources, maintaining regional dominance, or protecting American economic interests.

The end of the Cold War, however, did not mark the end of US military interventions. In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, attacks, the US launched its "War on Terror", a sweeping campaign aimed at dismantling terrorist networks, particularly al-Qaeda, and later ISIS, which the US earlier supported and funded behind the curtain. Although this war has led to significant military spending and a global military presence, the rhetoric of fighting terrorism has also been used to justify invasions and occupations in countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Syria. The US military interventions in the Middle East and North Africa, often carried out in the name of combating terrorism, have led to widespread destruction, loss of life, and the destabilization of entire regions.

The excuse of 'fighting terrorism' has also been used to justify surveillance and the militarization of policing within the US, creating a broader climate of fear and militarism. The War on Terror, while supposedly aimed at protecting American citizens, has often exacerbated insecurity and contributed to global instability, helping the rise of new extremist groups and the prolongation of conflict in several regions.

Military Technology

Military technology plays a significant role in warfare. Each major technological revolution in warfare has led to a drastic increase in both the scale and lethality of conflicts, amplifying the environmental and human costs of war. Over time, these technological advances have made warfare more destructive, efficient in killing, and difficult to manage, with catastrophic consequences for civilians and the environment.

Gunpowder marked the first major revolution in warfare. The 15th century saw the widespread use of firearms and cannons, which replaced traditional weapons, leading to the creation of centralized armies and more efficient military campaigns. The expansion of gunpowder-based weaponry fueled colonial conquests and wars of colonial expansion, leading to the extraction of resources from colonies and the subjugation of indigenous populations.

By the mid-20th century, the development of nuclear weapons marked a terrifying new phase in the capacity for mass destruction. The bombing of Hiroshima

and Nagasaki in 1945 demonstrated the devastating potential of atomic bombs, and the subsequent arms race during the Cold War ensured that nuclear weapons became a cornerstone of military strategy for the US and the Soviet Union. Imperialism during this period was increasingly tied to the threat of nuclear warfare, with nations vying for control of the technology and influence over territories strategically important for maintaining nuclear deterrence.

In the 21st century, we have seen the rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and autonomous weapons. AI technologies have revolutionized modern warfare by enabling machines to perform tasks that human soldiers previously did. This includes the development of drones for targeted strikes, which can be controlled remotely, and advanced surveillance systems that allow for the monitoring of entire regions. AI can also be used in cyber warfare, enabling the disruption of critical infrastructure without firing a shot. Autonomous weapon systems—machines that can operate without human intervention—are already being deployed in some conflicts, potentially making warfare even more detached from human oversight and moral consideration.

These technological innovations have made war more efficient, but also more detached from traditional ethical frameworks. The idea of 'clean' or 'precise' wars, often touted by proponents of advanced technology, ignores the indiscriminate consequences for civilians and the environment. The use of drones, for example, while allowing for more targeted strikes, also leads to unintended civilian casualties and widespread psychological trauma. Autonomous weapons, meanwhile, raise serious ethical questions about accountability in the event of a massacre or violation of international law — like what we have been witnessing in Palestine.

Civilian Toll

As military technology advanced, the proportion of civilian deaths in conflicts has increased dramatically. The evolving nature of warfare, with increasing reliance on long-range artillery, aerial bombardment, and, more recently, drones and cyber warfare, has blurred the lines between combatants and non-combatants. These technological tools, while providing military forces with more efficient methods of striking targets, have also made it much easier to kill civilians, either intentionally or as 'collateral damage'. What was once an issue primarily in terms of ground battles and direct confrontations between armies is now a global concern, with technology allowing remote killing and warfare that can devastate populations thousands of miles away.

The twentieth century, in particular, saw technological innovations that drastically increased the scale and intensity of wars. History reveals a dramatic rise in the ratio of civilian to military casualties as military technologies have advanced [3]. For example, in World War I (1914-1918), the ratio was 1 civilian for every 20 military personnel, i.e., 1:20. This shifted to 1:1 in World War II (1939-1945), 5:1 in the Korean War (1950-1953), and has escalated to 20:1 in the Vietnam War (1961-1975). One of the most alarming statistics is the death toll in wars and conflicts of the twentieth century: 231 million people lost their lives due to conflicts in the 100 years spanning from 1900 to 1999 [4]. Of these deaths, a significant portion—estimated to be more than 80%—were civilians. The ratio of civilian casualties to military deaths underscores the increasingly indiscriminate nature of modern warfare, driven by technological advancements that have made it easier to inflict mass harm on non-combatants.

The "War on Terror"—which spanned Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Pakistan, Syria,

and beyond—has seen the rise of some of the most catastrophic consequences for civilian populations in recent history. At least 408,000 civilians have been killed directly as a result of US-led interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Syria, and Yemen alone [5]. However, this direct toll is just the beginning. Indirect deaths—those that result from the destruction of infrastructure, disease, famine, and displacement—often make up a far greater share of the toll. In total, estimated 3.6 to 3.8 million people have died indirectly from wars in these regions [5]. Combined, the death toll from the post-9/11 wars exceeds 4.5 to 4.7 million people, the number still rising as violence continues and areas remain in conflict [5].

The impact of war is particularly devastating on children, who bear the brunt of violence and disruption to their lives. More than 7.6 million children under the age of five in post-9/11 conflict zones suffer from acute malnutrition, a direct result of the lack of access to food, clean water, and medical care [5]. The destruction of hospitals, schools, and agricultural land, combined with the global disruption caused by ongoing wars, means that these children are left vulnerable to long-term health problems, developmental delays, and death.

The destruction and instability caused by war have led to the displacement of millions of people around the world. In 2023, there were 170 armed conflicts and nearly 120 million people worldwide were forced to flee due to various factors – mainly conflict, persecution, violence, human rights violations and events that disrupt public order [6]. Refugees and internally displaced populations are often not reported and are caught in a vicious cycle of violence and deprivation, struggling to find safety and security.

Climate Toll

The environmental impacts of military operations are significant, yet have been largely overlooked in global climate agreements. When the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in 1997, military emissions were specifically excluded from commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions [7]. Similarly, under the Paris Agreement of 2015, military emissions were treated as voluntary reporting, a move that allowed for continued underestimation of the true environmental toll of warfare [7]. As a result, the climate impact of global military operations is frequently under-reported and poorly understood, even though the military-industrial complex is a major contributor to global warming.

Greenhouse gas emissions

The world's militaries collectively account for an estimated 5.5% of all global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions [7], which is roughly equivalent to the emissions of an entire industrialized nation. If the global military were a country, it would rank as the fourth largest emitter of greenhouse gases, just between India and Russia [7]. Furthermore, if the United States military were considered as one country, it would have the 47th highest emissions worldwide [8]. Its total emissions would be greater than those of countries such as Denmark, Sweden, and Portugal. This enormous carbon footprint largely goes unnoticed because military operations and emissions are typically not included in national carbon emissions reporting or international agreements. This exclusion is a significant gap and is deliberately maintained in global climate governance to serve the interests of the industrial-military complex and imperialist powers.

Several key factors drive the military's

carbon footprint, the most significant being the consumption of fossil fuels. Militaries, particularly those of the United States and its allies, use vast amounts of oil, gas, and other forms of dirty energy, both in peacetime and wartime. The production, transport and deployment of weapons, aircraft, tanks, and other heavy machinery consume huge amounts of energy, releasing vast amounts of carbon dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere.

Wartime GHG Emissions

In the course of warfare, explosive weapons, such as bombs, missiles, and artillery shells are released into the environment, each detonation producing emissions. The US military alone has fired more than 337,000 bombs and missiles in the past two decades [9], each of which contributes to atmospheric pollution. Bombers and fighter jets that transport these weapons burn enormous amounts of fuel. For example, military jets can burn 4.28 gallons of gasoline per mile [10], and each explosion further contributes to greenhouse gas emissions.

Warfare also accelerates the environmental impact by directly targeting oil production, storage, or transportation infrastructure. Countries such as Colombia, Libya, Syria, and Iraq have seen their oil infrastructure targeted in military conflicts, leading to devastating environmental consequences. During the 1991 Gulf War, the oil fires set in Kuwait by the retreating Iraqi forces contributed to more than 2% of global fossil fuel CO_2 emissions in that year [11]. The pollution caused by these fires not only contributed to greenhouse gas emissions, but also accelerated the melting of Tibetan glaciers due to soot deposited on the ice, highlighting the far-reaching climate consequences of military conflicts.

The US-led War on Terror, which spanned multiple countries, including Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and Yemen, has released an estimated 1.2 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere [12]. This is roughly equivalent to the emissions produced by 257 million cars annually [12]. These emissions come not only from military operations, but also from logistical support for combat missions, the burning of fuel for planes, tanks, and artillery, and the destruction of infrastructure.

Israel's military activities, even without accounting for periods of active conflict, contribute approximately 7 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent annually [13]—a footprint comparable to the emissions of Cyprus. When military operations are factored in, these numbers increase dramatically. For example, the US military's extensive use of cargo flights to transport equipment has a significant carbon footprint. Two hundred cargo flights [14], burning 50 million litres of aviation fuel and delivering over 10,000 tonnes of military equipment to Israel alone resulted in 133,000 tonnes of CO_2 emissions [13]. This is more than the total emissions of Grenada for the entire year, highlighting the carbon-intensive nature of military logistics. In 2022, the US military alone generated about 48 million metric tons of CO_2 [13]—more than the total annual emissions of 150 individual countries, including nations such as Norway, Ireland, and Azerbaijan.

Peacetime GHG Emissions

The US military has 742 military bases in 82 countries and territories, with 171,736 active personnel deployed in 177 countries, in addition to the 1.2 million stationed in the United States [15]. Each of these bases consumes substantial amounts of energy, whether in the form of electricity, fuel for vehicles and aircraft, or fossil fuels used in operational activities.

In countries like Britain, where the military has 145 overseas sites in 42 countries [16], the emissions from these bases contribute to the overall environmental footprint of the military. Russia and India, respectively, have 21 and 3 military bases overseas. The UK's Ministry of Defense alone is one of the largest consumers of fossil fuels within the government, and similar patterns are seen in other militaries, including Russia, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and China.

Militaries consume fossil fuels at an astounding rate, even during peacetime. The US Department of Defense operates 566,000 buildings worldwide, with its network of military bases and facilities, and consumes 40% of its use of fossil fuel for routine operations [8]. This includes training exercises, vehicle operations, the operation of base facilities, and manufacturing activities. In addition, military vehicles, aircraft, and naval ships consume large amounts of fuel, further contributing to the emissions. Similarly, in Switzerland and the UK, defence ministries are some of the largest energy consumers within their respective governments.

The military's use of fossil fuels for wartime operations and for the day-to-day functioning of forces makes militaries one of the largest institutional contributors to global warming.

Environmental Toll

The environmental consequences of war are extensive and often irreversible, affecting natural landscapes, ecosystems, biodiversity, and resources critical to life. Modern warfare not only results in human casualties but also leaves behind a legacy of environmental degradation that can persist for decades, if not centuries.

Deforestation

Deforestation is a particularly significant consequence of war. The world's militaries occupy around 1% to 6% of all land [12]. On these lands, they respect little environmental regulation and experiment with chemicals that are banned internationally. Military operations often clear vast areas of forest to create strategic advantages, whether through the destruction of trees, the removal of vegetation to clear lines of sight, or by causing wildfires. This leads to the loss of valuable forests that play an essential role in maintaining ecological balance and mitigating climate change.

During the Vietnam War, the US military's use of defoliants such as Agent Orange to remove jungle cover led to the destruction of over 5 million acres of forest and 500,000 acres of farmland [17]. The loss of forest cover affected not only the local ecosystems but also the indigenous communities, who relied on these lands for food, shelter, and livelihood. The legacy of Agent Orange continues to affect the health of those exposed to it, and the land remains contaminated.

In Afghanistan, deforestation is a chronic issue, with the country losing nearly 95% of its forest cover [18] in recent decades due to logging, military activity, and environmental mismanagement. As forests disappear, the ecosystems that depend on them—including wildlife habitats and water cycles—suffer irreversible damage.

In Iraq, the environmental impact of the war has been devastating. The lush marshlands of southern Iraq, once some of the most ecologically rich areas of the Middle East, were reduced to only 10% of their historical size [18] due to dam construction, military action and draining of the waterways during the Gulf War in the 1990s. This destruction has had severe consequences for local biodiversity, and

many species of birds, fish, and plants are facing extinction.

Destruction of Ecosystem

One of the most direct environmental impacts of war is the destruction of biodiversity. Bombing campaigns, military occupations, and other forms of modern warfare can destroy ecosystems, resulting in the loss of vital natural habitats for countless species. Military activities often involve clearing large areas of land for the construction of bases, transportation routes, and defensive structures. In some cases, entire ecosystems are disrupted to deprive enemies of cover, forcing local populations to evacuate, and leaving vast tracts of land inhospitable for wildlife. The environmental toll of these actions extends far beyond the war zone, as these ecosystems are often irreplaceable and can take generations to regenerate if they recover at all.

Studies have shown that the number of large animals in an area can decrease by up to 90% during warfare [8], and even a single year of conflict can result in long-term loss of wildlife. For example, in the 1990s, deliberate draining and destruction of the Mesopotamian Marshes in Iraq led to the loss of 90% of this vital ecosystem [11], displacing the Marsh Arabs who relied on it for their way of life.

The phrase "an army marches on its stomach" highlights the critical need to feed military forces, often leading to the hunting of local wildlife, particularly larger mammals with slower reproduction rates. In the ongoing war in Sudan, poaching to supply meat for both soldiers and civilians has had devastating consequences for wildlife populations in the neighboring Garamba National Park in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The park, once home to a thriving elephant population, saw the number of elephants fall from 22,000 to just 5,000

[19]. In addition, the population of white rhinos was decimated, leaving only 15 individuals alive [19]. This tragic decline in animal numbers underscores how conflict can extend far beyond the battlefield, inflicting lasting harm on vulnerable wildlife and ecosystems.

Furthermore, military transport—such as ships, cargo planes, and trucks—often carries non-native plants and animals, which can invade new environments and threaten native species. During World War II, the introduction of rats to remote Laysan Island in the Pacific Ocean provides a striking example of how military conflict can lead to the near extinction of native species [19]. The rats, brought in by military forces, wreaked havoc on the fragile ecosystem of the island, where native birds had no natural predators. The Laysan finch and the Laysan rail, two species endemic to the island, were nearly wiped out by rats, which ate their eggs and young birds. The rats also contributed to the destruction of the island's vegetation, further endangering the already vulnerable species that depended on native plants for food and shelter. In addition to rats, other invasive species, such as the sandbur, an aggressive plant introduced during the war, also took root [19]. The sandbur spread quickly across the island, crowding out native bunchgrass that had been essential for the survival of local birds. As the sandbur proliferated, it altered the entire habitat of the island, making it increasingly difficult for native species to thrive.

Pollution and Contamination

The toxic aftermath of war extends beyond immediate damage to ecosystems, with pollution from the use of chemical weapons, explosives, and munitions that heavily contaminate soil, water, and air. Many weapons used in modern warfare

contain hazardous materials such as depleted uranium and heavy metals, both of which have devastating long-term effects on both human health and the environment.

For example, during the Gulf War of 1991, an estimated 320 tons of depleted uranium (DU) munitions were used [20]. The use of DU in weapons is highly controversial due to its toxicity and long-lasting environmental effects. When these munitions explode, they release toxic particles into the air and soil, which can contaminate vast areas and pose serious health risks to civilians. Soil contamination caused by DU can last for centuries, making affected areas dangerous for habitation and agriculture long after the conflict ends. The health effects of exposure to DU have been associated with an increased risk of cancer, birth defects, and other chronic diseases among those exposed.

The production, testing, transport, and use of advanced weapons have some of the most devastating environmental consequences of war. At the end of conflicts, weapons are often discarded in the ocean, leaving lasting ecological damage. For example, from World War I until the 1970s, outdated munitions and chemical weapons were regularly dumped into the sea by the United Kingdom [12]. A staggering 1 million tonnes of munitions now lie scattered on the ocean floor in a natural trench between Northern Ireland and Scotland [12], where they sometimes explode underwater. In addition, chemical weapons have been known to wash up on nearby beaches, posing a direct threat to human and marine life. The legacy of war is also evident in places such as the Solomon Islands, where unexploded bombs from World War II continue to kill and cause injuries to this day [12].

During the 2006 Israel-Lebanon conflict, the bombing of the Jiyeh power plant in Lebanon released an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 tons of oil into the Mediterranean Sea [21]. The resulting oil spill affected the Lebanese coast and extended to Syrian waters. This caused severe ecological damage, killing marine life, including seabirds and fish, and devastating local fishing industries. Oil spills from bombed power plants and storage facilities are a common environmental disaster in wartime, with long-lasting impacts on marine ecosystems.

War also contaminates bodies of water with chemicals used in weapons and explosives. In places like Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan, contamination from munitions, unexploded ordnance, and the breakdown of industrial facilities have led to contamination of groundwater and surface water sources. This not only affects local communities' access to clean drinking water, but also damages the aquatic ecosystems that depend on these water sources for survival.

The Climate and Environmental Costs of Rebuilding

The environmental and climate costs of war extend far beyond immediate destruction. After the devastation, the rebuilding process poses its own significant challenges, not only in terms of human life and infrastructure, but also through the environmental and climate toll it demands. The sheer scale of reconstruction in war-torn regions contributes substantially to greenhouse gas emissions and exacerbates the environmental damage that conflict has already caused.

The Emissions from Reconstruction

Rebuilding after war is a resource-intensive process that requires substantial amounts of raw materials such as cement, steel, wood, and sand. These materials, especially cement and concrete, are known to

have a high carbon footprint due to the energy-intensive nature of their production. In 2019, the global construction industry was responsible for 3,560 Mt CO_2 of emissions [11], making it a major contributor to climate change. This figure reflects both direct emissions from the construction process and indirect emissions linked to the production of the materials needed for construction.

Among the raw materials used in construction, cement production is notable for being particularly carbon intensive, accounting for approximately 8% of global greenhouse gas emissions [11]. The role of cement in construction is particularly problematic because its production involves the calcination of limestone, which releases a significant amount of carbon dioxide (CO_2). The energy consumption of cement manufacturing plants further amplifies the carbon footprint of the building industry, with older, less efficient facilities often found in conflict zones contributing even more to the emissions burden.

In areas like Syria, where most of the housing is partially or completely destroyed, the rebuilding effort will be costly and environmentally damaging. For example, estimates suggest that the reconstruction of Syria's housing could release around 22 Mt CO_2 [11]. This environmental cost is compounded by material scarcity and challenges in the import and transport of materials to conflict zones.

Gaza — A Harrowing Example

One of the most recent and devastating examples of the environmental toll of war is the situation in Gaza. In just one year of continuous conflict, the landscape of Gaza has been altered to the point of becoming almost unrecognizable. Almost 60% of the region has been damaged or destroyed, and certain areas have suffered far worse devastation: 69.3% of North Gaza, 73.9% of Gaza City, 49.1% of Deir el-Balah, 54.5% of Khan Younis and 46.3% of Rafah have been partially or completely destroyed [22]. The extent of damage is staggering, with entire neighborhoods, infrastructure, and historically significant buildings leveled.

An estimated 75,000 tonnes of explosives [22] have been dropped in Gaza, devastating its urban landscape and creating an overwhelming amount of debris. According to experts, it could take years to remove 42 million tons of debris [22], much of which are contaminated with unexploded bombs and hazardous materials, adding a further layer of risk for reconstruction workers and civilians attempting to return to their homes.

Rebuilding Gaza is projected to be a monumental and costly task, experts estimate that it could cost more than $80 billion [23]. The economic toll on the region is already immense, but the climate and environmental costs of reconstruction could be even more significant. Given that Gaza remains under blockade, the logistical challenges of importing construction materials, machinery, and resources will make the process even more difficult and environmentally destructive. If the blockade persists, it is estimated that the rebuilding process could take as long as 350 years [24]!

Without the blockade, it is still projected that it could take 40 years to completely rebuild Gaza [25]. However, even in the best-case scenario, the environmental cost of this extensive rebuilding process would continue to rise. The production of construction materials, the transport of goods and the reconstruction of infrastructure will require large amounts of energy, much of which will come from fossil fuels, especially in regions where the renewable energy infrastructure is severely damaged.

End militarism: the only way forward

There is a prevailing narrative that war is a necessary means to defend a nation's sovereignty, combat terrorism, or preserve democracy. This argument is often promoted by powerful imperialist nations, their media, and other influential entities in an attempt to justify military interventions throughout the world. However, history repeatedly shows that war, in its various forms, has never truly resolved any sociopolitical disputes—whether on a regional or global scale. The problems that lead to war are rarely solved by the destruction and devastation that accompany it; instead, they are perpetuated or worsened.

However, this narrative serves a deeper and more troubling agenda: the interests of the military-industrial complex in imperialist nations. These powerful entities benefit enormously from the profits generated by the war machine. They have a vested interest in manufacturing conflicts, selling weapons, and securing control over valuable natural and human resources. These powers intentionally fabricate sociopolitical circumstances that create fertile ground for extremism, terrorism, and unrest. In many cases, they directly or indirectly support the rise of these threats, seeing them as tools that can be manipulated to further their own agendas.

Once these destabilizing forces have been nurtured, imperialist powers justify military intervention under the guise of 'saving democracy' or 'fighting terrorism'. They initiate wars in distant lands, positioning themselves as protectors of freedom and peace. However, the true objective is rarely about democracy or security; rather, it is about expanding their geopolitical influence, securing access to resources, and profiting from the sale of weapons. The consequences of these wars are often catastrophic, not just in terms of human lives lost and communities torn apart, but also in their long-term environmental and climatic repercussions. Forests are razed, ecosystems are destroyed, and the carbon footprint of military operations further accelerates global warming, pushing humanity closer to the brink of extinction.

In light of this, individuals with good intentions—those who genuinely care about the welfare of humanity—must begin to recognize and understand the imperialist motivations behind the perpetual wars. The wars are manufactured and engineered for profit and control. People must unite, raise awareness, and unite in movements that challenge and resist the forces driving wars.

The global community must demand accountability for greenhouse gas emissions and environmental degradation caused by war and the industrial-military complex. As nations craft global climate policies, it is critical to recognize the substantial environmental cost of militarization. The military's role in contributing to climate change through emissions, resource depletion, and ecological damage must be explicitly addressed. To combat the climate crisis effectively, policies must include measures to mitigate the military's environmental impact and integrate this issue into broader global climate action.

Moreover, scientists, engineers, physicians, and experts who contribute to the development of war technologies—whether directly through the creation of weapons or indirectly through technological advancements that support military operations—must reflect on the ethical implications of their work. They must ask themselves whether their intellectual labor and innovations should be used to advance the cause of death and destruction or whether they should be directed toward the betterment of humanity, fostering peace, prosperity, and

sustainability. The choice is yours, and it is a choice that could either perpetuate the cycle of destruction or help break it for future generations and save humanity before it is too late. □

References:

1. Lorenzo Macchi, Countries with the highest military spending worldwide in 2023, Statista, 30 May 2025.

2. Global victims of US military aggression, IBON Foundation, 6 July 2024.

3. Jurisic Dragisa, The challenges of military operations in urban areas, Vojno Delo 74. 75-94 (2024). 10.5937/vojdelo2202075J.

4. Deaths in Wars and Conflicts in the 20th Century, Center for International. & Security Studies at Maryland, 20 June 2006.

5. Civilians Killed & Displaced, Watson Institute of International and Public Affairs, June 2025.

6. Global Trends report 2023, UNHCR (2023).

7. Doug Weir, The climate costs of war and militaries can no longer be ignored, The Guardian, 9 Jan 2024.

8. How War Impacts Climate Change and the Environment, Fight Climate Change, 13 October 2022.

9. Medea Benjamin and Nicolas J.S. Davies, The U.S. drops an average of 46 bombs a day: Why should the world see us as a force for peace? Salon, 11 January 2022.

10. The Defense Department is worried about climate change — and also a huge carbon emitter, The Conversation, 12 June 2019.

11. How does war contribute to climate change? Conflict and Environment Observatory, 14 June 2021.

12. Joe McCarthy, How War Impacts Climate Change and the Environment, The Global Citizen, 7 April 2022.

13. Emissions from Israel's war in Gaza have 'immense' effect on climate catastrophe, The Guardian, 9 January 2024.

14. 244 US cargo planes, 20 ships deliver over 10,000 tons of military equipment to Israel — report, The Times of Israel, 25 December 2023.

15. US overseas military footprint, IBON, 7 May 2023.

16. Sammy Barker, Britain's military infrastructure — for the new cold war, Socialist Action, 8 December 2020.

17. Kimberly Amadeo, Vietnam War Facts, Costs, and Timeline, The Balance, 20 September 2024.

18. Why we need to protect biodiversity from harmful effects of war and armed conflict, UN Environmental Program, 6 November 2018.

19. Kimberly Amadeo, The Effects of War on the Environment, Treehugger, 30 December 2020.

20. Stacey Pizzino and Michael Waller, Conflict pollution, washed-up landmines and military emissions – here's how war trashes the environment, The University of Queensland, 14 Nov 2023.

21. How conflict impacts our environment, Peace and Security, United Nations.

22. Israel's war on Gaza: Before and after satellite images reveal the extent of ruin to civilian infrastructure after a year of war, Al Jazeera, 2024.

23. Julia Press and Sarah Holder, Rebuilding Gaza Could Take Over $80 Billion, Global Cooperation, Bloomberg, 20 August 2024.

24. Joseph Krauss, It could take 350 years for Gaza to rebuild if it remains under a blockade, UN report says, AP News, 23 October 2024.

25. Aid agencies: Will take $80bn and 40 years to rebuild Gaza Strip, Arab News, 17 January 2025.