
Security Studies

Izvorni znanstveni članak
355.02

**Contemporary National Security in the Light of Militarization
and Militarism**

ANTON GRIZOLD

Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana

Summary

A national security system today represents a synthesis of all subsystems within a society, because it provides the basic conditions necessary for a society's survival and development and the quality of life as well as activities aimed at fortifying the capacity of societies and nature to withstand jeopardy. It also helps in fending off the repercussions caused by the sources of danger. National security systems of contemporary states comprise the function and the structure of national security that includes not only the capacity of a state to preserve the society's values when faced with internal and external threats to their citizen's peace and freedom, but also joint action with other social subsystems for the sake of the progress of the entire society. The efforts of modern states to achieve demilitarization as part of their national strategies can be the starting-point for the formation of new national security systems which would realize their security and defense needs without creating a social basis for the process of militarization. The process of demilitarization in modern society cannot in itself represent the model for the national security system, but it can be its basic component.

Security and survival have been the basic elements of human life throughout human history. Ever since the earliest human communities, security has been the basis for satisfying other basic needs important to maintain human existence (e.g. to provide for life necessities, to achieve general material and cultural well-being, to find the meaning of life). The need to feel secure has also been the main lever underpinning the development of various human activities to ensure the satisfaction of other basic human needs in an organized way.

The notion of security and the activities related to it have been changing with the development of human community and social systems. Security measures and preparations for being ready to reduce the threats and insecurities deriving from the human environment, and to ensure security of the society as a whole, have become a vital part of the life and work of modern societies. Today's level of civilizational and cultural development has brought, in addition to the 'classic' threats, a number of new insecurities and threats to the individual, society and international community (e.g. antisocial and

pathological behavior, technological advances, ecological problems, underdevelopment, social insecurity, crime, drugs and arms trade etc.). Thus, security in its modern sense can be understood as a state of stability in society which means that the society is well prepared to protect and defend itself from various sources of threats, and is able to prevent any disruptions (imbalances) which could jeopardize the physical, intellectual, spiritual and social integrity of the society and its individuals.

But security in its modern sense not only means the elimination of existing and presupposed sources of threat, but also systematically planned activity through which society provides for the safety and security of its members and environment. Security has in the existing circumstances a universal all-embracing character and content, which is due to the fact that all spheres of human life and work in society (economic, political, social, educational, military etc.) are inseparably interwoven. Therefore, the national security system of modern states as a security instrument not only includes the state's capability to defend the values of its society against external and internal threats, to maintain peace and the freedom of its citizens and to prevent threat or fear. It also includes the capacity of the state to ensure its socio-economic development, i.e. the social, ecological, etc. well-being of its citizens.

Insecurity and threat affect all members of a society. So it is understandable that the need for security is satisfied in an organized way, by a special sphere of social activity called security and defense. Security and defense activities involve the identification of threats, preparations of the society/state to be ready to defend and secure itself from the processes and phenomena arising in nature, in society and between different societies which are recognized as dangerous or threatening.

Since the stratification of societies into classes, the organization of military force, as a means of oppression monopolized by the state, has been the most important and characteristic feature of defense activities. Thus, defense activity is performed by the military organization which is a group of people specially trained and equipped by the state. Since military threat has been considered as the dominant one, societies have devoted particular attention to the development of military activities for ensuring national security. The most important effects of this monopoly in the area of national security systems are the following:

1. Ensuring security is the 'classic' function of the state which involves: defense of its citizens against external (military) threat, maintenance of peace and order in the state, and ensuring security in all spheres of social life (the economy, education, health, social care, and welfare, etc.).
2. The military-defense activity of society is one of the most institutionalized forms of human life and work; planning, organization, direction and execution of this activity is completely in the hands of the state.
3. The military organization is the principal agent of military-defense activity in society.
4. The military way of thinking is a more or less established constituent part of everyday life (culture) in modern states and in international relations.

The above mentioned features have created the foundations for the military force to become one of the principal factors in shaping and realizing ideological, political, economic and other objectives of the society/state. The military can acquire such status and role in society either through its own will and actions and/or through the support of civilian political representatives and other interest groups in society who consider military-defense activity as the state's primary function. The result can be that all other state interests become subordinated to this function of the military.

The process in which the position and role of the military factor in society are strengthened in quantitative terms (such as the percentage of GNP allotted to the maintenance and development of the military system) and in qualitative terms (such as the assertion of military values, the way of thinking in a society) is commonly referred to as militarization. The process of militarization creates the foundations for the development of militarism in society. In spite of all the positive advances and changes in contemporary society as well as the international community since the Cold War, modern states still maintain numerically reduced and organizationally modified armed forces. Moreover, modern armed forces are increasingly becoming an instrument of national policy and, as such, they represent part of the social power of a nation. Thus, an important question arises about the relations of civil society, state apparatus and the military, regarding the role and influence the military establishment has in directing the development of contemporary society.

The basic starting point to establish the concept of demilitarization in professional terms, as a realistic option to ensure contemporary national security, is the identification and definition of the phenomena of militarization and militarism in all their aspects. This is also the aim of this paper.

Some concepts of militarization and militarism

The literature dealing with these two phenomena is quite extensive, offering many different definitions and interpretations. Most of the theoretical studies of various aspects of these two phenomena derive from studies into military-defense and social organizations as practiced in the USA. Many authors consider militarism and militarization as being an exclusive characteristic of Western, industrially developed (capitalist) countries and most highly institutionalized in the USA. Many studies of this kind are relatively weak in their argumentation because of the superficial (or lack of) analyses of the actual processes in the socio-economic structure as well as of the military-defense activities of society. Moreover, most of the existing analyses are often ideologically biased.

Since militarization and militarism are interlinked and several social phenomena it is difficult (almost impossible) to design a unified theoretical framework to embrace all their dimensions (economic, political, cultural, psychological, military, etc.) We can approach this goal by studying some of the most typical views and understandings of these phenomena as expressed in professional literature. However, we must be aware that any selection of the most representative views and approaches to the understanding of militarism and militarization is always arbitrary.

The term militarism is of French-English origin and was introduced by the French socialist Proudhon in the 19th century. The word was coined for the needs of socialist propaganda (to fight against an absolutist military government or against the influence and power of the military top leaders in the government). Later, the term was also used as an expression of the fight of the proletarian masses against the military and its rule or to designate the aggressive policy of the states of that period. The term had a strongly negative connotation and expressed the opposite of the values of liberal democracy. It has retained its negative meaning also in the modern studies of the phenomena of militarism and militarization.

In the literature, there are various views and theories on the origin of militarism. However, many authors simply use the term without defining it in its denotative sense. Some attempt to do so, but the problem of these definitions is of a methodological nature since the term is related to various existing practices, such as:

1. the relationship between the state military organization, political system of the state, and society in which the political system and the society are subordinated to the interests and needs of the state military organization. The political system of the state is an intermediary of military values and principles that penetrate all spheres of society;
2. a high proportion of the government budget allotted to military expenses;
3. armament at national and world levels;
4. national politics tending to increase its military power to use force in the settlement of disputes; and
5. the existence and high output of military-industrial complexes.

The common denominator of all of the abovementioned social practices, which are associated with the term militarism, is a close link with the state military organization. However, any structural linkage among the abovementioned practices, and between militarism and these practices has yet to be proved.

Realist/Liberal views of militarism

The authors operating within realist or liberal theoretical frameworks most often define militarism as: strengthening of the states' military power, use of armed force in solving social conflicts, domination of military institutions over civilian, political activities to establish and advance military ideology (values, norms) in the society, etc.

The above mentioned practices in society are connected in various ways with the existence of the army, which is a specialized institution of the state. Accordingly, individual authors use the term militarism to refer to the existence of one, two, or more of the above mentioned characteristics.

The theoretical (and methodological) starting-point common to several of these studies of militarism is the thesis that militarism is not merely an expression of traditional behaviors, which could be eliminated at a higher level of democratization, but a reflection of the relationships between the civil and military institutions of society. The con-

tent and nature of these relations affect the society as a whole (especially in the conditions of the growing diversion of technological achievements to the development and production of weapons). Therefore, the studies of the actual practice of militarism should include an analysis of the professionals in the military organization, as a distinct social group, especially their social status and function within the state apparatus.

The majority of these authors believe that it is unfair and methodologically unacceptable to claim that professional soldiers are necessarily militarists, and that they tend to glorify military goals and interests in the society. Due to the frequent use of the term militarism to designate 'pathological' symptoms in society, it is necessary to distinguish between justifiable military interests (the military as an institution of the government to ensure the military security of citizens against military aggression from the outside) and the unlawful and excessive power of the military organization in civilian domains.¹

One of the important theoretical studies of militarism is *A History of Militarism* (1937) written by the German-American military historian Alfred Vagts. He dealt with different forms of militarism in their evolution. Vagts explained his understanding of militarism by making a distinction between militarism and the military way. According to him, every war may be led in two different ways: in a military manner and in a militaristic manner. The military way seeks to achieve limited and well-defined objectives with minimum costs of manpower and material resources). Militarism, on the other hand, often pursues objectives that may not be identical with national interests or with victory in a war. Militarists are often preoccupied with maximizing their power within the state, rather than with defending it from its external enemies. Thus militarism may impede the achievement of military objectives in a war. Militarism, according to Vagts, included the way of thinking, the value system and sentiments which exalt military institutions, and seek to transfer the military way of action and the way of thinking into the whole society.²

Vagts and some other authors regard militarism and exalting of the military way as dysfunctional, since it indicates a failure of the primary function of the military organization. However, such an understanding of militarism neglects the fact that the role and function of the state military organization are tightly interwoven. This problem was treated in more depth by the American sociologist Samuel P. Huntington, who studied civil-military relations and the relations of the officer corps with the state.

Defining the nature of civil-military relations, Huntington first examined the status of the military profession in society, and then analyzed the military mind. He came to the conclusion that 'civilian control' over the state military organization is an instrument for reducing military power which appears in two forms: the so-called 'subjective' form (maximizing civilian power) and the 'objective' form (maximizing military professionalism). The subjective form of civilian control achieves its goals by civilianizing the army (also by denying the autonomy of the military sphere by making it the mirror of

¹ Vagts, A., *A History of Militarism*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1937, pp. 13, 16.

² Huntington, Samuel P., *The Soldier and the State*, Harvard University Press, 1957, p. 83.

the state), the essence of objective civilian control, on the other hand, is the recognition of autonomous military professionalism.³

It seems that Huntington saw military professionalism as the 'key' for civil control over the armed forces. However, military professionalism by itself does not sufficiently guarantee non-interference of the army in politics. Under certain circumstances, the army is (by law or as a state institution) obliged to secure the existence of a certain socio-political system.

The existence of the above mentioned two types of civilian control over the military organization has led some authors to claim that the trend of military professionalism has developed parallel to a higher or lower degree of isolation of the armed forces in society. This can lead to the rise of autonomous military goals and interests that may counteract the aims of the government.⁴

Some authors define militarism as a value system that exalts military virtues (loyalty, patriotism, discipline, bravery, and physical strength) above the civilian values of modern industrially developed societies (individualism, humanitarianism, intellectual curiosity, and artistic creativity).⁵

Militarists accept war and the preparation for war as a social necessity of survival. Michael Mann claims that militarism is a behavior mode and an institutional complex which regards war and preparation for war as a normal and desirable social activity.⁶

The motives for militarism also change with time and place. According to some authors, early militarism in primitive societies was simply a better organized and more efficient means of plundering or conquering the neighboring tribes. Later, in more highly organized societies, militarism was associated with the rise and expansion of national goals related to the nation-state. In the mid-19th century, militarism in the Western world was associated with imperialism and an aggressive foreign policy. Since World War II, and with the advent of nuclear weapons, militarism in developed countries has become regarded as a potential possibility and danger rather than as an existing practice.⁷

It is interesting how the authors using the realist or liberal approach see the relation between the terms 'militarization' and 'militarism'. Most authors do not define this relationship or simply regard these two terms as being interchangeable. In those cases where this relationship is defined, we can most often find statements that the relation

³ *Marxism, Communism and Western Society*, *ibid.*, p. 439.

⁴ Harry L. Coles, *The Encyclopedia Americana*, International Edition, Grolier Incorporated, Vol. 1, 1981, p. 107.

⁵ Mann, M., *Capitalism and Militarism*, in: Shaw, Martin (ed.), *War, State and Society*. St. Martin's Press, New York, 1984.

⁶ Harry L. Coles, *ibid.*

⁷ Ross, Andrew L., *Dimensions of Militarization in the Third World*, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 13, 4/1987, pp. 561-564.

between ‘militarization’ and ‘militarism’ is one of cause and effect, i.e., militarization as a process leads to various forms of militarism.⁸

Francis Beer, for instance, defines militarization as an international public justification of war, military pacts, military trade, military aid to foreign countries, and aggressiveness; further, as the domination of military elites and as militaristic behavior in government, the economy, culture and society.⁹

Augusto Varas also gives a descriptive definition of militarization. He defines it as an ‘excessive emphasis on the importance of the country's military’. According to him, militarization brings about growth of the state's military power and an increasing military interference in the internal policy of the state (in the sense of control over it).¹⁰

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) defines militarization as continuous growth of the state's military capacities. This growth is usually accompanied by the increasing role of military institutions in internal (including the economy, society and inner policy) and international domains.¹¹

A group of authors (Peter Wallensteen, Johan Galtung, Carlos Portales) describes two forms of militarization. The first is defined as a social formation and structure of the state characterized by the institutionalized and persistent predominance of military behavior within the state and also in international relations. Such institutionalization may be informal (e.g. associations which glorify the state's military and defensive readiness), or formal (military rule). Behavior, characteristic of the second form of militarization includes the priority of violent acts in society over non-violent ones. In this second form, militarization means a restricted possibility for the choice between certain forms of behavior, while militarization in its first form appears as an institution, as a structured pattern of behavior marked by a certain degree of persistence and stability. In real life, both forms of militarization are usually tightly interwoven. According to this interpretation, militarization may, for example, at the international level become an expression of the reaction against growing trends toward pluralism in the world, whereas within the state it may feature as a reaction against growing demands for democratization and participation.¹²

⁸ Beer, Francis A., *Militarization. Peace Against War*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1981, p. 12.

⁹ Varas, Augusto, *Militarization and the International Arms Race in Latin America*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1985, pp. 26-27.

¹⁰ Militarization and Arms Control in Latin America, in: *World Armaments and Disarmament*, SIPRI Yearbook 1987, p. 303.

¹¹ Wallensteen, Peter, Galtung, Johan, Portales, Carlos, *Global Militarization*, Westview Press, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1985, XI.

¹² Lider, Julian, *Military Force*, Farnborough, Hants: Gower, 1981, p. 258.

Marxist views of militarism

Authors within the Marxist paradigm deal with militarism from different aspects: militarism as a political means, the goals of militarization (external wars, domestic suppression or both), social forces which use militarism as an instrument (e.g. financial capital, the military, the bourgeois class, the capitalist state), etc. These authors most often define militarism as:

1. a function of state-monopolistic capitalism which defends its class interests by means of armed violence;
2. the main instrument of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to achieve its reactionary political goals (maximization of its power) by means of armed violence;
3. a form of policy which aims at increasing military power and at permanent military preparations of the state for an imperialistic war; and
4. a system of economic, political, ideological, and immediate military measures adopted by aggressive capitalist countries to prepare for an imperialistic war.¹³

Most descriptions of militarism given by authors from the former Soviet Union stressed its internal aspect which leads to the privileged status of military corps, and to subordination of the economy and culture of the capitalist state to ‘imperialistic military goals’.

Furthermore, they regarded militarism as an instrument of the financial oligarchy to consolidate and increase its power. Militarism reflects a series of measures adopted by the capitalist state in all fields of social activity: militarization of the economy, science and education; the arms race; the founding of military blocs; expansion of armed forces; intensified preparations for war; suppression of the labor movement and of the national-liberation struggle; and extensive militaristic propaganda. Some studies stress the economic aspect of militarism (as an economic activity) whose aim is the achievement of high profits.

The common denominator of most of these ‘dogmatic Marxist’ definitions of militarism is the notion of militarism as a class phenomenon, which had its beginnings in the class society and reached its maximum extent and intensity in the monopolistic phase of capitalism. Militarism is therefore not treated as a phenomenon in general, but as an instrument consciously used by the monopolistic bourgeoisie to achieve maximum power and profits.¹⁴

¹³ Lider, Julian, *ibid.*

¹⁴ One of the characteristic general definitions of militarism in the literature in the former Soviet Union is: ‘Imperialistic militarism is a complex social phenomenon incorporating a system of economic, political, ideological and military measures adopted by aggressive capitalist nations with the intention to prepare for and wage imperialistic wars. It is an instrument of the financial oligarchy to consolidate and expand its domination, to preserve the capitalist system and to create high profits. Militarism appeared with the stratification of society into classes and with the rise of class exploitation. The bourgeoisie class inherited militarism from other class-antagonistic societies, adopted its most reactionary elements and adapted them to

Some of those authors present their views on militarism in a more factual way, for example, according to its functions, ideology and institutional background of modern militarism.¹⁵

Thus, the internal function of militarism is supposed to be the preservation and consolidation of the existing system in society, keeping the exploited masses in a subordinated position, and suppression of the liberation struggle. The external function of militarism is to ensure the satisfaction of the ruling class' interests abroad. Both functions of militarism combine to form one unified goal – the maintenance and strengthening of the power of the ruling class and protection of its profits. With the appearance of the first socialist country (after the October Revolution) and later of other socialist countries, this general goal of militarism in the capitalist system acquired a new element, namely, destruction of the socialist system. 'Imperialistic politicians and ideologists do not attempt to conceal that the principal aim of militarism today is the destruction of socialistic systems in the world, of international labor and liberation movements, and the restoration of the domination of capital all over the world. With their vindication of an unlimited nuclear world war against socialist countries, militarists show that the aim of such a war is victory over the socialist countries at all costs'.¹⁶

Another characteristic of modern militarism is that it appears in all 'imperialist countries', that it links them, and gives the USA an opportunity to impose their will. The two main instruments of the militaristic foreign policy of capitalistic countries are, according to those authors, war and the threat of war.

The authors with a 'dogmatic Marxist' approach claimed that militarism also includes ideology, i.e. self-justification and indoctrination. They found the basic ideological characteristic of militarism in the idea that military power is a decisive agent in social development and, as such, guarantees sovereignty, motivation and represents the force of development and the means for solving all political disputes. They were also opposed to understanding militarism as being only one way of thinking about politics and society in terms of military merits and values.¹⁷

Most 'liberal Marxist' authors dealing with the phenomenon of militarism proceed from the idea that the basic origin of militarism lies in the class society and in the state as an instrument of class oppression. This idea disputes the predominant thesis of the authors from the former Soviet Union that militarism is an exclusive characteristic of capitalism. Some 'liberal Marxist' authors have demonstrated that political systems enable the emergence of militarism in every modern society which has a state military organization.

its interests and needs.' Milovidov, A.S., Kozlov V.G. (eds.), *Filozofskoje nasledije V.I. Lenina. Problemi Sovremennoj vojny*, Voennoe Izdaniye, Moskva. 1972, p. 52.

¹⁵ Ponomarev, B. N., *Borba protiv militarizma. Gonki vooruženij v sovremennom mire, Novaja i novejšaja istorija 2/1987*. 'Nauka'. Moskva, p. 4.

¹⁶ Migolatiyev, A. A., *Eskalacija militarizma*, Voennoe izdaniye, Moskva, 1970, p. 22.

¹⁷ Kučuk, Ejub, *Militarizam*, Rad, VIZ Beograd, 1977, p. 48.

One of the most comprehensive surveys of militarism in 'liberal Marxist' literature was written by Ejub Kučuk. In his book 'Militarizam', Kučuk gave the following value-neutral definition: 'Militarism is the relationship between the state military and the rest of the society, a relationship which is determined by the historically determined class structure. The characteristic of this relationship is that political system and international relations are structured and shaped according to organizational principles of the state military.'¹⁸

Kučuk's definition points out the following essential characteristics of militarism:

1. The existence of social classes is the main cause of the emergence and existence of the state military organization and of the conditions in which the principles characteristic of the military organizational structure penetrate the various spheres of social life in societies that have a certain class structure. This shows that militarism is possible in all class societies where military activity is monopolized by the state.
2. Militarism is not primarily a system of values and ideology, a particularistic political activity based on armed force. It is also not merely a pure military-technical phenomenon or a predominance of military institutions (of any type in history) over the civil domain; it is a specific, objective social relationship between the state military and the rest of the society which enables the military to affect the whole society, for example by imposing its specific military interests, values and norms, etc.
3. The agents of military tendencies are mixed: civilian as well as military persons.

In his study of modern militarism, E. Kučuk proceeds from the supposition that the increased role and power of the state (gained with the transition from liberal to monopolistic and state capitalism, and with the new socialist political systems) has increased the role of the state military organization. The final result is the penetration of the organizational principles of the state military system and the corresponding value system into the political, economic, educational and other spheres of the social system.¹⁹

This process is referred to as militarization, which may result in militarism of different forms and degrees.

According to Kučuk, the socio-historical circumstances giving rise to militarization and militarism in the modern world originate in social classes, and can include the following:

- a. Power relationships within the social community in circumstances where vital economic, political and other interests of the ruling class are being threatened. In such cases, the ruling class resorts more intensely to the state and its military, all of which may lead to various forms of militarism and vice versa – when the power relations are favorable for the ruling class, the processes of militarization is less expressed.

¹⁸ Kučuk, Ejub, *ibid.*, p. 127.

¹⁹ Kučuk, Ejub, *ibid.*, p. 174.

- b. War as a source of menace to the whole social community. As long as there exists the threat of total or limited war, humanity shall remain in a state of permanent military readiness, which creates favorable conditions for the rise of militarism.
- c. The situation and role of the state military in the political system. The hitherto socio-economic and political developments in the world have created circumstances where there is no clear delineation between political and military factors. This has also changed the state military status from being a 'totally professional instrumental social power to becoming a political power.'²⁰
- d. The position and role of political and cultural institutions of a country. The lack of democratic political institutions, of experience, and of people's adherence to civil political institutions – a low level of political culture in general, create a situation in which an autonomous military alienated from society becomes ever more powerful and instills its principles and values into the whole society.

Methodological Framework for Studying Militarization and Militarism

The author of this paper believes that the phenomena of militarization and militarism should be studied as a case (country) study at two levels.

First, at the qualitative level – to discern the type of the relationship between the professional part of the military and the politically powerful groups in the state apparatus (e.g. the presence of military representatives in the state bodies and in other state institutions where state policy is being formed), as well as the relationship of the professional part of the military with the most important civilian spheres (such as the economy, research and education, etc.). One can assume that the powerful position of military representatives in the state apparatus and their decisive participation in the process of decision-making in the leading civilian structures in society permit the greater influence of the military factor in directing social life.

Second, at the quantitative level – to determine the extent of financial, material and technical facilities which are available to the state military, or are used for military-defensive purposes. Therefore, one can assume that the higher the quantity (e.g. the sum of military expenditures, the total number of military persons, the percentage of the state budget intended for military research and development, etc.) the greater the potential socio-economic and political power of the military in society.

A methodologically appropriate evaluation of the trends and practices in the relations between the state military and the society, which could induce the excessive and negative influence of the military on society (i.e. abuse of military' power to advance its specific interests in society), can only be done by considering both aspects – quantitative and qualitative. A similar approach has also been advocated by those authors who distinguish between two fundamental aspects of the process of militarization:

²⁰ Ross, Andrew L., *ibid.*, p. 565.

- a. militaristic thinking, i.e. assertion of military values and way of thinking of society; and
- b. militaristic behavior, i.e. excessive emphasis on the importance of the military system for social life, resulting in a continuous expansion of this system, regardless of the level of development of the society and the possibilities for satisfying the civilizational and cultural needs of all its members.

Both of these basic aspects of the militarization process may appear simultaneously, and are expressed in growing demands of the professional part of the military for an ever higher percentage of the gross national product and ever greater military political power and impact on society. In practice, it means high military expenditures (relative to GDP), a huge state military organization (total members relative to population, high number of weapons systems, etc.), relatively high proportion of national production for military needs, increased military export, and assertion of military values, norms, ways of thinking in public life, etc.

A similar approach was taken by L. Ross, who used the following six pointers to determine the extent of militarization in empirical terms:²¹

- Military Expenditures (MILEX)
 - value of MILEX
 - MILEX as a proportion of GNP
 - MILEX as a proportion of central government expenditures (CGE)
 - MILEX growth rates
- Armed Forces
 - size of the armed forces
 - armed forces per 1,000 people
 - armed forces growth rates
- Arms Imports
 - value of arms imports per year
 - arms imports as a proportion of total imports per year
 - arms import growth rates
- Arms Production
 - value of arms production per year
 - arms production as a proportion of GNP
 - arms production as a proportion of the total industrial output of the state in one year
- Wars
 - number of interstate wars over time
 - number of intrastate wars over time
 - duration of interstate and intrastate wars
 - casualties resulting from interstate and intrastate wars

²¹ Kučuk, Ejub, *ibid.*, pp. 129-145.

- Military Regimes
 - number of military regimes
 - change in the number of military regimes over time

The process of militarization, therefore, can lead to different forms of militarism in contemporary society. Several criteria are used in the classification of these forms. The most common criteria used in identification of the various forms of militarization and militarism are the agents and the social environment.

According to the first criterion, Kućuk differentiates between three forms of militarism: military, civilian and civilian-military. The fundamental differences among them are:

- military militarism is an activity of the state military featuring as an autonomous political power which assures the instrumental role of civilians in the service of the military (instilling of military organizational principles and value system into the political system and other spheres of social life);
- in civilian militarism, politocracy in power takes the military organization as a 'social model' for the establishment and direction of social life;
- in the civilian-military form of militarism, mixed-civilian-military groups endeavor to structure the global mechanisms of the society on military principles of organization.²²

The social environment criterion makes the distinction between militarization and militarism possible:

- a. at different structural levels within the society (e.g. the economic, political, educational, military levels, etc.); and
- b. in international relations, where the shaping of foreign policy is connected with the process of defense planning and military reasoning.

Conclusion

According to what has been stated so far, militarization could be defined as a process in which the position and role of the state military is strengthened and has an ever increasing influence on society in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

The process of militarization creates the foundations for the emergence of militarism in society. The latter can be understood as the relation between the state military and the whole society, as well as the relationships within each of these two units. Both units advance specific professional military interests that are considered as the state's primary objectives along which the state organizes and directs its social life. This 'absolute' type of militarism does not exist in any modern country. However, in several states there are particularistic aspirations and activities directed towards militarization. Such activities

²² Brzoska, Michael, Conversion in a Resource-Reuse Perspective, in: Ljubica Jelušič and John Selby (eds.), *Defense restructuring and conversion: Sociocultural aspects*, European Commission/Directorate-General Research, Brussels, 1999, pp. 14-31.

have their objective basis in the circumstances in the world (different value systems which encourage the need for the military-defense activities of independent countries; maintenance of world peace and security by means of military mechanisms and instruments linked with the logic of deterrence, etc.). Under certain circumstances, for example when individual states undergo deep internal changes in their socio-economic or political systems (e.g. post socialist states after the Cold War), the abovementioned subjective and objective factors may give rise to the development of behavioral patterns within the state military and in society in general which have been defined as militarization.

For the sake of objectivity and to neutralize the negative connotation of the term militarization, it is necessary to identify those of its characteristics that do result in a form of militarism. Society may ensure its national security by increased channeling of its capacities into the military-defensive activities without creating the social foundations for the emergence of the following empirical signs of militarism:

- imposition of military values, norms, and reasoning upon the society as a whole;
- the military abusing its position in society to achieve its own professional aims;
- a military government (militocracy) and directing the whole social development primarily according to the needs and interests of the state military; and
- glorification of military ideals and values above other values in society, etc.

It can be said that society's intensive efforts to develop military-defensive activities with the function of ensuring national security do not necessarily lead to militarism. In order to restrain from crossing over the shadowy boundary line between defense and militarism, that is, in order to retain only its defensive function, it is necessary to achieve in the national security systems at least the following:

1. a balance between military and non-military mechanisms;
2. the status of the military as a service to the state; and
3. the adaptation of military-defensive activities to the level of threat to society, taking into account the fact that contemporary security is internationalized and is based on the interdependence of the present level of social development and conditions.

The ensuring of the security of an individual and of the society has acquired totally new dimensions in our modern civilization. As mentioned before, states have so far confined the issue of national security to its military aspect and have operationalized it through military activity. Other civilizational aspects of modern security, such as the socio-economic, political, cultural, spiritual-intellectual and ecological ones, have been neglected although they are acquiring ever more acute dimensions. Therefore, it is understandable that our time calls for a redefinition, a new definition of security in its modern sense, to encompass all of its various dimensions. This also involves a change in the content of the security policies of modern states in the sense of a greater role of non-military means and mechanisms in national security activities. Only in this way is it possible for the activities related to the security of an individual and society, which have so far been completely in the hands of the state apparatus, to gradually become part of

the common awareness and culture of each nation as well as of the global society. It is only with the development of a security culture as part of the political culture of modern society that rationality and the importance of the security issue can be framed within the sphere of cultural, non-violent values and the norms of each individual society and of the world.

The efforts of modern states to achieve demilitarization as part of their national strategies can be the starting-point for the formation of new national security systems which would realize their security and defense needs without creating a social basis for the process of militarization.²³ Therefore, an antipode to militarization processes are the processes of demilitarization, through which modern countries could reduce the extent and influence of military activities in society (reduction of the percentage of gross national product spent on military purposes, gradual commercialisation of the military industry, etc.).

The process of demilitarization in modern society cannot in itself represent the model for the national security system, but it can be its basic component. In other words, demilitarization as a component of the modern states' security concept should, in order to be a factual process in society, contain both the quantitative and qualitative aspects. These processes will gain an actual basis and perspective only when the processes of demilitarization at the national, regional and world levels are functionally linked to the mechanisms of ensuring security in the modern (postindustrial) era. In the time of general revision and reshaping of security-defensive doctrines and systems, it is necessary for nation-states to include the concept of demilitarization in the fundamental operational elements of their security strategies.

References

- Beer, Francis A., 1981: *Militarization. Peace Against War*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco
- Brzoska, Michael, 1999: Conversion in a Resource-Reuse Perspective, in: Ljubica Jelušič and John Selby (eds.): *Defense restructuring and conversion: Sociocultural aspects*. European Commission/Directorate-General Research, Brussels, 14-31
- Coles, Harry L., 1981: *The Encyclopedia Americana*, International Edition, Grolier Incorporated, Vol. 1
- Huntington, Samuel P., 1957: *The Soldier and the State*, Harvard University Press
- Kučuk, Ejub, 1977: *Militarizam, Rad*, VIZ Beograd
- Lider, Julian, 1981: *Military Force*, Farnborough, Hants: Gower
- Mann, M., 1984: Capitalism and Militarism, in: Shaw, Martin (ed.), *War, State and Society*, St. Martin's Press, New York
- Marxism, Communism and Western Society*, 1973: Vol. 5, Herder and Herder, New York
- Migolatičev, A. A., 1970: *Eskalacija militarizma*, Voennoe izdanije, Moskva
- Militarization and Arms Control in Latin America, in: *World Armaments and Disarmament*, SIPRI Yearbook 1987
- Milovidov, A. S., Kozlov V. G. (eds.), 1972: *Filozofskoje nasledije V.I. Lenina. Problemi Sovremennoj vojny*. Voennoe Izdanije, Moskva
- Ponomarev, B. N., 1987: Borba protiv militarizma. Gonki vooruženič v sovremennom mire, *Novaja i novejšaja istorija 2 'Nauka'*, Moskva
- Ross, Andrew L., 1987: Dimensions of Militarization in the Third World, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 561-564
- Vagts, A., 1937: *A History of Militarism*, W.W. Norton, New York
- Varas, Augusto, 1985: *Militarization and the International Arms Race in Latin America*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado
- Wallensteen, Peter, Johan Galtung, Carlos Portales, 1985: *Global Militarization*, Westview Press, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, XI