



DEMILITARIZE  
FOR CLIMATE  
JUSTICE!



Global Week  
of Action  
for Peace &  
Climate Justice



Global Days of Action  
on Military Spending

EARTH DAY  
APRIL 22

GDAMS 2026

## GDAMS and Earth Day - April 22

### Why Is It Important To Talk About Military Spending On Earth Day?

**Join us this Earth Day in our GDAMS campaign: Demilitarize for Climate Justice!**

Militarism is deeply connected to the climate crisis. By prioritizing domination and fossil fuel extraction, it fuels conflict and drives environmental harm. Military operations require vast amounts of energy, and armed forces are among the world's largest institutional consumers of fossil fuels and emitters of greenhouse gases.

As military spending continues to rise, it not only fuels wars and increases emissions but also diverts vital resources away from urgently needed climate solutions.

This Earth Day, join us as part of the [Global Days of Action on Military Spending](#) to call for change. This day, coordinated by the [Arms, Militarism and Climate Justice Working Group](#), reflects growing awareness that peace and climate justice are closely interconnected.

Let's advocate for reduced military spending and the redirection of resources towards climate action, care, and a just transition. Make sure to add your events to [this form](#) so we can feature them on the [GCOMS website](#).

**Demilitarize for Climate Justice!**

*This document is part of the **GDAMS Toolkit 2026**, which you can access [here](#). There you can find more information about possible actions and other useful material.*

## What will you find in this document?

*There's probably more here than you need—don't worry! Just take what's most useful to you.*

*Use these resources to organize and support your actions for GDAMS and beyond. You're welcome to translate the materials into your language—please [send translations to us](#) so we can share them more widely.*

*For graphics, you use the Canva template links (below) to translate visuals; don't forget to tag us on social media! More information follows.*

- 1. Militarism and the Climate Breakdown: Key Facts & Figures**
- 2. Q&A on the Militarism–Climate Nexus**
- 3. Earth Day Graphics and Visuals**
- 4. List of Resources Used & More**

### **1. Militarism and the Climate Breakdown: Key Facts & Figures**

- **How is militarism connected to the climate breakdown?**

Militarism is a system that prioritises domination, extraction and armed security over cooperation, care and ecological sustainability, and climate breakdown is one of its direct outcomes. It protects fossil fuel extraction, fuels conflicts over land and energy, and requires enormous amounts of fuel to sustain military operations. Militaries are among the world's largest institutional consumers of fossil fuels, powering jets, warships, bases and global supply chains that produce vast greenhouse gas emissions, much of which remains unreported. Rising military spending both diverts resources from climate action and directly worsens the crisis by expanding weapons production, infrastructure and operations that increase fossil fuel use and emissions, locking societies deeper into dependence on polluting energy systems.

- **Militarism and fossil fuel dependence**

- **Consumption:** Military operations rely heavily on fossil fuels for aircrafts, naval fleets, armoured vehicles and global supply chains. There is a correlation between military spending and military emissions - the more money is spent on fossil-fuel intensive war planes, ships and bases, the greater the impact on the climate.

- Research from Scientists for Global Responsibility estimates that every additional 100 billion dollars in military spending

generates approximately 32 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) ([Parkinson 2025](#)). To put it into perspective, producing 32 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually would require the emissions from approximately 23 million cars ([Parkinson and Simms 2025](#)).

- An F-35 fighter jet typically consumes approximately 5,600 liters (about 1,480 gallons) of fuel per hour during operational flight;
- Militaries are responsible for an estimated 5.5% of annual global GHG emissions ([Parkinson and Cottrell 2022](#)).

This means that, if the world's militaries were a country, it would have the fourth largest carbon footprint, behind China, the USA, and India. This is an estimate, since militaries typically report less than 10% of their carbon footprint, and many do not report any GHG emissions data at all ([SGR 2025](#)). The US military is already the world's largest institutional greenhouse gas emitter ([TNI, SW, TPNS 2023](#)).

- As well as having devastating immediate humanitarian impacts, waging war also drives climate change. The first 15 months of Israel's war on Gaza is estimated to have caused 33.2 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e - equivalent to the annual emissions of Jordan - exacerbating the global climate emergency on top of the huge civilian death toll ([Neimark et al. 2026](#)).
- It is estimated that the global top 20 military spenders alone are responsible for at least 10 billion metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) of military-related emissions during the first quarter of the 21st century. This has accrued from the US\$40 trillion spent on their militaries since 2001 ([TPNS 2025](#)).

- **Control:** control over oil and gas reserves has long contributed to geopolitical conflict. This cycle of fossil fuel dependence, militarisation and conflict reinforces both fossil fuel consumption and geopolitical instability.

- Research suggests that 25–50% of interstate conflicts since 1973 have been linked to oil resources ([Colgan 2013](#); [Crawford 2022](#)).

- For example, the 2003 invasion of Iraq was widely associated with strategic control of oil resources, as well as the recent military attacks on Venezuela and Iran ([Colgan 2013](#)).
  - Fossil fuels are also used to run and sustain the military infrastructure and occupation in Palestine ([TNI 2025](#)). Palestinian civil society organisations have called for a [global energy embargo](#) to disrupt fossil fuel flows enabling military operations. To date, the total estimated amount of the military and conflict-related climate reparations owed by Israel and its allies to the Palestinian people since the Nakba is US\$148 billion, resulting from Israel's military footprint of at least 500 million tCO<sub>2e</sub> ([TPNS, PICS 2025](#)).
- **Extraction: Fossil fuel extraction itself is frequently militarised.** Military forces, paramilitaries and private security contractors are deployed to protect extraction sites and suppress community resistance. Environmental defenders opposing extractive projects face severe violence.
- Global Witness reports that more than 1,900 land and environmental defenders were killed between 2012 and 2023 ([Global Witness 2023](#)). Indigenous Peoples and women are disproportionately affected by militarised extractivism, facing land dispossession, displacement and gender-based violence.
- **“Greening” the military is a false solution to climate**
- There is no evidence that the military can be “green”.
- Armed forces often highlight technological efforts to decarbonise, such as installing solar panels and exploring so-called sustainable aviation fuel. However, these efforts are grossly inadequate to tackle the full scale of the military's impact on the climate. ([Crawford 2025](#))
  - The total emissions of militaries are rarely, if ever, included in national net-zero targets. Emissions reduction targets in military climate strategies are typically vague or undefined (e.g., the UK's 2021 Defence Climate Change and Sustainability Strategic Approach sets no concrete reduction targets beyond “contributing” to national net-zero goals). In practice, militaries

are given exemptions from emissions targets if it is thought to interfere with 'battlefield advantage'.

- With little to no climate considerations in defence procurement decisions, purchases of weapons systems now will lock in fossil fuel reliance for decades. For example, the gas-guzzling crown jewel F-35 fighter jets are expected to be in service well beyond the net-zero year 2050.
- Major military alliances prioritise operational dominance over emissions reductions; national security framing often drives increased military spending as the response to climate impacts rather than rethinking or reducing military activity ([TNI, SW, TPNS 2022](#)).

○ **Environmental impacts of armed conflicts**

- Between 1950 and 2000, nine out of 10 major armed conflicts have occurred in Global biodiversity hotspots, which cover only 2.4% of the Earth's land. More than 80% of these conflicts in the hotspots have led to wide-scale biodiversity loss, deforestation and other environmental impacts ([Mongaby 2023](#)).
- Militaries need large areas of land and sea, for bases, facilities, testing and training. Military lands cover between 1-6% of the global land surface, many in ecologically important areas ([CEOBS 2025](#)).
- Active conflict with the extensive use of conventional weapons exacerbates environmental and wildlife devastation that can have long-lasting effects on the environment and people long after the fighting has ended ([UN Fact Sheet 2025](#)).
- Climate damage caused by Russia's war in Ukraine has been estimated to cause 311 million tCO<sub>2e</sub> ([Initiative on GHG accounting of war 2026](#)).

○ **The climate crisis is increasingly framed as a security issue, fuelling a vicious cycle that leads to more securitisation, militarisation, emissions, and ultimately only benefits arms companies ([TNI 2021](#)).**

- The dominant drive and demand for 'climate security' comes from a powerful national security and military apparatus, in particular that of the wealthier nations. Framing the climate crisis as a security issue is deeply problematic as it ultimately reinforces a militarised approach

to climate change that is likely to deepen the injustices for those most affected by the unfolding crisis.

- It also shifts responsibility for the climate crisis to the victims of climate change, casting them as ‘risks’ or ‘threats’.
- *‘I think [climate change] is a real opportunity for the [aerospace and defence] industry’*, said Lord Drayson in 1999, then UK Minister of State for Science and Innovation and Minister of State for Strategic Defence Acquisition Reform. Revenues from sales of arms and military services by the 100 largest arms-producing companies rose by 5.9 per cent in 2024, reaching a record \$679 billion ([SIPRI 2025](#)).

- **How could military spending be reallocated for climate action?**

**Opportunity cost:** Global military spending reached at least USD 2.7 trillion in 2024 and is set to rise. If current trends persist, the world is projected to be spending USD 6.6 trillion by 2035 ([SIPRI Fact Sheet 2025](#)). Rising military budgets increase fossil fuel consumption while diverting resources away from climate action. Redirecting even a portion of this spending could significantly accelerate the transition away from fossil fuels.

- “\$2.4 trillion is what the High-Level Expert Group on Climate Finance estimates is needed every year to invest in renewable energy, adaptation, and other climate-related issues in developing countries, excluding China. Whether on slashing emissions or building climate-resilience, it’s already blazingly obvious that finance is the make-or-break factor in the world’s climate fight – in quantity, quality, and innovation” ([Stiell 2024](#)).
- The wealthiest countries are spending 30 times more on their militaries than on providing climate finance for the world’s most vulnerable countries ([UN Fact Sheet 2025](#)).
- Reinvesting 15% of 2024 global military spending (\$387 billion) is more than enough to cover the annual costs of climate change adaptation in developing countries ([UN Fact Sheet 2025](#)).
- Climate finance in perspective: Investing even a portion of military spending in climate action could substantially reduce emissions. 2024 Global military spending (\$2700 billion) could pay for (either/or): 115 million US households installing solar; 27 million UK house retrofits; 805 thousand wind turbines; 3 million electric buses ([TNI 2025](#)).

- Reducing military expenditure is a win-win in the global just transition. A proposed Fossil Fuel Treaty supported by a broad cross-section of civil society and many governments offers a concrete mechanism to advance this agenda. Built on a UN mandate, a growing civil society movement, and an increasing number of committed countries, a reallocation framework, such as a Global Just Transition Fund, within the Fossil Fuel Treaty could redirect public finance from military spending toward climate action (Geyer and Riccoboni 2026).

## 2. Q&A on the Militarism–Climate Nexus

- ***How is militarism connected to the climate breakdown?***

Militarism is a system that prioritises domination, extraction and armed security over cooperation, care and ecological sustainability, and climate breakdown is one of its direct outcomes. It protects fossil fuel extraction, fuels conflicts over land and energy, and requires enormous amounts of fuel to sustain military operations. Militaries are among the world’s largest institutional consumers of fossil fuels, powering jets, warships, bases and global supply chains that produce vast greenhouse gas emissions, much of which remains unreported. Rising military spending both diverts resources from climate action and directly worsens the crisis by expanding weapons production, infrastructure and operations that increase fossil fuel use and emissions, locking societies deeper into dependence on polluting energy systems ([Crawford 2022](#)).

- ***How much does the military contribute to the climate crisis?***

The global military sector is responsible for around 5.5% of annual greenhouse gas emissions — if it were a country, it would be the 4th largest emitter in the world. It is important to mention that precise calculations are difficult because countries are not required to report military emissions to the UNFCCC, creating significant gaps in transparency and accountability.

Militaries rely heavily on fossil fuels for aircraft, naval fleets, vehicles, and supply chains.

This matters because ignoring the military’s emissions undermines any serious global climate action strategy, putting people and the planet at serious risk. We cannot achieve a livable future for all while continuing massive fossil-fuel-dependent militarization ([Parkinson and Cottrell 2022](#)).

- ***How do armed conflicts worsen climate and environmental risks?***

In addition to the devastating immediate human cost, armed conflicts devastate ecosystems and biodiversity — often in the most vulnerable regions.

War generates massive carbon emissions, worsening the climate crisis, and leaves long-term environmental damage, which can impact people’s health, homes, and livelihoods. Climate and security are interconnected. Conflict both accelerates environmental degradation and undermines resilience to climate impacts. Ignoring the military-environment link risks blind spots in climate policy.

(Sources: [UN Fact Sheet 2025](#), [Neimark et al. 2026](#)).

- ***How does military spending limit global climate action?***

Global military spending reached at least \$2.7 trillion in 2024 and is set to rise further. The wealthiest countries are spending 30 times more on their militaries than on providing climate finance for the world’s most vulnerable countries.

Every \$100 billion increase in military spending generates ~32 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e, which is equivalent to the annual emissions from approximately 23 million cars. Redirecting even a small portion could close the global climate finance gap and fund renewable energy, sustainable transport, and adaptation.

\$2.4 trillion is what the High-Level Expert Group on Climate Finance estimates is needed every year to invest in climate-related issues in developing countries, excluding China.

Ignoring militarization in climate discussions leaves trillions of dollars unallocated to the solutions the planet needs.

(Sources: [SIPRI Fact Sheet 2025](#), [SGR 2025](#), [TNI, SW, TPNS 2022](#), [Stiell 2024](#))

- ***Can the military go green?***

In recent years, the world’s most powerful armed forces have claimed commitment to climate action. No evidence supports that claim. Armed forces often highlight efforts to decarbonise such as installing solar panels and exploring so-called sustainable aviation fuel, but these efforts are grossly inadequate to tackle the full scale of the military’s impact on the climate. Militaries lack viable, scalable alternatives for these needs; many “net zero” pledges rely on unproven technologies or fuels with serious social/environmental costs. As a result, weapon systems being bought now lock in fossil fuel dependence for decades. Major alliances prioritize military dominance over emissions cuts, treating climate impacts as a reason to expand capabilities rather than reduce them. (Source: [TNI, SW, TPNS 2022](#)).

- ***How does framing the climate crisis as a security issue worsen injustice and who benefits?***

Treating climate change as a security threat drives securitisation and militarisation—raising emissions, deepening injustices for those most affected,

shifting blame onto climate victims by labeling them as “risks” or “threats,” and ultimately benefiting arms companies that profit from increased defence spending. (Source: [TNI 2021](#)).

- **How could military spending be reallocated for climate action?**

Global military spending reached at least USD 2.7 trillion in 2024 and is set to rise. If current trends persist, the world is projected to be spending USD 6.6 trillion by 2035. Rising military budgets increase fossil fuel consumption while diverting resources away from climate action. Redirecting even a portion of this spending could significantly accelerate the transition away from fossil fuels; reducing military expenditure is a win-win in the global just transition. A proposed Fossil Fuel Treaty supported by a broad cross-section of civil society and many governments offers a concrete mechanism to advance this agenda. Built on a UN mandate, a growing civil society movement, and an increasing number of committed countries, a reallocation framework, such as a Global Just Transition Fund, within the Fossil Fuel Treaty could redirect public finance from military spending toward climate action.

(Source: [SIPRI Fact Sheet 2025](#), Geyer and Riccoboni 2026).

### 3. Earth Day Graphics and Visuals

Accounts To Tag:

**Instagram** - [@gcoms](#)

**Facebook** - [@DemilitarizeDay](#)

**Bluesky** - [@demilitarizeday.bsky.social](#)

<b>Earth Day General Visuals</b>	
Landscape format. Available in different languages. You can translate it into your language, too!	
<p><b>Sample Caption/s:</b></p> <p>This Earth Day, join GDAMS (April 10–May 9) in calling to cut military spending and invest in peace, people, and the planet. Global military budgets hit \$2.7T in 2024—fueling wars, fossil-fuel-heavy operations, and huge hidden emissions. If militaries were a country, they’d be the world’s fourth largest emitter.</p> <p>On April 22 we spotlight the environmental cost of militarism and demand money for climate justice and a just transition.</p>	<p><b>Materials:</b></p> <p><a href="#">GDAMS Banner</a></p> <p><a href="#">Earth Day Graphic with slogan</a></p>

<p>Act now: reduce military spending, protect communities, and defend the planet.</p> <p><b>Demilitarize for Climate Justice!</b></p> <p>#EarthDay #DemilitarizeForClimateJustice #DemilitarizeDay          #DefundMilitarism #MoveTheMoney #GDAMS2026 #WarCostsUsTheEarth</p>	
<p><b>Earth Day Graphics</b></p>	
<p>Carousels format to be posted on <b>April 22.</b></p>	
<p><b>CAROUSEL 1 - Militarism and fossil fuels</b></p> <p><b>Suggested caption:</b></p> <p>Militaries consume massive amounts of fossil fuels, driving both emissions and conflict. This Earth Day, let's advocate for a world where resources are invested in clean energy, not warfare. 🌱💡</p> <p>#EarthDay #DemilitarizeForClimateJustice #DemilitarizeDay          #DefundMilitarism #MoveTheMoney #GDAMS2026 #WarCostsUsTheEarth</p>	<p><b>Materials:</b></p> <p>Link to the Graphics - <a href="#">Carousel 1 (9:16 Format)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Carousel 1 (4:5 Format)</a></p> <p>(Editable one will be added once ready)</p>
<p><b>CAROUSEL 2 - War and environmental destruction</b></p> <p><b>Suggested caption:</b></p> <p>Armed conflicts devastate forests, biodiversity, and communities — often in the most vulnerable areas. This Earth Day, join us in calling for peace and environmental protection by cutting military spending. 🌿✌️</p> <p>#EarthDay #DemilitarizeForClimateJustice #DemilitarizeDay          #DefundMilitarism #MoveTheMoney #GDAMS2026 #WarCostsUsTheEarth</p>	<p><b>Materials:</b></p> <p>Link to the Graphics - <a href="#">Carousel 2 (9:16 Format)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Carousel 2 (4:5 Format)</a></p> <p>(Editable one will be added once ready)</p>
<p><b>CAROUSEL 3 - Military spending vs climate action</b></p>	<p><b>Materials:</b></p>

<p><b>Suggested caption:</b></p> <p>Money spent on war could fund a sustainable future for every country. This Earth Day, redirect military spending to climate action. ⚡🌍</p> <p>#EarthDay #DemilitarizeForClimateJustice #DemilitarizeDay #DefundMilitarism #MoveTheMoney #GDAMS2026 #WarCostsUsTheEarth</p>	<p>Link to the Graphics - <a href="#">Carousel 3 (9:16 Format)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Carousel 3 (4:5 Format)</a></p> <p>(Editable one will be added once ready)</p>
--	--

#### 4. List of Resources Used & More

- CEOBS (2025), [How does war damage the environment?](#)
- Crawford, N.C. (2022) [The Pentagon, Climate Change, and War: Charting the Rise and Fall of U.S. Military Emissions.](#)
- Crawford, N.C. (2025), [The contribution of armed forces and war to climate change](#)).
- Colgan Jeff D. (Fall 2013) "[Fueling the Fire: Pathways from Oil to War,](#)" International Security, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 147–180, doi:10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00135.
- Geyer K. and Riccoboni G. 2026, The Double Dividend: How Reducing Military Spending Can Finance a Just Transition: The Fossil Fuel Treaty as a Tool for Justice and Peace.
- Global Energy Embargo For Palestine - <https://palenergyembargo.com/>
- Global Witness (2023), [Almost 2,000 land and environmental defenders killed between 2012 and 2022 for protecting the planet.](#)
- Initiative on GHG accounting of war (2026) [Climate damage caused by Russia’s war in Ukraine: 24 February 2022 – 23 February 2026.](#)
- Lin, H.C., Buxton, N., Akkerman, M., Burton, D., de Vries, W. (October 2023), [Climate crossfire: how NATO’s 2% military spending targets contribute to climate breakdown.](#) Transnational Institute <http://www.tni.org/climatecrossfire>.
- Mongabay 2023 "[Study: Despite armed conflicts, Indigenous lands have better environment quality](#)"
- Benjamin Neimark, Frederick Otu-Larbi, Reuben Tete Larbi, Patrick Bigger, Linsey Cottrell, Lennard de Klerk, Mykola Shlapak (2026), [Israel-Gaza conflict carbon emissions exceeded 30 million tons](#), One Earth, Volume 9, Issue 3.

- Parkinson (2025) [Military spending rises and greenhouse gas emissions: What does the research say?](#) Scientists for Global Responsibility.
- Parkinson and Cottrell (2022). [Estimating the Military's Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions](#). Scientists for Global Responsibility; the Conflict and Environment Observatory.
- Parkinson and Simms (2025) [Dirty Tackle: The growing carbon footprint of football](#)
- SIPRI 2025, [Top 100 arms producers see combined revenues surge as states rush to modernize and expand arsenals](#).
- SIPRI Fact Sheet 2025, [Trends In World Military Expenditure, 2024](#).
- SGR (2025). [Most militaries report less than 10 percent of their carbon footprint](#).
- Stiell S. 2024, [Speech by UN Climate Change Executive Secretary](#).
- TPNS (2025) [Climate Reparations for Military Emissions](#).
- TPNS, PICS (2025) [Military & Conflict-Related Emissions & Climate Reparations for Palestine](#)
- TNI (2025), [Climate Collateral - Why the military's impact on climate change can no longer be ignored](#).
- TNI (2025), [Palestinian liberation is inseparable from the fight against global fossil capitalism](#)
- TNI, Stop Wapenhandel, Tipping Point North South (2022) [Climate Collateral: How military spending accelerates climate breakdown](#).
- TNI, Stop Wapenhandel, Tipping Point North South (2023), [Climate crossfire: How NATO's 2% military spending targets contribute to climate breakdown](#); Instagram graphics: [https://www.instagram.com/p/Cyf3SE-MOOf/?img\\_index=9](https://www.instagram.com/p/Cyf3SE-MOOf/?img_index=9)
- UN Secretary-General's Report (2025) [The Security We Need: Rebalancing Military Spending for a Sustainable and Peaceful Future](#).
- [UN Fact Sheet - The Security We Need](#) (2025).
- Useful Website: [Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator](#)
- [Resource page on war, militarism and ecosocial justice](#)