

Global Militarisation Index 2014

Grebe, Jan

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Sonstiges / other

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Grebe, J. (2014). *Global Militarisation Index 2014*. (2014). Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC).
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-64123-3>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.de>


Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

GLOBAL MILITARISATION INDEX 2014

Jan Grebe \ BICC



bicc

SUMMARY

The Global Militarisation Index (GMI) depicts the relative weight and importance of the military apparatus of one state in relation to its society as a whole. The update of the GMI 2014 is based on data from the year 2013 (i. e. the most recent year for which data has been available) and comprises 152 states. BICC's GMI is supported by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

In the 2014 GMI, Israel, Singapore, Armenia, Syria, Russia, Cyprus, South Korea, Jordan, Greece and Azerbaijan (POSITION 1 TO 10) are amongst the ten countries with the highest levels of militarisation—three of which are situated in the Middle East, two in East Asia and the remaining five in Western and Eastern Europe. The high levels of militarisation in these countries are mostly the result of comprehensive arms purchases.

The causes for the generally high levels of militarisation in the Middle East are manifold. They range from the defence of existing authoritarian regimes against possible internal adversaries to external conflicts and potential threats from the outside. All in all, one will have to assume that the level of militarisation in the region will remain high or will even increase.

The neighbouring states Armenia (POSITION 3) and Azerbaijan (POSITION 10), both belonging to Europe, show very high levels of militarisation and have initiated major increases in their military expenditures over the past years. The high levels of militarisation in these two countries must, however, be seen in the overall context. Russia (POSITION 5) delivers arms to both South Caucasian republics and has been pursuing a comprehensive military reform since 2008.

Between 2009 and 2013, expenditures for equipment and procurement in European NATO states fell by more than US \$9 billion. Still, some states show high levels of militarisation (Greece: 9, Estonia: 21, Turkey: 24, Bulgaria: 27, Portugal: 28).

Singapore (POSITION 2) and South Korea (POSITION 7) are the two countries within East Asia that are amongst the most militarised countries. Singapore's procurement efforts are a reaction to its many unresolved territorial issues, the importance of strategic waterways in the region and the Chinese anti-access / area denial strategy. South Korea's high level of militarisation can be understood in the context of the ongoing state of war with North Korea, but also with unresolved territorial issues with Japan and China in the Yellow Sea.

CONTENTS

Summary	2
The methodology of the Global Militarisation Index (GMI)	4

BICC GMI 2014	
The top 10	5

Regional armament in focus	
Middle East	6
Militarisation in Europe	8
The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict	8
Austerity measures in Europe, the crisis in Ukraine and Russian military reform	9
Militarisation in Asia	11

GMI world map	12
Militarisation Index (Ranking 2013)	14
Imprint	15

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE GLOBAL MILITARISATION INDEX (GMI)

The Global Militarisation Index (GMI) depicts the relative weight and importance of the military apparatus of one state in relation to its society as a whole. For this, the GMI records a number of indicators to represent the level of militarisation of a country:

- \ the comparison of military expenditures with its gross domestic product (GDP) and its health expenditure (as share of its GDP);
- \ the contrast between the total number of (para)military forces and the number of physicians and the overall population;
- \ the ratio of the number of heavy weapons systems available and the number of the overall population.

The GMI is based on data from the Stockholm Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and BICC. It shows the levels of militarisation of 161 states since 1990. BICC provides yearly updates.

In order to increase the compatibility between different indicators and to prevent extreme values from creating distortions when normalising data, in a first step every indicator has been represented in a logarithm with the factor 10. Second, all data have been normalised using the formula $x=(y-\min)/(\max-\min)$, with min and max representing, respectively, the lowest and the highest value of the logarithm. In a third step, every indicator has been weighted in accordance to a subjective factor, reflecting the relative importance attributed to it by BICC researchers (see Graph below). In order to calculate the final score, the weighted indicators have been added up and then normalised one last time on a scale ranging from 0 to 1,000. For better comparison of individual years, all years have finally been normalised.

The GMI conducts a detailed analysis of specific regional or national developments. By doing so, BICC wants to contribute to the debate on militarisation and point to the often contradictory distribution of resources.

GMI indicators and weighing factors

Category / Indicator	Factor
 Expenditures Military expenditures as percentage of GDP	5
	3
 Personnel Military and paramilitary personnel in relation to population ¹	4
	2
	2
 Weapons Heavy weapons in relation to population	4



Expenditures

Military expenditures as percentage of GDP

5

Military expenditures in relation to health spending

3



Personnel

Military and paramilitary personnel in relation to population ¹

4

Military reserves in relation to population

2

Military and paramilitary personnel in relation to physicians

2



Weapons

Heavy weapons in relation to population

4

¹ \ The main criterion for coding an organisational entity as either military or paramilitary is that the forces in question are under the direct control of the government in addition to being armed, uniformed and garrisoned.

BICC GMI 2014

Numerous conflicts in the world influence the level of militarisation in many states. Amongst these are not only direct military confrontations but also unsolved conflicts around contested territories and different threat perceptions such as terrorism or piracy. Such causes for rearmament can be observed in nearly all regions of the world to a higher or lesser degree. In the Middle East, for instance, the conflict in Syria, the dramatic worsening of the conflict between Sunnites and Shiites that has been kindled in many places in the region, and the nuclear conflict with Iran induce the states of the Gulf Co-operation Council (Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Oman, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates) on the one hand and Israel on the other to increase their military budgets and to invest in more modern weapons for their armed forces. In the South China Sea, contested territorial claims between China, Japan, the Philippines and Vietnam cause markedly higher investments in the respective naval forces. In Europe, the crisis in Ukraine has led to demands for NATO states to markedly increase their defence budgets to respond to Russia militarily. In Africa, states react to regional armed conflicts with “peacekeeping missions” and thus expand their armies. Furthermore, piracy in the Horn of Africa and the Gulf of Guinea has led to a comprehensive modernisation of the naval forces of many littoral states (such as Nigeria, Ghana and Kenya). Finally, in South America, despite relatively few armed conflicts, many countries pursue the build-up of their national arms industries and invest large amounts in the acquisition of cutting-edge technologies. The reasons behind this are unsolved border issues but also, as is the case for Brazil, ambitions of strengthening its own power position in the region by military means. In the following, the GMI 2014 will shed light on some current trends in militarisation.

Table 1
Top 10

Country				GMI Score	Rank
Israel	4.9	5.2	3.7	831.6	1
Singapore	4.7	5.3	3.3	801.0	2
Armenia	4.9	5.1	3.0	783.0	3
Syria	4.9	4.6	3.3	773.6	4
Russia	4.8	4.5	3.3	761.0	5
Cyprus	4.4	4.9	3.3	757.1	6
Korea, Republic of	4.5	5.1	2.9	756.7	7
Jordan	4.6	4.7	3.2	748.7	8
Greece	4.4	4.7	3.2	746.8	9
Azerbaijan	4.9	4.7	2.8	746.2	10

The top 10

In the 2014 GMI, Israel, Singapore, Armenia, Syria, Russia, Cyprus, South Korea, Jordan, Greece and Azerbaijan are among the ten countries with the highest levels of militarisation. The high levels of militarisation in these countries are mostly the result of comprehensive arms purchases.

While the United States (POSITION 31) shows a relatively high level of militarisation in the GMI 2014, it does not belong to the top 10. Yet it remains the leading country in terms of its military budget (US \$640 billion), with 37 per cent of global military expenditures.² In contrast to its military spending (3.8. per cent of gross domestic product) for maintaining one of the largest armies in the world, US health expenditures amount to 17.9 per cent of GDP. Despite the larger percentage, there are only 2.4 physicians compared to 5 soldiers and paramilitaries per 1,000 inhabitants. Even though the reduction of the amount of activities in Afghanistan and Iraq meant that expenditures for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) went down, the United States has kept its position amongst the top 40 in the GMI. It remains globally present and has a comprehensive global network of military bases.

² \ The information on military expenditures of individual countries refers to data collected by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI).

Regional armament in focus

Middle East

Nearly all countries in the Middle East show high levels of militarisation. The only real exceptions are Qatar and Tunisia.³ Israel continues to lead the Index in position 1 and shows the highest level of militarisation in the world. In 2013, Israel spent US \$16 billion on its armed forces; 5.6 per cent of its GDP, while the share of health expenditures amounted to 7.5 per cent with 23.7 soldiers and paramilitaries and merely 3.4 physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. The conflict in the Middle East is the driving factor behind Israel's arms policy. In the eyes of Tel Aviv armament efforts of many Arab states are a threat that must be taken seriously and that needs to be addressed through its own modernisation efforts and arms purchases. The country possesses the most modern and powerful army, one that is better equipped than any other in the region in terms of weapons systems. Israel is extremely careful to maintain that technological superiority, mainly with regard to missile defence and surveillance. The Arab states of Syria (POSITION 4), Jordan (POSITION 8), Kuwait (POSITION 12) and Oman (POSITION 16) are also some of the most militarised countries in the region. Saudi Arabia can be found in position 20. The kingdom is traditionally seen as the protector of the Arab Gulf States which is why it not only intends to expand its political influence but also to show its military strength.

The causes for the generally high levels of militarisation are manifold. They range from the defence of existing authoritarian regimes against possible internal adversaries to external conflicts and potential threats from the outside.

In concrete terms, the continuing war in Syria and the nuclear conflict with Iran (POSITION 31) may contribute to a military build-up of individual states. Even though presently an agreement between the United States and other western states and Iran seems possible, it remains uncertain whether the general build-up of arms in the region can be stopped. Distrust of Iran in the states of the Gulf Co-operation Council, for instance, is too deep. With Iran's growing regional leadership role and its interference in different conflicts, such as Iraq, the GCC states feel that their own interests and claims to power are threatened. Iran has more than 500,000 men at arms, including about 125,000 well trained Revolutionary Guards. It is true that the country's military material is old and its armed forces are often not well equipped, but in conventional weapons terms Iran is still superior to some of its smaller neighbours; it has 7.5 soldiers and paramilitaries and merely 0.8 physicians (according to the last available information of 2005) per 1,000 inhabitants. Tests with their own medium-range and ballistic missiles have also led to insecurity with Iran's neighbours with regard to Teheran's military-political agenda.


Table 2
The ten most militarised countries in the Middle East

Country				GMI Score	Rank
Israel	4.9	5.2	3.7	831.6	1
Syria	4.9	4.6	3.3	773.6	4
Jordan	4.6	4.7	3.2	748.7	8
Kuwait	4.8	4.2	3.2	732.5	12
Oman	5.5	3.4	2.8	703.6	16
Bahrain	4.8	3.4	3.3	697.9	19
Saudi Arabia	5.3	3.2	3.0	693.6	20
Lebanon	4.7	3.5	3.2	685.1	25
Egypt	4.3	4.3	2.7	683.9	26
Iran	4.5	4.1	2.6	675.0	30

³ \ In 2013, Libya was on position 111. The sharp drop in the level of militarisation of the country can be attributed to the drastic reduction of the number of soldiers and heavy weapons as a result of the war.

Map 1

Ranking of Middle Eastern countries compared to the rest of the world



The high level of militarisation in the region is also reflected in the ratio of military expenditures to the gross domestic product (GDP) of some countries. Oman (11.3 percent of GDP) and Saudi Arabia (9.3 per cent of GDP) are holding the lead. Both countries spend markedly less of the GDP on health; in Oman, the share of health expenditures in GDP represents a mere 2.5 per cent; in Saudi Arabia 3.2 per cent. In total, military expenditures in the Middle East show a clear ascending trend. Between 2004 and 2013, military spending has increased by 56 per cent to US \$150 billion in the current year. With US \$67 billion, the lion's share can be attributed to Saudi Arabia. Against the background of increasing instability and armed conflicts, there is growing concern of the disastrous momentum of an arms race in this region. The states of the Middle East invest heavily in the modernisation of their armed forces, including the purchase of new and top of the range weapons systems. In the past years, some states have concluded record-level arms deals and invested billions of US dollars in new weapons. States such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Jordan and the United Arab Emirates aim at expanding their own arms industry by importing arms technologies. In January 2012 Saudi Arabia alone signed arms deals with the United States worth US \$60 billion. This also shows that the United States continues to be the main supplier for most states in the region, and especially for Israel, Saudi Arabia, Iraq and the United Arab Emirates with whom they concluded deals for

the delivery of combat aircraft, helicopters and missiles as well as comprehensive modernisation and maintenance agreements worth billions of dollars.

Many states focus on the expansion and modernisation of their air force as well as the purchase of strategic weapons, such as missiles that allow aiming at more distant targets in the region. In the past years Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in particular have invested in such weapons. The fight against so-called Islamic State in the north of Iraq and in Syria in which Arab states also participate with air strikes will further increase the importance of the air force for many states. While conducting extensive arms deals with Arab countries, the United States makes sure that the military superiority of Israel remains—by providing the country not only with modern fighter planes and tanker aircraft but also air defence systems and state-of-the-art radar systems and missiles.

All in all, one will have to assume that the level of militarisation in the region will remain high or will even increase.

Militarisation in Europe

Five countries from Europe can be currently found in the top 10. Armenia (POSITION 3) shows the highest level of militarisation of European countries, followed by Russia (POSITION 5). High levels of militarisation are also shown by Cyprus (POSITION 6), Greece (POSITION 9) and Azerbaijan (POSITION 10). Ukraine can be found on position 13.

The high level of militarisation of Cyprus is the result of the still continuing conflict between the Greek and Turkish population groups on the island. The fact that Greece shows such a high level of militarisation is the result of decades of military build-up and the slow decrease of the huge military budget. While the country still has a large number of heavy weapons systems it has decided to reduce its army in the long term.

The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict

This year's GMI again points to the protracted Nagorno-Karabakh conflict in the South Caucasus. The neighbouring states Armenia and Azerbaijan show very high levels of militarisation and have initiated major increases in their military expenditures in the past years. Military expenditure in 2013 by Armenia has reached US \$427 million, while expenditures in Azerbaijan have grown to US \$3.4 billion. In Armenia, the share of military expenditures of the GDP is 4 per cent; in Azerbaijan it is 4.7 per cent—compared to other European countries, they are clearly in the lead. With a share of 4.5 per cent of the GDP, health expenditures in Armenia are only marginally higher than military spending; in Azerbaijan, this share amounts to 5.4 per cent. Per 1,000 inhabitants, Armenia has 17.9 soldiers and paramilitaries and 3.6 physicians; in Azerbaijan, there are 8.9 soldiers and paramilitaries and 3.5 physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. Due to the boom in oil production, the government of Azerbaijan has plenty of financial resources for covering the recent enormous growth of the defence budget. As a result of its drastic increase in its gross domestic product, Baku has been more confident for a number of years. From this position of strength, the country is trying to influence the course of the conflict to its advantage.

Armenia, however, shows moderate economic growth resulting in only a comparably slow growth in military expenditures. Still, Azerbaijan and Armenia aim at comprehensive modernisation activities for their outdated weapons systems for which they are highly dependent on Russian support, and that support is provided to both countries. In this respect, Azerbaijan is trying to diversify and expand its military relationships and has ordered weapons from Ukraine that has become an important supplier of weapons to Baku. Talks with South Korea about the sale of modern weapons systems are ongoing. Behind these massive investments in new weapons lies the central interest of Baku to strengthen its own arms industrial capacities. Even though the government has been able to achieve major successes and is able to produce an increasing number of military goods on its own, it will still be dependent in the long term upon the import of high-tech products, including conventional large weapons systems.

While Armenia follows a similar strategy, it is dependent upon close co-operation with Russia in its wish to modernise its own armed forces and will—even though it is trying to expand military co-operation to other countries—in the short- to medium term not be able to free itself from dependency on Russia.

In addition, both countries participate in the NATO Partnership for Peace and the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) programmes; yet another motive for changing and modernising their armed forces.

There are frequent small armed incidents between these two highly armed states. Recent events contradict the common assumption that the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict is a “frozen conflict”. On 12 November 2014, for instance, the Azerbaijan armed forces shot down an Armenian combat helicopter in the contested area and killed at least two of its crew. This incident started off yet more sabre rattling with accusations from both sides. Such an event can trigger a dangerous spiral of escalation between the two countries that will be difficult to stop. The GMI shows the high levels of militarisation in the two countries which must, however, be seen in the overall context.

Map 2
Nagorno-Karabakh/South Caucasus



Austerity measures in Europe, the crisis in Ukraine and Russian military reform

The financial crisis of 2009 triggered decisions by numerous European countries to downsize their military expenditures and to save on procurement costs. Between 2009 and 2013, expenditures for equipment and procurement in European NATO states fell by more than US \$9 billion. Still some of them show high levels of militarisation (Greece: 9, Estonia: 21, Turkey: 24, Bulgaria: 27, Portugal: 28).

In the current GMI, Germany is on position 87 and thus remains in the middle of the field. With a defence budget of US \$48.8 billion, it is in position 7 of global military expenditures. Its military expenditures as a share of the country's GDP come to a moderate 1.4 per cent while the share of health expenditures of the GDP is 11.3 per cent. In Germany, there are 3 soldiers and paramilitaries and 3.6 physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. The development in Germany is a result of the reform of the armed forces that foresees a downsizing of the armed forces and a reduction in military spending. The massive problems regarding

procurements and the use of new weapons systems, however, point to a trend of possible increases in spending in the future.

Currently, developments in eastern Ukraine and the Crimea are leading to a new willingness of some European NATO countries to build up their armed forces. At the NATO summit in September 2014 in Wales, demands for an increase in the defence budgets of two per cent of GDP could be heard. Even earlier, Sweden (POSITION 91) as a reaction to Russia's actions in eastern Ukraine had announced an increase in its military spending. The GMI 2015 will show whether this will have any effects on the level of militarisation of Sweden.⁴ This will also hold true for Finland (POSITION 17) whose military budget will decrease further in 2015 even though there had been long debates on whether to increase military spending or not as a reaction to Russian policy.

Ukraine itself finds itself on position 13 of this year's GMI representing its continued very high level of militarisation. Military expenditures amounted to US \$5.3 billion, representing a share of 3 per cent of the GDP. Compared to that, the share of expenditures on health of the GDP was 7.6 per cent. Per 1,000 inhabitants, there were 4.7 soldiers and paramilitaries but 3.1 physicians. The country has a well-functioning arms industry which is one of the most productive industrial sectors even though it shows some fundamental structural deficits and is outdated in terms of its technology. Ukrainian arms manufacture has a strong focus on exports. It is one of the major suppliers for numerous conventional large weapons systems for Sub-Saharan Africa. Another feature that is specific to Ukraine is the close interrelation between Ukraine and Russia which remains despite efforts to approach the West.

NATO and Ukraine have long been co-operating in the framework of different programmes; due to its relationship with Russia, however, full membership is problematic. As a result of the annexation of the Crimea and the fighting in eastern Ukraine, the discussion about accession to NATO might well intensify.

⁴ \ The current GMI purely collects data of 2013 and thus only mirrors developments until early 2014. Any increases in military expenditures will be shown in the coming years.

Table 3
The ten most highly militarised countries in Europe

Country				GMI Score	Rank
Armenia	4.9	5.1	3.0	783.0	3
Russia	4.8	4.5	3.3	761.0	5
Cyprus	4.4	4.9	3.3	757.1	6
Greece	4.4	4.7	3.2	746.8	9
Azerbaijan	4.9	4.7	2.8	746.2	10
Belarus	4.2	4.9	3.1	735.3	11
Ukraine	4.6	4.3	2.9	714.7	13
Finland	4.1	4.6	3.0	702.2	17
Estonia	4.4	4.3	2.8	693.0	21
Turkey	4.5	4.2	2.8	689.1	24

How Ukraine's level of militarisation will develop is uncertain; the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine and perception of the Russian threat are likely to further influence it in the coming years.

Russia (POSITION 5) has been pursuing a comprehensive military reform since 2008 in which the armed forces are to be repositioned, the weapons systems to be modernised and the arms industrial capacities to be improved. The country's armed forces consist of 1,4 million soldiers and paramilitaries. Therefore, there are about 10 soldiers and paramilitaries per 1,000 inhabitants. In the course of the reform, the armed forces are having difficulties in finding sufficient draftees and good personnel. With US \$87 billion in 2013, Russia's military budget is the third highest in the world. Its share of the GDP amounted to 4.1 per cent while the share of health expenditures amounted to 6.3 per cent. The last available figures (2006) speak of 4.3 physicians per 1,000 inhabitants.

As a lesson from striking deficits in the war against Georgia, the Russian leadership intends to invest in the armed forces and transform them from a mass mobilisation army into modern combat armed forces by 2020. In its effort to modernise its weapons systems, Russia also intends to fall back on western European arms technology. As a result of the deterioration of the situation in eastern Ukraine, Germany has discontinued the delivery of a combat training centre while France has stopped the delivery of the first Mistral helicopter carrier—also as a result of intra-European pressure. Regardless of the difficulties, the Russian leadership is intent on massively investing in its armed forces and its arms industry. The transformation could increase the level of militarisation even more.

Table 4
The ten most highly militarised countries in Asia

Country	\$	👤	🌐	GMI Score	Rank
Singapore	4.7	5.3	3.3	801.0	2
Korea, Republic of	4.5	5.1	2.9	756.7	7
Brunei	4.7	4.3	2.8	712.6	14
Mongolia	4.0	4.6	3.2	712.3	15
Vietnam	4.3	4.7	2.5	691.0	22
Thailand	4.3	4.0	2.2	632.8	42
Sri Lanka	4.7	3.6	2.0	618.8	46
Malaysia	4.3	3.7	2.2	616.2	50
Kyrgyzstan	4.6	2.9	2.7	613.5	54
Cambodia	4.2	3.4	2.4	603.7	65

Militarisation in Asia

With Singapore and South Korea, two countries from East Asia can be found amongst the ten most militarised countries in the world.

Singapore shows the highest global level of militarisation and has continued to increase its military spending in the past years. Its defence budget today amounts to US \$9.7 billion, which corresponds to a share of 3.4 per cent of the GDP; the share of health expenditures is only a little higher at 4.7 per cent. At 147,600, the armed forces (including paramilitaries) are relatively small, but due to the modern equipment they are considered to be particularly powerful and effective. Per 1,000 inhabitants, there are 28.4 soldiers and paramilitaries and only 1.6 physicians. The country enforces its military build-up by purchasing combat tanks, fighter planes, air defence systems and, lately, by having ordered two German submarines intended to harness the country against the danger of piracy and other warships in their coastal regions. These procurement efforts are also a reaction to the many unsolved territorial issues, the importance of strategic waterways in the region and the Chinese anti-access / area denial strategy. The expansion and modernisation of the Singaporean air force is another highly important part of the country's military strategy. This is mirrored in comprehensive procurement plans for the purchase of new fighter planes from the United States.


South Korea's high level of militarisation must be viewed in the context of the ongoing state of war with North Korea, and this is the reason why the country has a comparatively large army with 659,500 soldiers and paramilitaries. There are 13.2 soldiers and paramilitaries per 1,000 inhabitants while there are merely 2.1 physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. Defence expenditures amount to US \$33.9 billion, which corresponds to a share of 2.8 per cent of the country's GDP, and which besides China and India is the highest budget in the region. The share of health expenditures of the GDP amounts to 7.5 per cent. From the viewpoint of the South Korean government, North Korea continues to present an enormous threat.⁵ In its defence plan 2020, the South Korean government stresses again the importance of deterrence and defensive weapons systems. While numerous arms technology developments are geared towards North Korea, the increase in importance of the navy points to the fact that unsolved territorial issues with Japan and China in the Yellow Sea also have an influence of its security policy.

Besides Singapore and South Korea, Brunei (POSITION 14) and Vietnam (POSITION 22) show high levels of militarisation and are confronted with similar conflicts. Vietnam also lays claims to territories in the South Chinese Sea and is again and again involved in clashes with Chinese fishing and marine vessels. Mongolia with its Russian neighbour in the north and China in the south also features prominently (15) in the GMI. China, whose military expenditures only make up two per cent of the GDP, is on position 86, quite in the middle. With US \$188 billion, it is at the second highest position globally with respect to the level of its military expenditures.

5 \ No reliable data are available on North Korea. It must, however, be assumed that the level of militarisation is extremely high.

The depiction and use of boundaries or frontiers and geographic names on this map do not necessarily imply official endorsement or acceptance by BICC.

Map 3
Overview GMI-ranking worldwide



Source conflict data: UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset Sources of administrative boundaries: Natural Earth Dataset

Rank 1-30 Rank 31-60 Rank 61-90 Rank 91-120 Rank > 120
no data available countries in armed conflicts

MILITARISATION INDEX (RANKING 2013)

Rank	Country	Rank	Country	Rank	Country
1	Israel	46	Sri Lanka	91	Sweden
2	Singapore	47	Georgia	92	Czech Republic
3	Armenia	48	Yemen	93	Congo, Republic of
4	Syria	49	France	94	Central African Republic
5	Russia	50	Malaysia	95	Chad
6	Cyprus	51	Botswana	96	Japan
7	Korea, Republic of	52	Montenegro	97	Netherlands
8	Jordan	53	Slovenia	98	Indonesia
9	Greece	54	Kyrgyzstan	99	New Zealand
10	Azerbaijan	55	Australia	100	South Africa
11	Belarus	56	Paraguay	101	Luxembourg
12	Kuwait	57	United Kingdom	102	Burundi
13	Ukraine	58	Lithuania	103	Nepal
14	Brunei	59	Colombia	104	Nicaragua
15	Mongolia	60	Croatia	105	Argentina
16	Oman	61	Namibia	106	Guatemala
17	Finland	62	Hungary	107	Philippines
18	Algeria	63	Qatar	108	Ireland
19	Bahrain	64	Austria	109	Laos
20	Saudi Arabia	65	Cambodia	110	Uganda
21	Estonia	66	Pakistan	111	Libya
22	Vietnam	67	Italy	112	Albania
23	Belize	68	Uruguay	113	Cape Verde
24	Turkey	69	Afghanistan	114	Zambia
25	Lebanon	70	Mauritania	115	Guyana
26	Egypt	71	Bosnia and Herzegovina	116	Mexico
27	Bulgaria	72	Kazakhstan	117	Rwanda
28	Portugal	73	Brazil	118	Congo, Democratic Republic of the
29	Morocco	74	Poland	119	Togo
30	Iran	75	Moldova	120	Tanzania
31	United States of America	76	Tunisia	121	Fiji
32	United Arab Emirates	77	El Salvador	122	Dominican Republic
33	Serbia	78	Latvia	123	Ethiopia
34	Norway	79	Guinea-Bissau	124	Bangladesh
35	Romania	80	Bolivia	125	Cameroon
36	Denmark	81	India	126	Cote D'Ivoire
37	Chile	82	Gabon	127	Senegal
38	Iraq	83	Venezuela	128	Kenya
39	Switzerland	84	Spain	129	Mali
40	Macedonia	85	Belgium	130	Benin
41	Peru	86	Canada	131	Mozambique
42	Thailand	87	Germany	132	Zimbabwe
43	Ecuador	88	Honduras	133	Nigeria
44	South Sudan	89	China	134	Mauritius
45	Angola	90	Slovakia	135	Jamaica
				136	Lesotho
				137	Burkina Faso
				138	Ghana
				139	Madagascar
				140	Malta
				141	Seychelles
				142	Niger
				143	Malawi
				144	Sierra Leone
				145	Timor-Leste
				146	Liberia
				147	Papua New Guinea
				148	Iceland
				149	Panama
				150	Costa Rica
				151	Haiti

**bicc **

Internationales Konversionszentrum Bonn
Bonn International Center for Conversion GmbH

Pfarrer-Byns-Straße 1, 53121 Bonn, Germany
+49 (0)228 911 96-0, Fax -22, bicc@bicc.de

www.bicc.de
www.facebook.com/bicc.de



Director for Research
Professor Dr. Conrad Schetter

Director for Administration
Michael Dedek

AUTHOR

Jan Grebe
Researcher at BICC

EDITOR

Susanne Heinke

COPYEDITING AND TRANSLATION

Heike Webb

SUPPORT

Michael Ashkenazi, Monika Obersneider, Carina Schlüsing, Marc von Boemcken, Marianne Wargenau

EDITORIAL DESIGN

Diesseits - Kommunikationsdesign, Düsseldorf



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under:
[cf. creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)



bicc Bonn
International Center
for Conversion \