

# US Military Is a Bigger Polluter than as Many as 140 Countries - Shrinking this War Machine Is a Must

By [Benjamin Neimark](#), [Prof. Oliver Belcher](#), and [Patrick](#)

[Bigger](#)

Global Research, July 10, 2019

[The Conversation](#) 25 June 2019

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Environment](#), [Militarization and WMD](#)

*The US military's carbon footprint is enormous. Like corporate supply chains, it relies upon an extensive global network of container ships, trucks and cargo planes to supply its operations with everything from bombs to humanitarian aid and hydrocarbon fuels. Our [new study](#) calculated the contribution of this vast infrastructure to climate change.*

Greenhouse gas emission accounting usually focuses on how much energy and fuel civilians use. But [recent work](#), including our own, shows that the US military is one of the largest polluters in history, consuming more liquid fuels and emitting more climate-changing gases than most medium-sized countries. If the US military were a country, its fuel usage alone would make it the 47th largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world, sitting between Peru and Portugal.

In 2017, the US military bought about 269,230 barrels of oil a day and emitted more than 25,000 kilotonnes of carbon dioxide by burning those fuels. The US Air Force purchased US\$4.9 billion worth of fuel, and the navy US\$2.8 billion, followed by the army at US\$947m and the Marines at US\$36m.

It's no coincidence that US military emissions tend to be overlooked in climate change studies. It's very difficult to get consistent data from the Pentagon and across US government departments. In fact, the United States insisted on an exemption for reporting [military emissions in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol](#). This loophole was [closed by the Paris Accord](#), but with the Trump administration [due to withdraw from the accord in 2020](#), this gap will return.

Our study is based on data retrieved from multiple Freedom of Information Act requests to the US Defense Logistics Agency, the massive bureaucratic agency tasked with managing the US military's supply chains, including its hydrocarbon fuel purchases and distribution.

The US military has long understood that it isn't immune from the potential consequences of climate change – recognising it as a “[threat multiplier](#)” that can exacerbate other risks. Many, though not all, [military bases have been preparing](#) for climate change impacts like sea level rise. Nor has the military ignored its own contribution to the problem. [As we have previously shown](#), the military has invested in developing alternative energy sources like biofuels, but these comprise only a tiny fraction of spending on fuels.

The American military's climate policy remains contradictory. There have been attempts to “green” aspects of its operations by increasing [renewable electricity generation on bases](#),

but it remains [the single largest institutional consumer of hydrocarbons in the world](#). It has also locked itself into hydrocarbon-based weapons systems for years to come, by depending on existing aircraft and warships for open-ended operations.

Not green, but less, military

Climate change has become [a hot-button topic on the campaign trail](#) for the 2020 presidential election. Leading Democratic candidates, such as [Senator Elizabeth Warren](#), and members of Congress like [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez](#) are calling for major climate initiatives like the [Green New Deal](#). For any of that to be effective, the US military's carbon footprint must be addressed in domestic policy and international climate treaties.

Our study shows that action on climate change demands shuttering vast sections of the military machine. There are few activities on Earth as environmentally catastrophic as waging war. Significant reductions to the Pentagon's budget and shrinking its capacity to wage war would cause a huge drop in demand from the biggest consumer of liquid fuels in the world.

It does no good tinkering around the edges of the war machine's environmental impact. The money spent procuring and distributing fuel across the US empire could instead be spent as a peace dividend, helping to fund a Green New Deal in whatever form it might take. There are no shortage of policy priorities that could use a funding bump. Any of these options would be better than fuelling [one of the largest military forces in history](#).

\*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

[Benjamin Neimark](#) is Senior Lecturer, Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University.

[Oliver Belcher](#) is Assistant Professor of Geography, Durham University.

[Patrick Bigger](#) is Lecturer of Human Geography, Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University.

Featured image: A US Navy warship refuelling off the coast of California. [Jason Orender/Shutterstock](#)

The original source of this article is [The Conversation](#)

Copyright © [Benjamin Neimark](#), [Prof. Oliver Belcher](#), and [Patrick Bigger](#), [The Conversation](#), 2019

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Benjamin Neimark](#), [Prof. Oliver](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)