

Critiquing Global Priorities: The UN Military Spending, Peacebuilding, and the Role of Love in International Relations

Uwomano Benjamin Okpevra^{1*}

¹ Delta State University, Abraka Nigeria

Abstract

This paper delves into the intricate relationship between international relations and government budgets, focusing on the paradoxical allocation of resources to both peace and war efforts. By examining the stark contrast between the colossal military expenditures of nations, particularly the United States, and the comparatively modest budgets of global peace-building institutions like the United Nations, the study sheds light on the values and priorities of international actors. It critically evaluates the consequences of this imbalance, such as unmet societal needs, and highlights the stark juxtaposition of rhetoric about democracy and the reality of military power projection. Furthermore, this paper explores the notion that the values of a nation can be better understood through its budget than its constitution, emphasising how the allocation of resources reflects a nation's true priorities. The work advocates for a shift away from viewing humanity through a security lens, and for a more compassionate approach to global issues, grounded in the politics of love and an understanding of the genuine dilemmas of humanity. Ultimately this paper contends that a recalibration of budgetary allocations and the promotion of love and compassion are vital steps toward redefining the principles that guide international relations.

Keywords: Global Priorities; Politics of Budget; Paradox of Peace and War; Role of Love; Peacebuilding; UN Military Spending

* Corresponding author email: okpevra@delsu.edu.ng

Introduction

The post-Cold War era has witnessed a rapid growth in peacekeeping and peacemaking interventions, due to a change in global interests and a broader interpretation of security. This has created a paradox for International Relations and conflict students who traditionally focused on the causes and remedies of war. But peace operations, while noble, have produced unintended consequences for both International Relations and the well-being of local and international interveners. This paper aims, therefore, to highlight these consequences in an attempt to influence policy and decision-makers on when and how to wage peace (Richmond 2024).

Secondly, the paper focuses on International Relations and the politics of Budget: The paradox of peace and war, introducing the dignity of critique itself it explores UN policy through several lenses, ultimately taking decision makers to task on their inattention to matters of utmost importance. The major focus is to make the world stop and think; to question the UN's prioritisation of resources from a global, post-structural worldview, and to consider alternatives. First, it sets the stage by considering the amount of attention and resources given to military force and economic sanctions, versus the attention given to accurately understanding and solving the world's problems in the long term. Finally, this paper presents a perspective on the UN priority given to military force versus peacebuilding and other forms of global problem-solving (Ivanova 2023).

In other words, this study delves into the intricate relationship between international relations, budgetary politics, and the

paradoxical dynamics of peace and war, specifically exploring their implications for conflicts in Africa. Drawing on historical analyses and contemporary case studies, the research illuminates how global power structures influence the allocation of resources, shaping the economic dimensions of conflict in the African context. Examining the paradox of peace and war, the study scrutinises instances where ostensibly peaceful endeavours, such as foreign aid or economic partnerships, inadvertently contribute to the perpetuation of conflicts. Furthermore, it investigates how budgetary decisions, both at the national and international levels, impact the vulnerability or resilience of African nations to internal and external threats. This research attempts to offer insights that contribute to a deeper understanding of the difficulties faced by African governments in their pursuit of peace and development within the global geopolitical landscape by dissecting these intricate relationships.

Critiquing The UN Military Spending

The United Nations (UN) has been criticised for its high military spending, 12.7 times higher than the Official Development Assistance and 604 times higher than the regular UN budget (Colin and Annette, 2012). The UN Secretary-General has called for a global compromise and statesmanship to resolve global challenges and geopolitical tensions, emphasising that the world needs to prioritise peacebuilding over military spending "Secretary-General António Guterres highlighted the need for 'statesmanship, not gamesmanship and gridlock' during the opening debate" (United Nations, 2023, para. 2). Africa spends more on

debt interest than on healthcare, and global military spending has reached historic figures, with \$2.24 trillion in weapons and war industry spending by April 2023. The UN General Assembly has called for more substantive content in the Security Council's annual report and pointed to the impact of vetoes on global peace. "Delegations adopted Fifth Committee resolutions on peacekeeping missions' budgets" (United Nations, 2023, para. 2). The UN-African Union partnership is vital to tackling increasing terrorism, governance gaps, and humanitarian plight in Africa, and the African Union-led peace support operations need predictable, adequate, and sustainable support "African Union-led peace support operations need predictable, adequate and sustainable support" (United Nations, 2023, para. 1). The role of love in international relations has been debated, with some scholars arguing that it can promote peace and cooperation. The implication for Africa is that the continent needs more investment in peacebuilding, governance, and development, and predictable and sustainable funding for peacekeeping operations.

In a video uploaded to Tik Tok of 1 minute and 59 seconds, on 15 October 2023, Bambacollege declared among others:

The United States spends almost a trillion dollars every year on war-making. But do you know what the budget of the United Nations is? The United Nations is supposed to be a global institution to build peace. The United Nations' annual budget is 3 billion dollars. 3 billion dollars to build peace, \$1 trillion just by the United States to produce war. You can't eat in this country. You can't find a house to live in in this country. You can't go to school and study without going into debt in this country. But you

can bomb any country in the world. The greatest country in the world is the greatest country, not because there's no hunger in it, but because you can destroy any other country. Those are your values. The values of a country are not to be measured by its constitution. The values of a country are to be measured by its budget. And the United States spends half its budget trying to destroy the world and then wags the finger and talks about democracy. *Tik Tok @ bambacollege*.

Thus, the United States allocates nearly a trillion dollars annually to its military efforts, which dwarfs the comparatively modest budget of the United Nations, an organisation ostensibly dedicated to global peacebuilding. To put things into perspective, the UN's annual budget is a mere \$3 billion, a fraction of what the US invests in war-making. This stark financial contrast raises pertinent questions about the priorities and values of a nation. According to the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, the United States spends more on national defence than China, Russia, India, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Germany, France, South Korea, Japan, and Ukraine combined (Peter G. Peterson Foundation, 2024). In 2022, the United States led the ranking of countries with the highest military spending, with 877 billion U.S. dollars dedicated to the military (Statista, 2024). The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute also highlights that U.S. military spending dwarfs the budget of other nations, with the U.S. accounting for 37 per cent of the total world military spending in 2015 (National Priorities Project, n.d.). These sources provide a comprehensive understanding of the significant disparity in military spending between the United States

and other nations, which raises important questions about national priorities and values.

In a nation where issues like hunger, homelessness, and the burden of student debt remain pressing, the substantial allocation of resources to military endeavours is both puzzling and thought-provoking. It highlights the paradox that while one might struggle to find a meal, a home, or affordable education, the capacity to wage war on any corner of the globe remains unquestioned and unhampered.

The perception of the United States from an international standpoint is indeed one of paradox and contradiction. While the nation is often lauded as a beacon of democracy, its actions tell a different story. A country that spends a significant portion of its budget on military operations while admonishing others on democratic principles and values appears inconsistent to those observing from outside its borders. This paradox can be attributed to several factors:

Military spending: The United States spends more on national defence than China, Russia, India, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Germany, France, South Korea, Japan, and Ukraine combined (Peter G. Peterson Foundation, 2024). This massive investment in military power contradicts the nation's democratic values because it highlights the priority given to military might over other areas such as health, education, and housing (IvyPanda, n.d.).

Inconsistency in actions: The U.S. has been involved in wars and military interventions in various countries, sometimes without clear democratic justifications. For example, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been criticised for not adhering to democratic principles

(IvyPanda, n.d.). Secondly, the inconsistency is portrayed in a 59-second skit uploaded to SORA Pill YouTube: US Foreign Policy in Under 59 Seconds – (SORA Pill, 2023).

As shown below: YouTube · SORA Pill

Ambassador: Gentlemen! It's a pleasure and an honour to meet you and your people. The US government support you in every possible way, ideologically, of course. However, we can not offer you any military aid at this time.

Man (in Africa): With all due respect, Ambassador, we need more than that. We are dealing with terrorism daily.

Ambassador: Oh, that's unfortunate.

Man (in Africa): Warlords overrun our villages

Ambassador: Yes, that's regrettable

Man (in Africa): Rapes, torture, and all manners of human atrocities

Ambassador: That's sad. But the US military is spread too thin, we can't afford another intervention this time.

Man (in Africa): We could use your help to protect our vulnerable plentiful and newly discovered oil Reserve.

Ambassador: Oil!!! Excuse me one second. (With excitement, he calls out) "Operation Golden Eagle is a go!" And in a flash, the US warplanes in large numbers appeared out of nowhere.

Then in a disdainful tone, he stretched out his hand to the African man and said "Welcome to Democracy" A classical demonstration of the US foreign policy in 60 seconds.

This dialogue presents a satirical critique of U.S. foreign policy, particularly focusing on the perception that American intervention is

primarily motivated by oil interests rather than humanitarian concerns. Let's analyze the key elements:

Selective Engagement: The dialogue highlights the perceived selectivity in U.S. foreign policy engagement. Initially, the ambassador offers only ideological support, dismissing requests for military aid despite serious humanitarian crises. This reflects criticisms that the U.S. often prioritizes its own interests over addressing urgent human rights issues abroad.

Oil as a Motivating Factor: The turning point in the dialogue occurs when oil reserves are mentioned. The ambassador's sudden enthusiasm and immediate military response satirize the notion that U.S. foreign policy is heavily influenced by oil interests. This aligns with criticisms that American interventions are often driven by economic motivations rather than humanitarian concerns.

Hypocrisy in Democracy Promotion: The ambassador's final line, "Welcome to Democracy," delivered in a disdainful tone, suggests a cynical view of U.S. democracy promotion efforts. It implies that the U.S. uses the rhetoric of spreading democracy as a cover for pursuing its own economic interests.

Military Readiness: The instant appearance of U.S. warplanes after oil is mentioned contrasts sharply with the earlier claim that the military was "spread too thin." This satirizes the perception that the U.S. always has military resources available when its economic interests are at stake.

Oversimplification of Complex Issues: While the dialogue effectively conveys its critique, it does oversimplify complex foreign policy

decisions. Real-world interventions involve multiple factors and stakeholders, which are not captured in this brief exchange.

In conclusion, this satirical dialogue encapsulates several common criticisms of U.S. foreign policy, particularly the perceived prioritization of oil interests over humanitarian concerns and the selective application of military power. It serves as a pointed commentary on the gap between stated American ideals and perceived actions in international affairs.

Double standards: The U.S. has criticised other countries for their human rights records and democratic practices while turning a blind eye to its military actions and the consequences of its policies. This double standard can contribute to the perception of inconsistency in the nation's democratic values.

Global impact: The U.S. military spending and its actions have significant implications for peace and stability. While the nation may claim to promote democracy and peace, its military might and interventions can sometimes exacerbate tensions and create instability in other regions (Kliesen & Bokun, 2023).

Thus, the United States' perception as a beacon of democracy is overshadowed by its significant military spending, inconsistency in actions, double standards, and global impact. This paradox raises important questions about the nation's priorities, values, and role in the international community.

This disconnect is further exemplified by the sight of warships lurking just offshore, ready to unleash destruction on foreign soil. The difference between espousing democratic ideals

and being prepared to unleash destructive power is evident, even perplexing.

The challenge lies in shifting the narrative from viewing humanity as a security problem that requires militarisation and policing to recognising the dilemmas and struggles of people worldwide. These dilemmas require different approaches, one grounded in empathy, compassion, and, above all, the politics of love. Unfortunately, the prevailing mindset among some leaders tends to fear and promote hatred, rather than understand the transformative power of love and its potential to address the fundamental needs of individuals (Council on Foreign Relations, 2023).

Ultimately, the values of a nation should be measured not merely by its constitution but by the allocation of its resources. While the United States touts its democratic ideals, it is critical to question whether they are reflected in budgetary decisions. The call to move towards a politics of love and understanding is a plea to transcend the constraints of conventional thinking and envision a world where compassion, empathy, and basic human needs take precedence over the machinery of war (Rosenfeld, 2014).

What the US is afraid of the most is peace. If the world is at peace, the US's military industry and economy will be collapsed. One can guarantee that 90% of Americans do not know anything about the US government, the world is just now starting to see how corrupt the US is. US citizens should demand the trillion dollars to be channelled internally instead of using it for war. Well, if all the countries in the UN were not completely poor besides the US, maybe they could afford it something.

It is claimed in some quarters, that the above position is pure propaganda. The state remains the dominant actor in International Relations and would take every measure to strengthen and defend itself. Can any nation uphold its global interests or even enforce peace in furtherance of its interests without military might? The UN being a supranational organisation cannot do beyond its constituent members' collective will and if they donate only \$30B, does that mean that all states must have a budget lower than that of the UN? China also has a budget of \$3.4 trillion. The US and China have their annual military spending running into billions of dollars. So, what's the point of this stance?

Theoretical Framework

Maybe one should call up neorealism as a theory of International Relations, its elements, treatment within the scholarship and its relevance to the current issues. It will generate more discussions on issues directly linked to the military interests of the US or perhaps they may raise newer issues of broader concern about neorealism as a theory. Waltzian neorealism is a theory of international relations that emphasises the importance of the state as the primary actor in the International System. According to Waltz, the International system is anarchic, meaning that there is no central authority to regulate the behaviour of states (Panda, 2023) (IvyPanda, n.d.). Therefore, states must rely on their capabilities to ensure their survival. Neorealism differs from classical realism in two important respects: methodology and level of analysis. In a method, realism was reconfigured as a rigorous and parsimonious social-scientific theory drawing in. Regarding

the level of analysis, Waltz argued that traditional realist arguments about domestic institutions, the quality of diplomacy and statecraft, national morale, etc., were less important than the distribution of power among states (Panda, 2023).

1. States are indeed the most important units of the international system according to Waltzian neorealism. However, one should always remember that neorealism is not only relevant to the state-centric system. It is the collective units with fighting capabilities that neorealism is concerned with and which in our time are the states.

2. Multipolarity does not have to occur only “when more than two actors possess nearly equal amounts of relative capabilities”. Mearsheimer has argued that multipolarity can be stable or unstable depending on power distribution. It is contradictory in that context by comparing the power of a given number of countries. You are not comparing their relative capabilities. In essence, “relative” is a form of comparison by itself. It is like preferring to compare a fraction or a percentage instead of an absolute number. Also, (this may be semantics) multipolarity is about the most powerful actors, not just any actors.

3. States “primarily” seek to survive: although this is correct, a better formulation would be that states at least seek survival and at most hegemony as Waltz argues. Offensive realists disagree (a point for another day).

4. The concept of “Security Dilemma” (SD), is similarly understood among realists. However, they disagree on its impact. This is important because it influences neorealists’ worldviews and their theories. The SD matters the most to defensive realists because they argue that its

intensity can be reduced and hence, some conflicts can be avoided. For offensive realists the SD is intractable. Therefore, although they recognise its salience, they do not accept that it can be improved and create a permissive environment for international cooperation.

5. That point on the SD is also relevant to the issue raised by Kouskouvelis about “how much capability the states seek” and the understanding of the differences among neorealists. Not all neorealists agree with each other and one fundamental reason for that is their interpretation of the SD. The issue raised by Kouskouvelis about “how much capability the states seek” and the differences among neorealists is a subject of debate within the field of international relations. Neorealism, associated with scholars like Kenneth Waltz, emphasises the anarchical structure of the International System and the importance of state behaviour in response to this structure. Not all neorealists agree with one another, and one fundamental reason for that is their interpretation of the structural constraints and the level of analysis in international relations.

Waltz’s neorealism prioritises structural constraints over a nation’s behaviours, strategies, and desires. He argued that the international system is anarchic, and states are the most important players, with their primary concern being survival and security. Neorealism differs from classical realism in its methodology and level of analysis. Waltz’s theory of international politics, presented in 1979, focused on the anarchical structure of the International system and the actions of great powers, which he believed could be explained solely in terms of this structure (Encyclopaedia

Britannica, 2024); (r/foreignpolicyanalysis, 2023).

For instance, if the SD is intractable then it becomes understandable that offensive realists like John Mearsheimer advocate maximisation of relative capabilities. He is best known for developing the theory of offensive realism, which argues that states are compelled to maximise their relative power due to the competitive nature of the international system. Mearsheimer's work emphasises the pursuit of power and security by States, and he believes that this behaviour is driven by the systemic incentive for states to become the most powerful in the international system. His theory is a type of neorealism that focuses on the anarchic nature of the International system and the actions of great powers (Johnson & Thayer, 2016).

Thus, if the SD is tractable, then it is to be expected that defensive realists argue that the necessary amount of power a state seeks... depends. Their justification for that is contingent on the SD and how they interpret it; seeking too much power, may become self-defeating. However, for Waltz, things are "simpler". He argues that the disagreement between offensive and defensive realists is a matter of strategy and depends on the situation. For him "realist theory, properly viewed, is neither offensive nor defensive... [R]ealism is best left without an adjective to adorn it."

6. Another point that must be stated clearly and remembered is that neorealism is not a theory of foreign policy but a theory of international politics. The difference is huge and often misinterpreted, hence the insistence on repeating it. Waltzian realism explains patterns of behaviour. It explains international outcomes.

Neorealism doesn't explain what states do but what states tend to do. For example, to take one of the few important things that Waltz explains, states tend to balance. Waltz explains why there has never been a universal empire and why the world is divided into states. The reason is that the strategy induced by the system is balanced. That is why there is no universal empire because balances of power emerge. Waltz argues that balances will occur and not that states will always balance. No evidence of non-balancing behaviour has disproved his theory. Waltz explains uniformity in outcomes or "continuity" as mentioned. In other words, he explains why "different countries, different internal structures, and different leaders often produce similar outcomes" but he also explains the opposite; why similar states act differently. Waltz does not say he explains foreign policy and the individual behaviour of states. He mentions that states are free to do any foolish thing they want to do. That also explains the title of his famous 1979 book: *Theory of International Politics*. Nonetheless, neorealism is not uniform and this clear and often misunderstood idea about what Waltz explains does not correspond to what defensive and offensive realists aim to do (but this is a point for a longer discussion).

7. Finally, the issues above explain why the US (and perhaps China) tend to have large military budgets and align themselves globally. The UN is not a state and you don't expect it to behave like one. Neorealism emphasises the systemic pressures that lead states to invest heavily in their militaries, as they seek to navigate a world where their security is ultimately their responsibility.

As a reminder, Neorealism posits that states primarily act in their self-interest within an anarchic international system. When applied to the large military budgets of the US and China, neorealism would argue that both nations are driven by the need to ensure their security and protect their strategic interests. The US maintains a substantial military budget to preserve its global influence, protect its allies, and secure its economic interests worldwide. This includes ensuring access to vital resources and maintaining stability in regions critical to its national security.

Critical Analysis

The video mentioned above is nothing short of Marxist propaganda filled with lies, distortions, misrepresentation of facts, half-truths, simplicism and reductionism just like any Marxist speech. It's that simple. However, that could be one's conceptualisation of the theme. And, one is at liberty to that, of course, after all, opinion is free, while facts are sacred.

A critical evaluation of the video within the context of Marxism is baffling to behold one taking a stand so absolutely against Marxism knowing full well that our world has been seriously endangered by capitalist ideology. It should be noted that Ideas and opinions are perceived differently in academic and intellectual discourse. Thus, it is a complicated issue as one may assume that the content of the video has nothing to do with Marxism or Marxist ideology. It merely emphasised the gross US military expenditure on war across the globe or military-industrial complex, as against the meagre UN budgetary expenditure of 3 billion dollars, an organ saddled with the sole task of promoting global peace, enhancing

economic integration and overall development of nations.

One intriguing question that may nag the severity of any scholar in the field of International Relations or Studies is, does the comparison between the US military budget and the annual budget of the UN make sense, even from outside an IR perspective? That could be the apples and oranges fallacy. It, therefore, becomes a desideratum to distinguish apples from oranges so one doesn't lump everything together and conflate issues because one wants to project the US as a war-driven state.

Is the US not a part of the UN? The US contributes about 22% to the same UN budget dedicated to finding peace in the world, more than any other country. But, conversely, viewed from the lens of bias, one may believe that the defence or national security budget equates to destroying the world. It may not make any sense to some, but those who think the UN has a bigger responsibility to ensure global peace and stability among nations will be amazed by how the organ is manned. Though, it's not the sole task of the US to finance the UN as a global organ, it's the responsibility of the membership of the General Assembly to ensure the UN has a big budget.

However, the principal actors (the big five) of the organ created a body the (security council) that often determines the most sensitive role of the organ, which reduces some members to a second-degree status in the organ. But, the UN Atlantic Charter, emphasised that all sovereign states are equal. There is a limitation to equality. They're juridical equals. *De facto* unequals!

In a dangerous world, one stakes in the world positively correlate with his defence budget. For instance, in everyday life, is the

security budget of a rich man the same as that of a poor man? Would you ask the rich man not to safeguard his riches and his life by throwing away arms to counter aggression from criminals? For instance, Gen. Murtala of Nigeria threw caution to the wind and treated his security with laxity, he had to pay with his dear life. It is not, therefore, necessary to use neorealism to explain a basic fact of life. This, no doubt, can elicit an intellectual discourse on the continuing relevance of IR theories.

The link between the video clip and the call for calm is that the issue of the moment is the Israeli-Hamas conflict and the role of their respective allies. Sending a video that depicts the US as destroying the world, lacking in compassion and promoting war doesn't help matters.

According to Jeremy Corbyn (former Labour Party Leader) *TikTok@ middleeasteye* MEE Opinion:

On October 7 1,200 people were killed. Since then, the Israeli bombardment of Gaza has already taken the lives of 22,000 people, and there are estimated to be at least 8,000 more bodies under the rubble. Seventy per cent of all housing in Gaza has been destroyed. 1.9 million people have been displaced from their homes.

Those hospitals that are still managing to survive and operate in some ways are going through the most horrendous conditions. Amputations without anesthetic. Lack of simple basic hygiene means that to clean wounds, they have to use vinegar if they can get it. There are millions of people corralled around the very small town of Rafah without food, water and means of escape because the border with Egypt has been closed. The only ones who can get through are those who have foreign passports.

Most of the dead are children because it is a very young population. In this situation, the United States president has just signed an order for more bombs to be sent as a gift from the United States to Israel to continue that bombardment. And some horrible shots where children are being invited to sign their names on a bomb that is going to be sent a few kilometres away into Gaza to destroy schools and kill many more children. The horrors of war as they air on live screen in front of us.

The British parliament was invited to vote for a motion calling for an immediate ceasefire in Gaza. 125 MPs voted for it. The rest either voted against or abstained. Shame on them! And shame on much of the media that keep on presenting this as a defensive war by Israel. It is an aggression against the most vulnerable, poorest, unarmed people in Gaza.

So, this weekend on the 13th January 13, 2024, all around the world, there are going to be demonstrations. In our powerlessness as citizens all around the world. We empower ourselves by going out together on the streets, whatever the weather, whatever the circumstances, to make a plea for peace, to make a plea for a ceasefire and peace and justice for the Palestinian people.

Those in Gaza are under bombardment at present, but also those in the West Bank who are having to endure settler violence. Those people in Hebron were driven out of their homes to make way for settlers to move in. Also, spare a thought for those living in refugee camps in Jordan, Syria, in Lebanon, who have been in those camps since 1948. We are now in the third or fourth generation growing up in refugee camps. And so, if you can please join a demonstration somewhere on the 13th. In

central London, the streets will be full of tens of thousands of people. No, hundreds of thousands of people, demanding a ceasefire, showing our voice is there for peace in the future. The people of Palestine are crying out for help and support to defend their culture, their lives, their language, and their very existence. The International Court of Justice will hear an application from South Africa to charge Israel with the charge of genocide against the Palestinian people. That case will be heard in The Hague.

This is not because the global conflicts are not important to Africa but because the African internal security issues are of immediate priority. Using Prof. Ibrahim I. Gambari's Tri concentric cycle model of Nigerian foreign policy, her national interest can never be anything, which has a high disintegrative potential in Nigeria, such as a war that invariably threatens unity as a people. Africa as the centrepiece of Nigeria's foreign policy viewed from the concentric circle's theory takes the national interest of Nigeria as a starting point of analysis. Prof. Gambari's innermost circle locates Nigeria's interest in global affairs as first and foremost its internal affairs. It is, therefore, better to discuss this now than to be torn apart by conflicts fought in far-flung regions of the World. Our prayers will always be with them and pray God will visit them with perpetual peace.

They want the USA to sit helplessly and watch its interests destroyed. It's strange how people think weakness brings peace despite world history showing that you have to be strong (or at least be supported by a strong entity) before you can have peace.

Capitalism did not kill more than 50 million Chinese during the Great Leap Forward programme of the Marxist Chinese Government (Marxism killed them), capitalism did not kill 2 million Chinese during the Cultural Revolution programme of the Marxist Chinese Government (Marxism killed them), capitalism did not kill 2 million Cambodians who were killed by Marxist Khmer Rouge regime (Marxism killed them), capitalism did not kill the 1.2 million Ethiopians who died during the red terror programme of the Marxist Derg regime (Marxism killed them), etc. It is an indisputable fact that Marxism has killed more human beings in world history than any other ideology.

Can one asseverate that all Sovereign States are really/truly equal in the International Relations/International Political System, regardless of what the UN Charter proclaimed? The speaker in the video clearly doesn't understand the functions of the United Nations and is just talking as if countries who join the United Nations automatically lose their sovereignty to the United Nations (i.e. countries must fold their arms against aggression until the United Nations come to their rescue). The speaker in the video is distorting facts either consciously or unconsciously.

American war machine prevented Iraq from wiping out Kuwait, American war machine prevented Iran from wiping out Saudi Arabia, American war machine reduced the deaths in the Bosnian Crisis, American war machine saved South Korea from North Korea, American war machine saved Europe from Nazi Germany, American war machine saved the whole East Asia from Imperial Japan's murderous destruction, etc but Marxist mischief makers like the speaker in this video will never mention

these realities. Where was the speaker in the video when Iran was planning to wipe out Saudi Arabia or when Iraq invaded Kuwait?

The speaker oversimplifies the role and functions of the United States as a State and the United Nations as a supranational Organisation, of which the US is its chief financial member. He presents the US as solely focused on military endeavours and the UN on peace-building. They engage in military, diplomacy, humanitarian interventions, activities, and more.

Some of these figures/statistics may have been consciously blown out of proportion by certain sources as part of well-orchestrated, well-oiled, state-controlled Propaganda machinery to discredit Marxism/Marxists!! Capitalism is credited with grave and heinous crimes in the context of the obliteration of human lives!

Considering how he has built the foundation of his argument, he is very conscious of his views and their intended outcome. Look at it again. The first issue he raised is the "US Huge Military Spending." The speaker argues that the United States allocates a disproportionately large amount of its budget to military expenditures, estimated to be nearly a trillion Dollars annually. He then contrasts this with the comparatively small budget of the United Nations, which is focused on peace-building. On that premise alone, and without further context, he concludes that the US focused on war-making and therefore, destroying the world, unlike the UN, which focuses on peace-building. The question is, does a huge military budget amount to war-making alone and destroying the world? The answer is no. States with high stakes globally must have a higher military

budget to defend themselves and protect their interests.

High stakes in global political affairs demand and translate to huge budgetary provisions to address adequately these stakes, for states that understand the critical essence of the how/what/why questions or equations!

These are personal opinions, not indisputable facts. The argument is political, not economic. It looks at how certain regimes used politics to achieve certain ends. But the point and perspective here is economic and across regimes. Capitalism has brought more disasters and misery upon humanity than any other economic ideology. Nigeria is a case study. As one reels out facts and figures from ancient history, remember there is a modern history of the deadlier evil of capitalism. A testament to this position is the concerted efforts by many responsible and responsive states to adopt welfarist governance.

At this point, BRICS should just pull the plug and charge oil with gold and not USD. That would settle it for the US. The term "invisible hand" first appeared in Adam Smith's famous work, *The Wealth of Nations*, to describe how free markets can incentivize individuals,

By and large, the emphasis here is on the intricate relationship between international relations and government budgets, focusing on the paradoxical allocation of resources to both peace and war efforts. It goes further to critically evaluate the consequences of this imbalance and advocates for a shift away from viewing humanity through a security lens, emphasizing the need for a more compassionate approach to global issues, grounded in the politics of love. Thus, it is the contention of this paper that a recalibration of budgetary allocations and the

promotion of love and compassion are vital steps toward redefining the principles that guide international relations. The criticisms and alternative perspectives, such as the argument that the state remains the dominant actor in international relations and the relevance of neorealism as a theory of international relations is well encapsulated. These counterpoints provide a comprehensive view of the complex issues surrounding government budgets, military expenditures, and the values that underpin international relations.

International Relations and the Politics of Budget: The Paradox of Peace and War and its implication for Conflicts in Africa

The 20th Century was abundant with wars between nations. Two World Wars bear testimony to how resource conflicts can lead to widespread and intense warfare. Yet what is more recently interesting is not war between nations, but rather intrastate conflicts within countries. Since the mid-20th Century, the world has seen an increase in these internal conflicts and they have been accompanied by a decline in the frequency of wars between nations. In light of this, there are two contrary trends visible in the world today. The first trend is that the number of nations at war with each other is decreasing. The second trend is that wars within nations are becoming more frequent. The work of Paul Collier focuses on the relationship between these trends and the changes like warfare and is the focus for this study.

The subject of the paradox of peace and the implications of peace operations on the security of the host country are timely given the recent

and current peace operations and the anticipated future of the nascent African Standby Force and the common African security regime. This provides for a wide-ranging comparative study with potential lessons for broader regional and global security. Although the focus is on Africa, the conceptual discussion is applicable to any area of intervention, particularly other areas of the global south. It should also be noted that while peace operations are a primary tool of intervention, one will also be discussing the broader impact of peacemaking diplomacy and the multitude of agreements often made with warring parties.

The post-Cold War era has witnessed a rapid growth in peacekeeping and peacemaking interventions, due in part to a change in global interests and a broader interpretation of security. This has created a paradox for students of international relations and conflict who traditionally focused on the causes and remedies of war. But peace operations, while noble in cause, have produced unintended consequences for both African security and the well-being of local and international interveners.

It is against the backdrop of the above that it becomes imperative to aver that there is need for Africans to know they have no business with UN as it is today. Yet, it must be emphasized that if the UN is dismantled today, the turmoil in Africa would further exacerbate. For example, Nigeria may disintegrate, and so would be Cameroun, Sudan, Morocco, Egypt, etc. Leaders would remain in power in perpetuity, merely conducting Elections. A New World Body should come but it does usually after world Wars. Think back to the formation of The League of Nations and now The U.N.O. It follows,

therefore, that if a New World Body is desire, another World War should be expected. With Africa's present economy, can she levy war at this time?

However, there has to be a world war before there can be a better and more inclusive International System and Organization. The biggest criticism of the UN has to do with the veto powers held by those considered the wrong countries; there are those who argue that this cannot be rectified without first dissolving the entire body. Others believe that, while the veto powers are a problem, it does not warrant the body's dissolution.

Is it not possible that the United Nations be dissolved and reconstituted for effectiveness and impartiality? Noteworthy is the fact that the UN has both positive and negative aspects. Most commentators from here tend to focus only on the negative aspects, and do not consider what the body is doing to impact positively, especially on the less developed parts of the world. It is alright to hammer on the negative aspects and seek for ways to correct them, just as it is good to seek for ways to increase and improve on the positive aspects.

Whatever argument is presented by regions and continents will be taken seriously only if they have successfully established a model regional organization that overcomes the UN's shortcomings. As at now, the world's attention is on BRICS. Will it be a serious and viable alternative, or just another passing fad? The EU appears stable, but what positive impact it has on members apart from freedom of movement is yet to be seen. Africa has no business with the United Nations. It is the United Nations, controlled majorly by America and its allies, that has business with Africa. In fact, the dismantling

of the UN would hasten the liberation of Africa and other parts of the world languishing under the crushing yoke of imperialism.

That there is need for Africans to know they have no business with UN as it is today, seems to be the kind of views canvassed by the so called 'African Anti-globalists'. I think that a major drawback of the UN is that it is unable to end wars especially, civil wars within the nation state because of theory of non-interference in the internal affairs of nation states. This is a long list of intrastate conflicts that the UN is unable to resolve. It has not intervened in Somalia, Libya, Sudan and even Mali and Congo. It didn't intervene in Eritrea and Ethiopia. It didn't intervene in Isreal-Gaza (Hamas), It has not intervened in Isreal-Syria, Isreal-Lebanon, and I am yet to see any intervention in Isreal-Iran. There exist Alliances forming in the void that the UN should have occupied.

Surprisingly, it still a matter of conjecture as none has been able to interrogate what makes the UN unable to intervene in these wars and bring the global peace it was established for. However, it would seem, it is simply because these wars --majority of them -- are staged to perpetuate western hegemonic control of the world.

Conclusion

The paper sheds light on the stark contrast between the colossal military expenditures of nations, particularly the United States, and the comparatively modest budgets of global peace-building institutions like the United Nations. It highlights the underlying values and priorities of international actors and emphasizes how the allocation of resources reflects a nation's true priorities. The work also questions the

disconnect between espousing democratic ideals and being prepared to unleash destructive power, advocating for a reevaluation of budgetary decisions in light of these contradictions.

The paper's call for a more compassionate approach to global issues, grounded in the politics of love, is a thought-provoking perspective that challenges traditional notions of international relations. By emphasizing the need to prioritize empathy, compassion, and basic human needs over the machinery of war, the paper offers a compelling argument for redefining the principles that guide international relations.

Overall, the paper offers a thought-provoking and timely analysis of the relationship between government budgets and international relations, advocating for a paradigm shift towards a more compassionate and empathetic approach to global issues. The paper's critical evaluation of the consequences of imbalanced budgetary allocations and its call for the promotion of love and compassion present a valuable contribution to the ongoing discourse on international relations and global priorities.

REFERENCE

- Donnelly, J. (2000). *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Einar H. Dyvik, Countries with the highest military spending 2022(<https://www.nationalpriorities.org/campaigns/us-military-spending-vs-world/>). Accessed Dec 15, 2023
- https://www.reddit.com/r/foreignpolicyanalysis/comments/1kmjba/neorealism_theory/?rdt=64262
- <https://www.tiktok.com/@bambacollege/video/7290317592915447072>,
- Ivanova, R. (2023). *Structure and functions of the United Nations in the field of budgetary relations*.
- Jeremy Corbyn (former Labour Party Leader) TikTok@ middleeasteye MEE Opinion
- John Joseph Mearsheimer <https://www.newyorker.com/news/q-and-a/why-john-mearsheimer-blames-the-us-for-the-crisis-in-ukraine>.
- Johnson, D., & Thayer, B. (2016). The evolution of offensive realism: Survival under anarchy from the Pleistocene to the present. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 35(1), 1-26. doi:10.1017/pls.2016.6
- Little, R. (2007). Kenneth N. Waltz's Theory of International Politics. In *The Balance of Power in International Relations: Metaphors, Myths and Models* (pp. 167–212). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Military spending by country worldwide 2022 | Statista (<https://www.statista.com/statistics/262742/countries-with-the-highest-military-spending/>)
- Panda, Ivy. (2023, October 31). Neorealism: Kenneth Waltz 'Theory of International Politics'. <https://ivypanda.com/essays/neorealism-kenneth-waltz-theory-of-international-politics/>
- Richmond, O. P. (2024). *Stalelated peacemaking in the liberal international order and the problem of peacemaking under multipolarity*. 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.53478/tuba.978-625-6110-04-5.ch03>
- Rosenfeld, Michel (2014) Is Global Constitutionalism Meaningful or Desirable? *European Journal of International Law*, Volume 25, Issue 1, February, Pages 177–199, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/cht083>
- Schweller, R. L. (1994). Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In. *International Security*, 19(1), 72–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539149>
- U.S. Defense Spending Compared to Other Countries (https://www.pgpf.org/chart-archive/0053_defense-comparison pdf
- U.S. Military Spending vs. the World National priorities <https://www.nationalpriorities.org/campaigns/us-military-spending-vs-world/>
- UN WAR AND BUDGET FOR International Relations and the Politics of Budget.pdf <https://ppl-ai-file-upload.s3.amazonaws.com/web/direct-files/6504329/a1e943a2-d38d-41ca-96ae-87ec8861b945/>