

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A global analysis of domestic military policies governing responses to public health emergencies

Kuang Yu Hu MPS¹

Ciara M. Weets¹

Rory Wilson MBChB MPH¹

Gunnar V. Ljungqvist MBBS MSc¹

Rebecca Katz PhD MPH¹

¹ Georgetown University Center for Global Health Science and Security, 3900

Reservoir Road NW Washington, DC 20057

Abstract

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, militaries around the world mobilized at an
27 unprecedented scale to support domestic response efforts. This was consistent with
28 the growing trend of asset mobilization for military operations other than war during
29 public health emergencies. However, the global scale and vast breadth of civil-
30 military cooperation during the pandemic invites new considerations regarding the
31 authority and scope of domestic operations of militaries during public health
32 emergencies. We have systematically analyzed domestic military deployment
33 policies in each UN member state, focusing on the authority, execution and scope of
34 military involvement pertaining to domestic public health emergencies.

35

36 We analyzed legally enforceable policies, including Constitutions, defense ministry
37 authorizations, and legal frameworks. We categorized how each country codified the
38 deployment of military assets, who holds authority for deployment and the procedural
39 mechanisms for deployments. Our findings revealed that of countries with active
40 military forces, nearly all (170/171) have codified rules on domestic military
41 deployment and 90.59% (154/170) allow military mobilization through executive
42 orders. Furthermore, 58.48% (100/171) of countries with an active military have
43 codified separation of powers to ensure that civilian decision makers are exclusively
44 empowered to mobilize military forces. Finally, we found that 74.85% (128/171) of
45 countries included language that authorized military involvement in domestic military
46 operations other than war.

47

48 Our findings provide critical data for analyzing the relationship between military
49 operations and public health outcomes, including how specific domestic military

50 deployment policies impact the speed and effectiveness of military involvement in
51 public health emergencies.

52

53 **Introduction**

54 During the COVID-19 pandemic, militaries around the world were mobilized at an
55 unprecedented scale to support domestic outbreak response efforts. This was
56 consistent with the growing trend of asset mobilization for military operations other
57 than war (MOOTW), during national emergencies, especially humanitarian crises
58 and outbreak responses [1]. However, the global scale and vast breadth of military
59 involvement during the COVID-19 pandemic invites new considerations regarding
60 the authority and scope of domestic operations of militaries during public health
61 emergencies .

62

63 Civil-military cooperation describes instances where militaries cooperate with civilian
64 authorities in MOOTW. Civil-military cooperation in public health responses involves
65 using military resources and capabilities to provide clinical, logistical and personnel
66 support to assist public health interventions [2]. Their ability to quickly organize large
67 numbers of personnel, facilitate logistics and transport, and provide self-sustaining
68 medical care is a unique capability that few civilian agencies can replicate [2].

69 Historically, militaries have significantly contributed to public health responses
70 ranging from biomedical research, healthcare provision in conflict settings and
71 implementing interventions during epidemics. However, over the past two decades
72 militaries have increasingly been deployed domestically and internationally to
73 provide humanitarian relief and assist in outbreak responses [3]. The growing role of
74 military deployment in outbreak responses became particularly apparent during the

75 2014-2016 West Africa Ebola outbreak and the 2015-2016 Latin American Zika
76 epidemic [4].

77

78 Civil-military cooperation became critical from the start of the COVID-19 pandemic,
79 with an estimated 95% of militaries engaged in assisting their domestic public health
80 response [5]. The nature of civil-military cooperation was varied due to differences in
81 political systems, state leadership and political legacies. Gibson-Fall [6] proposed
82 three distinct trends in civil-military cooperation during the first 6 months of the
83 COVID-19 pandemic. These were minimal technical military support, blended civil-
84 military cooperation responses and military-led responses.

85

86 The diversity of public health response roles that militaries performed worldwide
87 during the COVID-19 pandemic is striking [7]. The pandemic massively accelerated
88 and expanded the trend of deploying militaries in public health responses. This has
89 led to important questions on current policies governing domestic deployment of
90 militaries in public health emergencies. Therefore, we aimed to identify the domestic
91 military deployment policies in each UN member state, and assess how each nation
92 codifies the roles and responsibilities of militaries in domestic emergencies. We also
93 sought to capture data that might impact outcomes, such as decision making
94 authority for using a military domestically. These data will enable future research into
95 how domestic civil-military cooperation policies impact the outcomes of outbreaks
96 and natural disasters across diverse contexts.

97 **Methods**

98

99 **Country Selection and Project Scoping**

100 We analyzed legally enforceable policies, including Constitutions, defense ministry
101 authorizations, and legal frameworks from 193 United Nations (UN) Member States.
102 The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea was not included in this analysis, due to
103 lack of access to relevant documents. All policies were identified, analyzed, and
104 integrated into the customized data taxonomy between October 2023 and August
105 2024.

106

107 This military dataset was collected as part of the larger Analysis and Mapping of
108 Policies for Emerging Infectious Diseases (AMP EID) project, which creates and
109 analyzes repositories of policy documents. All policies are collected to inform
110 decision making during outbreaks, understand the global regulatory environments
111 with implications for infectious disease events, and to be incorporated into
112 epidemiological modeling. Across the project, a single standardized operating
113 procedure (SOP) was utilized to direct data collection. Projects began with a
114 literature review to identify relevant boolean search terms to surface relevant policies
115 for the topic. These search terms and the data collection methodology were then
116 tested in a proof-of-concept study of ten countries. At the conclusion of the proof-of-
117 concept study, the research team resolved methodological issues, finalized the
118 customized search protocol and created a standardized coding procedure. The data
119 taxonomy was then developed for data collection and coding.

120

121 **Policy Identification Protocols**

122 Military deployment processes and authorities are often found in the constitution or
123 other foundational legal documents of a nation. As such, we began data collection by
124 surfacing and reviewing the contents of all digitized constitutions of the 193 UN

125 Member States selected for study. As five countries do not have a formal
126 constitution, they were excluded from this step.

127

128 We then completed a search of online legal repositories for each nation, reviewing
129 any legally-enforceable policy with a title containing the terms ‘armed forces’,
130 ‘defense’, ‘emergency’, ‘security’, ‘army’ or ‘military’. If the policy document cross-
131 referenced another relevant document, that document was searched for by name
132 and reviewed. To ensure comprehensive data collection, we finally conducted a
133 series of standardized searches using boolean search terms (Table 1). In the case
134 that the target country conducted government affairs in a language other than
135 English, Google Translate was used to translate these search terms into the
136 language primarily used to conduct and communicate governmental actions.

137

138 **Table 1. Search term series employed in policy identification protocol.**

Sequence	Query Term
1	“[Country name] AND constitution”
2	“[Country name] AND “(defense OR “armed forces”) act””
3	“[Country name] AND “emergency act””

139

140 **Policy Analysis**

141 Potentially relevant policies were preliminarily screened to ensure that the identified
142 version was current and legally-enforceable. As a result, strategies, reports, draft
143 laws, and repealed laws were excluded, as these documents are not enforceable
144 within a country’s legal system. All screened policies were then downloaded as

145 PDFs, and captured in Airtable, a cloud-based platform that hosts relational
146 databases.

147

148 For policies in languages not spoken by any research team members, machine
149 translation was used to complete translation of policies into English. When possible,
150 fluent speakers of these languages were contacted by the research team to verify
151 the translation of relevant policy provisions.

152 For all policies that passed preliminary screening, the research team completed
153 comprehensive reviews of their contents, assessing them against the standardized
154 inclusion criteria (Supplementary Information 1). Policies that met inclusion criteria
155 were then entered into the customized data taxonomy and countries were assigned
156 to a qualitative category ('status') for each of the research categories ('subtopics')
157 associated with the research questions (Figure 1).

158

159 **Figure 1. Customized data taxonomy for military engagement policy data**
160 **collection.** Figure should be read from left to right. Each research question
161 corresponds to the subtopic and status to its right.

162

163 The literature review, methodology, and inclusion criteria were approved by the
164 entire research team and the Principal Investigator. To ensure uniform decision
165 making, the research was initially conducted by a primary researcher. To validate the
166 policy coding of the primary researcher, a second member of the research team then
167 completed a review of policies and associated codes. Any coding discrepancies
168 between the primary and secondary reviewer were deconflicted by the research

169 team and the Principal Investigator. The full datasets, reproducible code, and figures
170 are available at [8] [https://github.com/cghss/military_engagement].

171

172 **Findings**

173 We found that 88.60% (171/193) of UN Member States have an active national
174 military force, while the remaining 11.40% (22/193) of countries have had their
175 militaries disbanded or abolished. These 22 nations without a military force were
176 removed from subsequent calculations, as this research effort focused solely on
177 countries that had active militaries. Of those nations that have an active military,
178 nearly all (170/171) have codified rules on which decision makers may deploy armed
179 forces and how such deployments of military assets are ordered. Jamaica does not
180 define the triggering mechanism or process for military asset deployment and was
181 therefore removed from subsequent calculations in these categories [9]. All countries
182 (171/171) were found to define the scope of military operations, though qualitative
183 analysis found that there is significant variation in how broad the mandate for military
184 intervention is from country to country.

185

186

187 **Military Mobilization Processes for Domestic Deployments**

188 Nearly all countries dictate the process by which national military forces are
189 mobilized and deployed within either their constitution or legislation. Of the nations
190 with a military, 77.65% (132/170) included the military mobilization processes in the
191 constitution. Inclusion of these authorities was found to be commonplace, regardless
192 of region or form of government. By contrast, 22.35% (38/170) of countries included
193 this mobilization process in legislation (Figure 2). Five countries lack constitutions,

194 but codify their mobilization processes and authorities in seminal legislation. This is
195 the case in Saudi Arabia and New Zealand, neither of which have a formal
196 constitution, but instead have a collection of formative legislation in which the legal
197 processes for military deployments are documented [10,11].

198

199

200 **Figure 2. Regional and geographical distribution of policy location of codified**
201 **military deployment process.**

202

203 Policies documenting military mobilization processes universally include triggering
204 mechanisms that initialize the cascade of events required for troop mobilization and
205 deployment. We found that these triggering mechanisms always fell under either
206 executive orders or legislative actions. The majority of countries with active militaries,
207 90.59% (154/170), mobilize military assets through an order from an executive
208 decision maker. However, due to the diversity of global political systems, these
209 executive orders may take different forms. For example, in Nigeria, military assets
210 may be mobilized by order of the sitting president, whereas in Bhutan, military forces
211 are deployed at the order of the King [12,13]. In 16 countries (9.36%), mobilization of
212 the military cannot be authorized without approval of a legislative body, regardless of
213 the request of the executive (Figure 2). For example, in the Republic of Korea, a
214 presidential order to deploy the military requires approval from the national
215 assembly. In Denmark, except in response to an invasion of the country, the King
216 can only mobilize military forces with approval of the legislative body [14,15].

217

218 **Figure 3. Regional and geographical distribution of governing bodies**
219 **authorized to deploy military assets domestically.**

220

221 **Civil-Military Separation of Powers**

222 The legally-enforceable policies and constitutions that dictate the process and
223 mechanisms by which military assets may be deployed often also prohibit active
224 military personnel from holding political roles in the government. These stipulations
225 create a separation of powers between political and military leadership, and
226 therefore, ensure that military mobilization orders come from civilian authorities. We
227 found that 58.48% (100/171) of countries with an active military have codified such
228 separation of powers to ensure that civilian decision makers are exclusively
229 empowered to mobilize military forces. Notably, countries with histories of military
230 coups in the modern era that have since adopted democratic practices, such as
231 Argentina, Chad, and Chile have policies prohibiting active military personnel from
232 holding executive office [16–18]. The remaining 41.52% (71/171) of nations with
233 militaries allow active military personnel to hold executive offices. Often these
234 countries have a constitutional monarchy system, such as the United Kingdom or
235 Jordan, where the regent acts as the head of state, commands the military, and has
236 political influence [19,20]. However, this is also seen in countries that exclusively
237 concentrate political and military power under a single authority body or figure, such
238 as the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic [21,22].

239

240 **Scope of Permissible Domestic Military Deployments**

241 The scope of military engagement after deployment is often included in policies,
242 though we found that it tends to be less well defined than the triggering mechanism

243 and asset mobilization process. In order to capture the diversity of terms and
244 authorities given to military assets to engage in domestic, non-combat missions, we
245 intentionally employed the broad term 'Military Operations Other Than War
246 (MOOTW)'. 74.85% (128/171) included language that authorized military
247 involvement in domestic MOOTW. Many times, these were explicit authorities, as in
248 India, where military troops were authorized under the Disaster Management Act of
249 2005 to aid in domestic natural disaster response, states of emergency, and public
250 health assistance [23]. In other cases, such as that of Peru, the constitution states
251 that the military may be used to assist in cases of national emergency, which may be
252 triggered by a disruption to the peace or public order due to catastrophe or grave
253 circumstance [24]. Although Peru provides less prescribed circumstances for
254 involvement of the military in domestic MOOTW relative to India, both countries
255 could be construed to legally employ military assets in non-combat missions
256 triggered by emergencies. The remaining 44 countries (25.73%) with active militaries
257 do not include language in legally-enforceable policy to allow for domestic MOOTW.
258 While some may include broad language, such as the Constitutions of Bolivia or
259 Algeria, which states that troops may be involved in the defense of the state and its
260 interests, there was no terminology included in the provision to definitively suggest
261 that non-combat operations would be included in this mandate [25,26]. While
262 countries that do not explicitly authorize MOOTW tend to be evenly distributed
263 around the world, we found a noticeable concentration of countries in the World
264 Health Organization's Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMRO). Within EMRO, nearly
265 half of the nations (47.62%; 10/21) do not have codified authorities for MOOTW,
266 rendering it the region with the smallest proportion of countries that have policy
267 permitting MOOTW.

268

269 **Figure 4. Regional and geographical distribution of permitted scope of**
270 **domestic military engagement.**

271

272 **Discussion**

273 In mapping the international policy landscape, we have established the authority, the
274 execution, and the scope of domestic MOOTW. The authority of military deployment
275 has been described as either constitutional or legislative, and whether it is under
276 civilian control or not. The execution of domestic MOOTW has been codified as
277 either legislative or executive, describing the two main processes by which the
278 authority may deploy military forces for MOOTW. The scope of civil-military
279 operations has also been described, and whether MOOTW were explicitly mandated
280 or not in different countries. These data provide important context on the extent of
281 military powers during MOOTW on civil society, and what guardrails are in place to
282 prevent excessive force of militaries on its civilian population. This dataset thus
283 presents several dimensions of civil-military operations policy as they may be
284 potentially relevant for pandemic preparedness and response.

285

286 In the shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic, many questions remain unanswered
287 regarding how countries deployed their militaries as part of the pandemic response.
288 This paper thus offers critical information when analyzing the relationship between
289 civil-military operations and public health outcomes. For instance, it is possible that
290 specific policy patterns impact the speed or effectiveness with which countries were
291 able to deploy their militaries. These include whether legislative approval delayed
292 responses, whether allowing military officials to hold political office led to over-

293 militarization of public health responses and whether a lack of clear MOOTW
294 authorization delays responses.

295

296 This in turn may have palpable impacts on health outcomes, by providing quicker
297 logistical relief to health services, or ensuring faster lockdown measures to reduce
298 infection rates. This is highly salient information for anyone looking at policy reform
299 to optimize civil-military operations. Militaries with policy-mandated public health
300 operations within their military code may also have been more inclined to invest in
301 training and education pertaining to public health, which in turn may have impacts on
302 health outcomes during the pandemic, or impacted their success in maintaining
303 order, instilling trust in government, enforcing lockdown measures, and aiding in
304 recovery efforts. Policies pertaining to guardrails around civil-military operations may
305 also inform research into authoritarianism escalation risk. Elucidating these
306 questions will be crucial in preparing for future pandemic efforts.

307

308 The methodology employed in this research has important limitations. The protocol
309 relied on open-source policies for included countries. As such, nations without freely
310 accessible digital copies of its policies and legislation may not have been accurately
311 represented. Furthermore, military operations may include a scope of practice not
312 codified into policy. As such, some militaries may consider MOOTW within their
313 remit, despite this not being reflected in military policy. In this way, our research
314 represents a policy landscape, but may not represent the reality of domestic military
315 operations. Finally, in periods of exceptional circumstances countries may deviate
316 from their established policies through protocolised emergency powers, which have
317 not been captured by this research.

318

319 **Conclusion**

320 The data contained within this descriptive paper demonstrates the variety of ways in
321 which countries define and regulate their military's authority, operationalisation and
322 the scope of domestic MOOTW. We applied this to the context of public health
323 emergencies, which has become highly relevant since the mass deployment of
324 militaries around the world in domestic public health responses. While we describe
325 policies which were broadly drafted in non-emergency times, instances of deviation
326 from these laws during public health emergencies were beyond the scope of our
327 paper. In describing the present policies of civil-military operations, we generated
328 and informed future research avenues on the military deployment for public health
329 emergencies. This research therefore provides much needed data to generate
330 evidence-based policy analysis for pandemic preparedness.

331

332 **Acknowledgements**

333 This research was funded by a grant from Rockefeller Foundation. The funder had
334 no part in the conceptualization, design or analysis of the study. The authors would
335 like to acknowledge the work of Dr Ellie Graeden, Tess Stevens, Hailey Robertson,
336 and Ryan Zimmerman in contributing to designing of the data structure, managing of
337 the project database, and quality control of the collected data.

338

339 **References**

340 1. Michaud J, Moss K, Licina D, Waldman R, Kamradt-Scott A, Bartee M, et al.
341 Militaries and global health: peace, conflict, and disaster response. Lancet Lond
342 Engl. 2019 Jan 19;393(10168):276–86.

- 343 2. Bollen M, Kalkman JP. Civil-Military Cooperation in Disaster and Emergency
344 Response: Practices, Challenges, and Opportunities. *J Adv Mil Stud.* 2022;13(1):79–
345 91.
- 346 3. Kamradt-Scott A, Smith F. Chapter 11: Military Assistance During Health
347 Emergencies. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Global Health Politics.* Oxford University
348 Press; 2020. p. 197–216.
- 349 4. McInnes C. Fighting the next pandemic? Civil–military collaboration in health
350 emergencies after COVID–19. *Int Aff.* 2024 Jul 10;100(4):1551–70.
- 351 5. Erickson P, Kljajić M, Shelef N. Domestic Military Deployments in Response
352 to COVID-19. *Armed Forces Soc.* 2023 Apr 1;49(2):350–71.
- 353 6. Gibson-Fall F. Military responses to COVID-19, emerging trends in global
354 civil-military engagements. *Rev Int Stud.* 2021 Apr;47(2):155–70.
- 355 7. Boland ST, Grace R, Kaplan J. Civil-Military Engagement During Public
356 Health Emergencies: A Comparative Analysis of Domestic Responses to COVID 19.
357 *Stab Int J Secur Dev [Internet].* 2023 Aug 2 [cited 2024 Oct 3];11(1). Available from:
358 <https://stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.859>
- 359 8. Hu KY, Weets CM, Wilson R, Ljungqvist GV, Katz R. Data from: A Global
360 Analysis of Domestic Military Policies Governing Responses to Public Health
361 Emergencies [Internet]. GitHub; 2024. Available from:
362 https://github.com/cghss/military_engagement
- 363 9. Jamaica. The Jamaica (Constitution) Order in Council 1962 [Internet]. 1962
364 [cited 2024 Apr 10]. Available from: <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/214629>
- 365 10. Saudi Arabia. Basic Law of Governance [Internet]. 1992 [cited 2024 Oct 3].
366 Available from: <https://www.saudiembassy.net/basic-law-governance>

- 367 11. New Zealand. Defence Act 1990 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Nov 30].
368 Available from:
369 <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1990/0028/latest/DLM204973.html>
- 370 12. Nigeria. Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria [Internet]. 1999 [cited
371 2023 Nov 6]. Available from:
372 <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/ng/ng014en.pdf>
- 373 13. Bhutan. Constitution of the Kingdom of Bhutan [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2024
374 May 13]. Available from: [https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-](https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC117663/)
375 [FAOC117663/](https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC117663/)
- 376 14. Republic of Korea. Constitution of the Republic of Korea [Internet]. 1988 [cited
377 2023 Nov 2]. Available from:
378 https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_service/lawView.do?lang=ENG&hseq=1
- 379 15. Denmark. The Constitutional Act of Denmark [Internet]. 1953 [cited 2024 Jan
380 12]. Available from: [https://www.thedanishparliament.dk/-](https://www.thedanishparliament.dk/-/media/sites/ft/pdf/publikationer/the-constitutional-act-of-denmark.pdf)
381 [/media/sites/ft/pdf/publikationer/the-constitutional-act-of-denmark.pdf](https://www.thedanishparliament.dk/-/media/sites/ft/pdf/publikationer/the-constitutional-act-of-denmark.pdf)
- 382 16. Argentina. Constitucion Nacional Argentina [Internet]. 1995 [cited 2023 Nov
383 26]. Available from: <https://www.argentina.gob.ar/normativa/constituciones/nacional>
- 384 17. Chad. Constitution de la Republique du Tchad [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024
385 May 1]. Available from: [https://cdn.accf-francophonie.org/2019/03/Constitution-](https://cdn.accf-francophonie.org/2019/03/Constitution-2024.pdf)
386 [2024.pdf](https://cdn.accf-francophonie.org/2019/03/Constitution-2024.pdf)
- 387 18. Chile. Constitución Política de la República [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Nov
388 9]. Available from: https://www.oas.org/dil/esp/constitucion_chile.pdf
- 389 19. United Kingdom. Defence (Transfer of Functions) Act of 1964 [Internet]. 1964
390 [cited 2023 Nov 23]. Available from: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1964/15>

- 391 20. Jordan. Constitution of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan [Internet]. 1952
392 [cited 2024 Jan 19]. Available from: http://www.kinghussein.gov.jo/const_ch1-3.html
- 393 21. Iran. The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran [Internet]. 1989 [cited
394 2024 Mar 6]. Available from: [https://www.shora-gc.ir/en/news/87/constitution-of-the-](https://www.shora-gc.ir/en/news/87/constitution-of-the-islamic-republic-of-iran-full-text)
395 [islamic-republic-of-iran-full-text](https://www.shora-gc.ir/en/news/87/constitution-of-the-islamic-republic-of-iran-full-text)
- 396 22. Lao People's Democratic Republic. Constitution of the Lao People's
397 Democratic Republic [Internet]. 2003 [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
398 <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/180175>
- 399 23. India. The Disaster Management Act, 2005 [Internet]. 2005 [cited 2023 Nov
400 13]. Available from: https://ndma.gov.in/Reference_Material/DMAAct2005
- 401 24. Peru. Constitución Política del Perú [Internet]. 1993 [cited 2024 Jan 17].
402 Available from:
403 <https://www.congreso.gob.pe/Docs/constitucion/constitucion/index.html#p=1>
- 404 25. Bolivia. Constitución Política del Estado [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2024 Jan 12].
405 Available from:
406 [https://www.minedu.gob.bo/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1525:c](https://www.minedu.gob.bo/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1525:constitucion-politica-del-estado&catid=233&Itemid=933)
407 [onstitucion-politica-del-estado&catid=233&Itemid=933](https://www.minedu.gob.bo/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1525:constitucion-politica-del-estado&catid=233&Itemid=933)
- 408 26. Algeria. Order of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria [Internet]. 2020
409 [cited 2024 Apr 16]. Available from: <https://www.joradp.dz/TRV/AConsti.pdf>

Research Question	Subtopic	Status			
Where in policy is the codified authority to deploy the military?	Codified Authority	Constitutional	Legislative	Not specified	Military force abolished or disbanded
Which branch of government may mobilize the military?	Mobilization Authority	Executive branch	Legislative branch	Not specified	Military force abolished or disbanded
Is there a required separation of political and military power?	Civ-Mil Separation of Powers	Separation of civilian-military powers are required	Separation of civilian-military powers are not required		Military force abolished or disbanded
Can the military engage in operations other than war?	MOOTW	Military mandate includes MOOTW	Military mandate does not include MOOTW		Military force abolished or disbanded

Figure 1





Figure 2

Percentage of Countries Within Region



Authority Executive branch Legislative branch Military force abolished or disbanded Not specified

Figure 3




Figure 4