1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	A global analysis of domestic military policies governing responses to public
8	health emergencies
9	
10	Kuang Yu Hu MPS ¹
11	Ciara M. Weets ¹
12	Rory Wilson MBChB MPH ¹
13	Gunnar V. Ljungqvist MBBS MSc ¹
14	Rebecca Katz PhD MPH ¹
15	
16	
17	¹ Georgetown University Center for Global Health Science and Security, 3900
18	Reservoir Road NW Washington, DC 20057
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 deployment and 90.59% (154/170) allow military mobilization through executive 41 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

deployment policies impact the speed and effectiveness of military involvement inpublic 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 guickly 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

2014-2016 West Africa Ebola outbreak and the 2015-2016 Latin American Zikaepidemic [4].

77

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

98

99 Country Selection and Project Scoping

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

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

Member States selected for study. As five countries do not have a formalconstitution, 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

PDFs, and captured in Airtable, a cloud-based platform that hosts relationaldatabases.

147

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

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

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

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

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,

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

Figure 4. Regional and geographical distribution of permitted scope of
 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

In the shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic, many questions remain unanswered regarding how countries deployed their militaries as part of the pandemic response. This paper thus offers critical information when analyzing the relationship between civil-military operations and public health outcomes. For instance, it is possible that specific policy patterns impact the speed or effectiveness with which countries were able to deploy their militaries. These include whether legislative approval delayed responses, whether allowing military officials to hold political office led to over293 militarization of public health responses and whether a lack of clear MOOTW294 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 which countries define and regulate their military's authority, operationalisation and 321 322 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

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

338

339 References

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

Bollen M, Kalkman JP. Civil-Military Cooperation in Disaster and Emergency
 Response: Practices, Challenges, and Opportunities. J Adv Mil Stud. 2022;13(1):79–
 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.

McInnes C. Fighting the next pandemic? Civil–military collaboration in health
emergencies after COVID–19. Int Aff. 2024 Jul 10;100(4):1551–70.

5. Erickson P, Kljajić M, Shelef N. Domestic Military Deployments in Response
to COVID-19. Armed Forces Soc. 2023 Apr 1;49(2):350–71.

Gibson-Fall F. Military responses to COVID-19, emerging trends in global
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-
- 375 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/-
- 381 /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-
- 386 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-
- 395 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/DMAct2005
- 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
- 407 onstitucion-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	egislative	Not specified	Military force abolished or disbanded
Which branch of government may mobilize the military?	Mobilization Authority	Executive branch Legis	lative 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 civilian-military are not requ	of powers ired	Military force abolished or disbanded
Can the military engage in operations other than war?	моотw	Military mandate includes MOOTW	Military man does not ind MOOTW	ndate clude V	Military force abolished or disbanded





