

Military Keynesianism in Multipolar World: Divergent Strategies of the United States, China, and Russia

TAHA ALI

Introduction

A basic premise underpinning this article is, in an increasingly multilateral world marked by shifting power balances and runaway technological changes, countries are re-evaluating the relationship between military spending and fiscal policy. For economists and politicians, [military keynesianism](#) is an old, yet not worn-out debate, wherein, defence appropriation is used with the intention to stimulate the [economy](#). Yet opponents very justifiably fear that all these will lead to long-term fiscal risk and totally unsustainable debt, whereas, supporters argue dogs that investment in defence will essentially yield spillover benefits through [innovation](#), job creation, and modernisation of industries. It is, however, the same in different parts of the world, although very much in [accordance](#) with the distinct political, economic, and strategic contexts established in each country.

These three models contain around-the-world parallels. In the [United States \(US\)](#), continuous tradition of [budget deficits](#) has had as serious an operational and, indeed, a total overhaul on the military-industrial complex driven in a dynamic that has until recently been characterised by its mammoth debts piled on top of the country. Instead, in [China](#), a civil-military fusion strategy has blurred traditional lines that were distinguished in civilian industry and defence. It is a [dynamic](#) of an approach that propels a long-term geopolitical ambition, giving rise to a political ambition unbound to the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's best interests. In other words, the [Russian](#) feedback can, thus, use this energy force mind-policy of making use of energy surplus yields through economic enhancement with on-hand component able to self-support both military and economic interests. Through a contrast and comparison of such frameworks, it is observed that military expenditure gives a frame around the overall perspectives on not only national security, but also [public provision](#), thus, allowing construction for a future global order. Any of those three is reasonably good and highly varying, each with many implications on domestic policy and international relations, at the time when military power enjoys unprecedented linkage with economic resilience.

Global Perspectives: Comparing Military Keynesianism in the United States, China, and Russia

The United States: Deficit Spending and Military Keynesianism. The US has, for a long time, employed a peculiar model of military keynesianism-deficit-financed defence

spending, intended to act as an [economic stimulus](#). During and post-World War II, this model revived prominence when great military expenditure pulled the country out of the Great Depression. In contemporary times, through the means of deficit financing, the US is still vested in funding high-tech military design programs, frequenting the persistent [stimuli](#) that are expected to facilitate industrial growth and technological innovation. Deficit spending in the military sector has multiple purposes. First, it generates jobs among sectors where production relates directly to military-manufactured high-tech weaponry, aircraft, and the construction of nautical vessels and missile systems. Second, it stimulates the furtherance of innovative technology, which spills over into civil-industrial sectors via research and development. Military-industrial technology, such as the internet and [global positioning system](#), has turned around the entire economy. However, defenders of the US approach have their critics. While high amounts of deficit spending serve to swell national debt, certain analysts warn that this might eventually strain the economy. But since dollar is the reserve currency of the world, the [US enjoys](#) the rare status of being free to borrow and sustain sizable bouts of spending without becoming beholden to immediate external pressures. Indeed, continuing [debates](#) in regard to the trade-off between security imperatives and fiscal prudence articulate the complicated nature of this strategy. One of the enduring aspects of American [military keynesianism](#) is its ability, as many still continue to laud, to use public spending to trigger economic growth while deficits remain a major long-term concern. As modern US military decision-makers pour funding into advanced systems, such as hypersonic missiles, stealth aircraft, and next-generation cyber capabilities, the domestic defence industrial base continues to evolve. One should, however, present a critique.

China: Civil–Military Fusion as a Catalyst for National Modernisation. The [Chinese way](#) for military and economic development is a far cry from the American model. Instead of producing all their resources via deficit finance, the [Chinese government](#) combines their civilian and military capabilities through civil-military integration—the integration of military needs with civilian technological and industrial power. [National policies](#) espouse this strategy and view it as vital in aligning and executing China’s economic goals to aid China’s rapid growth and rise in global credentials. [Civil-military](#) fusion encompasses the understanding and incorporation of the tremendous potential of the flourishing [Chinese civilian](#) economy in bolstering military effectiveness. The government promotes collaborative research, co-designing production standards, and developing dual-use technologies that allow civilian sector innovations to swiftly morph into military gains. Magnetic resonance imaging would fall in that category. Military research and development, after all, gives a kick to growth across China in other sets of high-tech sectors.

Civil-military fusion goes beyond an [economic strategy](#); it is marked out as one of the critical pieces of the geopolitical vision of China. The civil–military integration

procedure would consecrate China to hasten its overall defence development while creating an invulnerable national ecosystem to sustain long-term growth. This, for other people, eliminates inefficiencies that are obtained from partitions [between state](#)-owned enterprises producing goods purely for civilian purposes and those for defence. By using this strategy, the government would unite resources in a troubled situation while all along helping to maintain growth [during peaceful](#) time. However, with this system, also comes challenges. Critics note that the defused distinctions between civilian and military sectors create difficult conditions for international relations, particularly defined against a geopolitical backdrop of western unease with the dual-use character of many Chinese technologies. Further, while [civil-military fusion](#) has moved along with many developments in missile technology, stealth aircraft, and space capabilities, it tussles with other concerns.

Russia: Resource-Driven Militarisation and the Energy-Defense Nexus. Military Keynesianism acquires a resource-driven character in Russia. Unlike the US reliance on deficit spending or China's fusion of civilian and military sectors, [Russia](#) has been dependent on abundant natural resource wealth, especially in oil and natural gas, to finance military modernisation and sustain a large [defence apparatus](#). In this model, energy revenues not only support the state budget but also underwrite the acquisition and [development](#) of advanced military technologies. This resource-driven paradigm harkens back to the unique historical and economic circumstances in [Russia](#). Ever since the collapse of the Soviet Union, challenges dogged Russia economically, but revenues from its natural profusion of fossil fuels have offered a very steady stream of money for the [Russian government](#). More importantly, it has allowed as much military reform to the poor industrial base of [Russia](#) as compared with what the West could accommodate. Armed with oil and natural gas, Russia [can afford high](#)-end military systems, from advanced missile defence platforms to stealth bombers and next-generation fighter aircraft-essential vehicles, for sustaining the influence Russia commands in the post-Soviet space and beyond.

One of the vital aspects of [Russia's](#) approach is the energy-military tandem in its modern system. As global energy prices rise, so do energy revenues, providing the Kremlin with budget to acquire cutting-edge weapon systems and maintain a massive military. These resource-dependent strategies have strategic implications, with [military strength](#) tied to energy exports. Essentially, Russia uses its natural resources as a geopolitical lever. Transportation of energy to Europe and Asia through huge pipelines transforms these into tools of influence, allowing Russia to impose economic costs on adversaries and secure favourable trade agreements. However, this reliance on [resource revenues](#) constitutes a serious threat. As the world shifts away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy and decarbonisation, this resource-based economic model confronts itself with a gloomy destiny.

Comparative Analysis and Global Implications

All three models—the US deficit spending, China’s civil-military fusion, and Russia’s resource-driven militarisation—stand as distinct reflections of national histories, economic structures, and strategic priorities.

The US deficit spending is made possible by American capacity to lead global economic markets and its position as the world's reserve [currency issuer](#). This also means multi-billion-dollar investments in military technology and the sustenance of a production base on defence, but not without increasing the national debt. Critics warn that once the deficits become unmanageable, the US will be forced to contend with [fiscal constraints](#), impairing its power projection capability globally. China’s civil-military integration, in the wake of rapid economic growth and state-directed planning, is transforming the Chinese military-industrial complex and accelerating [technological](#) modernisation. The integrated model gives China economic and military resilience, but dual-use and intellectual property practices have raised concerns, thereby, no doubt feeding rising [geopolitical](#) tensions with especially western nations. The Russian militarism, sustained by revenues from natural resources, is aided by energy to run its large army, using it not just as a purse for expenditures but at times as a strategic tool. However, the long-term military modernisation and sustainability of [the Russian economy](#) could be challenged as the world energy market adjustments and continued sanctions bite into its dependence on hydrocarbons. These [divergent formats](#) imply huge ramifications on a global scale. The US model puts emphasis on deficit financing to allow technological innovation while raising questions on the [sustainability](#) of its fiscal approach. China’s model is integrated and shapes international arms markets and reconfigures regional security dynamics, especially in Asia. Russian militarisation, based on energy resources, stands out as evidence of the relentless energy-and-resource dimension of geopolitics, even as the world seeks to shift away from fossil fuels.

Conclusion

In its different forms, military keynesianism remains one of the cornerstones of the national [strategy](#) of the US, China, and Russia. However, the methods and philosophies behind each approach vary exquisitely. The US uses deficit spending, which stimulates chain reactions of innovation, which help [boost military power](#); this is effective in practicing short-run effective demand but poses long-run fiscal risks. The [civil-military fusion](#) in China depicts a bigger context aimed at attaining technological self-reliance and modernising the military while encouraging [economic](#) growth through coordinated civilian and military development. Russia's resource-based military spending uses its abundant natural wealth to sustain defence spending and secure its [geopolitical influence](#) while the global energy panorama changes. The contrast between the approaches adopted to military keynesianism by the three nations will end up entering in the pages of history with

regard to domestic policy as well as international security as the centres of [global power](#) continue to shift. For progressives as well as analysts, fully grasping [nuanced strategies](#) is paramount for such sectors as future developments in global security and economic stability. In a world in which economic power and military capability are fused, these three cases will continue to leave marks on international relations and the future trajectory of global affairs.

Mohammad Taha Ali is currently pursuing Masters in Conflict Analysis and Peace Building at Jamia Millia Islamia. Prior to this, he completed a Bachelor's degree in History from Delhi University. His academic journey reflects a deep-rooted interest in understanding geopolitical dynamics, conflict studies, and historical perspectives. Through his coursework and research, he aims to contribute to the field of peace and conflict resolution

Article uploaded on 09-04-2025

Disclaimer: The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the organisation that he belongs to or of the USI of India.