

# **JPHS MUN 2022**

## **UNSC BG**

### **AGENDA – DELIBERATING UPON ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND POLITICAL IMPACT OF WIDESPREAD MILITARY BASES**

#### **I. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>II. LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IV. FOREIGN MILITARY BASES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>V. IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Problems, Challenges and Current Situations .....	4
a. Economic burden due to Foreign Military Bases .....	4
b. Social and Political effects of foreign military bases .....	5
B. International Legal Framework: - .....	7
a. Status of Force Agreement(SOFA): - .....	8
<b>VI. COUNTRIES POSITION ON THIS ISSUE: - .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII. QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER : - .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>VIII. REFERENCES: - .....</b>	<b>10</b>

## **II. LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Esteemed Members of the United Nations Security Council, In our capacity as the Executive Board of this meeting of the UNSC, we hereby issue this letter dated 10th February 2022 acknowledging the presence of all the member State representatives who shall be present to discuss the agenda in consideration, it's implications and what measures can be adhered so as to fulfil the goals entrusted to this Organization via its mandate while ensuring compliance to the principles laid down.

History has shown that peace and security can be built only on the basis of respect and mutual acceptance. And therefore, keeping into consideration the spirit of mutual respect, we request every concerned stakeholder to look at the agenda with a multi-dimensional approach in order to allow the conclusion to be more holistic and substantially fulfilling.

The negotiation on proliferating peace and stability cannot be conceptually or practically decoupled from matters of regional trust and security and it is expected from you as responsible and integral members of the global community to appreciate and apply said nexus in the forthcoming discussions. Initiation of a productive and substantive deliberation shall be the first step towards this and we shall acknowledge the significance that it carries so as to bring out the most assuring results in the coming course of time.

We look forward to a stimulating debate and a wholesome exchange of ideas during the proceedings in the upcoming meeting of this Committee, with a strong emphasis on decorum and diplomatic etiquette. We are certain that these proceedings shall prove to be fruitful in determining the path to be taken to solve some issues that prove to be a great challenge to the maintenance of a peaceful global status quo.

**President**  
Ahan Gadkari

**Vice-President**  
Shaurya Mahajan

### **III. INTRODUCTION**

The concept of a state owning military bases on another state's territory has existed since the time of the Greek city-states. However, the number of foreign military bases increases significantly during the Cold War (from 1945 until 1991.) Ever since the end of the Cold War, there has been a decrease in the number of overseas military developments. Currently, The USA have more than 1000 foreign military bases and installations, the Russian Federation has 25 military bases abroad, France and the United Kingdom both operate extensive overseas military bases. France and the United Kingdom typically operate military bases in nations that were formerly their colonies, the Russian Federation operates military bases mostly in areas that were formerly part of the Soviet Union, and the United States often operates bases in countries where it has fought a major war, such as Germany, Japan, and South Korea. Attitudes towards these bases vary, and serve contentious debate of the necessity of foreign military bases.

Proponents of these installations, such as the owners of these bases and some hosts, argue that these bases help promote security and stability worldwide, as well as help the local economy. Critics of these bases believe that, not only do these bases violate national sovereignty; they also foster regional instability and contribute to arms races.

This topic seeks to focus on how the spread of foreign military bases across the world has affected host nations and what the best international framework or unified strategy (if any) to deal with the problems posed by such bases would be.

### **IV. FOREIGN MILITARY BASES**

Foreign military bases or installations are the facilities directly owned and operated by or for military. There is no official definition adopted by United Nations. The foreign military bases are the extra-legal jurisdictions not subject to civil law. An overseas military base is a military base that is geographically located outside of the territory of the country whose armed forces are the principal occupants of the base.

The US Department of Defense define foreign military bases as –

“The term ‘military installation’ means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility or any ship, or any other activity under the jurisdiction of a department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense, including a leased facility, except that such term shall not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbor projects, or flood control projects.”

## **V. IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES**

Normally one nation allows any other nation to establish a military base in their country if they are allies. The foreign military bases can provide essential intelligence which can play crucial role in safety of host nation and the nation who have establish that base.

These bases can be used to control any unrest situation, counter terrorist activities, assist UN peace keeping forces etc.

### *A. Problems, Challenges and Current Situations*

#### *a. Economic burden due to Foreign Military Bases*

The Foreign Military bases put an additional economic burden on the nation’s economy who have establish it. Since these bases are operated outside countries territories so transportation cost to send supplies and forces cost a lot as compare to military base within the country. Often, military bases operated by a foreign nation help to boost to the economy of the host country, as it creates new jobs for locals, increase import and export of host nation. For example, local construction contractors often perform the construction of bases as this reduces the costs for the base operator. As long as the base exists it also creates a trade cycle for local business for various items.

there is a huge economic input in terms of long-term leasing and other support infrastructure provided to the foreign nation, and in some cases the host nation is paid a corresponding monetary compensation. Another economic impact that is often overlooked the defense-spending deficit that the host country enjoys as long as they are home to foreign military bases.

For instance, the presence of US military personnel in the Philippines has often prevented the Chinese from laying claim to certain resource- rich islands in the South China Sea. When the US military left, Philippine naval spending increased by nearly \$6 billion to compensate for the lost strategic advantage. However, there are cases where ideological or political differences result in negative impacts to the economy of the host nation, manifested in increased unrest, violence, and/or damages to property. Additionally, the presence of the base may require the acquisition of prime land resulting in the loss of real state capital. The influx of people on higher wages can drive up property and commodity prices beyond the reach of the locals, as has occurred in Guam. Bases are promoted as bringing economic prosperity to local communities, however it is very common for large quantities of goods to be shipped in 'from back home' by the military that are sold in stores within the base.

*b. Social and Political effects of foreign military bases*

It has been observed that these foreign military bases widely criticized by locals due to their role in host nation. Foreign military bases are also used for the extra-judicial transport, imprisonment and torture of people. Guantanamo Bay is the best known example, but many other facilities in Diego Garcia, the Middle East and Europe are implicated in the practice known as 'extraordinary rendition'. Distortion of local economies Bases can destroy jobs and livelihood by changing access to land for farming, fishing and hunting. In Okinawa the expansion of the base removed whole farming villages, two thirds of Vieques became a military base and therefore unavailable to locals, the people of Diego Garcia (the Chagossian people) were displaced entirely, while in Greenland, traditional hunting and fishing grounds have been denied to local communities once bases were established. Strain on local infrastructure, services, resources and housing a population of military personnel - with or without their families - can be a drain on water, infrastructure, land and lead to road congestion, the crowding of schools, etc. Pressure on local housing markets is caused by military families driving up prices for residents. Environmental contamination Some communities have sustained environmental contamination through live fire exercises and residues from weapons.

Dangerous pollutants such as nerve gasses, depleted uranium, unexploded mines and shells are stored at military bases. If not properly stored, such dangerous chemicals can leak onto land and into ground water, causing sickness in local communities. Tests at the former base at Clarke and Subic Bay revealed poisonous chemicals, lead and fuel in the ground water, poisoning

ecosystems, damaged biodiversity and fish stocks. In 2000, US Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright conceded the legacy of "serious public and environmental problems" caused by US military bases in the Philippines but she reiterated that the US had no legal obligation to clean up the deadly residue. Mustard gas containers are still found in the jungles on Guam and heavy chemical pollution has occurred Guam and Okinawa. The radioactive contamination arising from nuclear testing by the French at military facilities in the Pacific continues to threaten the lives and livelihoods of the people of Tahiti. Contamination from US nuclear testing continues in the Marshall Islands and Bikini Atoll, Eniwetok Atoll and Johnston Island. Greenpeace exposed the dumping of hundreds of barrels of waste at the base at Thule in Greenland, measuring high PCB readings and radioactivity. Disputes about who is responsible for contamination at the Harold Holt Naval Base in Western Australia is ongoing between the US and Australian authorities. Public health Communities near bases are often used for "Rest and Relaxation". Angeles City became a center of prostitution surrounding the former Clark U.S. Air Force base in the Philippines. The presence of US forces in the past has led to thousands of neglected children of American military fathers - 50,000 in the Philippines alone. Military prostitution is an institution found wherever US forces have been stationed since the mid-20th century-including, in Okinawa, South Korea and the Philippines, Thailand, Taiwan and the Pacific Islands. Violence Communities around US bases have recorded high levels of rapes committed by foreign soldiers, and other violent crimes. In Japan, the highly publicized gang rape of a twelve-year-old Okinawan girl in 1995 by three U.S. Marines galvanized political activism and brought wider attention to military-related violence against women. Then commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific, Admiral Richard Macke, incensed many Japanese citizens even further when he suggested that the servicemen were "stupid" because they could have bought a prostitute for less money than they spent on renting the car used in the abduction.

President Clinton and then U.S. ambassador Walter Mondale issued formal apologies to the Japanese government. Okinawan police reports from 1945 to 1950 reveal 278 reported rapes by U.S. servicemen. A local human rights group, Okinawan Women Act Against Military Violence, cite Okinawan police records that report U.S. military personnel raped 200 Okinawan women between 1972 and 1997. This number, however, is likely to be artificially low not only because of the difficulty and uncertainty of criminal justice processes, but also because of the historical under-reporting of sex crimes. Legal immunity in many cases, the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) or the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) includes clauses

that exempt troops from local laws. In 2011 in Moldova there were protests against Russian military presence in Transnistria.

Demonstrations are connected with a Moldovan citizen shot by a soldier from Russian troops stationed in the republic. People were angry due to the immunity of troops from prosecution and their own court martial proceedings, which are seen to be far from being unbiased. The Status of Forces agreement the US has with Korea (over 100 bases and facilities) states that US servicemen cannot be held accountable for their crimes under Korean law. In 2002 two teenage girls on their way to a birthday party were run over by a US tank. The US refused for the driver to be tried in Korea, but rather in the US where they were found not guilty. In 2006 alone, 2600 car accidents were reported involving US servicemen and there is no avenue for redress as Korean insurance companies refuse to cover damages. The 1963 agreement between Australia and the US 4 holds that in circumstances where an alleged offence is committed by an officer in the course of his or her official duties, Australia has an international obligation to give the US primary jurisdiction to deal with the officer. This led to Attorney General Robert McClelland issuing a certificate that allowed the killing of a cyclist in Queensland by a US naval officer to be handled by US authorities.

#### *B. International Legal Framework: -*

In the historic 1966 General Assembly resolution, the United Nations first marked the presence of the phrase “Foreign Military Bases” that was adopted to eliminate the bases in Asia, Latin America and Africa. The resolution suggested the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Council to address the problem and provide annual reports on the matter. However, it seems, less has been done with the same. Over the years the efforts of the international committee to address these contentious issues have met with failures, as the key actors have much to lose by the formation of an international binding framework to oversee the construction, maintenance and closure of bases. Including the legal grey areas and issues of diplomatic immunity of soldiers as discussed in the guide so far. However since 2003 various community campaigns resisting military bases have started to join forces to address the spread of military bases through an international campaign. It is now known as “The international network for the abolition of foreign military bases” or “No Bases Network”. The first global conference was held in 2007 in Quito and Manta, Ecuador where the two main objectives were laid out:

1. To support the local and regional groups that are members of the Network by sharing information, developing joint strategies, and helping new campaigns to get on their feet.
2. To create space in international forums and at the UN for a critical debate both on the legality and necessity of foreign bases as a method of military domination and on the need for codes of conduct or 'setting minimal standards' for the use of existing bases.

For this, the network actively engages with other international civil society networks and with intergovernmental forums, such as the NPT 2010 Review Process.

*a. Status of Force Agreement(SOFA): -*

Status of Force Agreements (SOFAs) is an agreement upon a framework which dictates how and within what capacity foreign military personal will operate within a host country. SOFAs often discuss many provisions but the most important provision agreed upon is the right of jurisdiction in event of a crime committed by the said military personal. The biggest issue with respect to SOFAs is that there is no singular agreed framework, upon which it can be based, which results in that a SOFA signed between two countries may address but is not limited to, criminal and civil jurisdiction, the wearing of uniforms, taxes and fees, carrying of weapons, radio frequency allocation and usage, license requirements and customs regulations.

Status-of-forces agreements generally come in three forms. These include administrative and technical staff status under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Privileges, commonly referred to as A and T status; a "mini" status-of-forces agreement, often used for a short-term presence, such as an exercise; and a full-blown, permanent status-of-forces agreement.

## **VI. COUNTRIES POSITION ON THIS ISSUE: -**

USA, UK, France and Russia have most of the foreign military bases around the world. China opened first military base in the Seychelles in 2011. Afghanistan hosts military bases of USA and UK. Russia has a base in Syria which is a matter of controversy since last 3 years. Germany also host the troop of US troops of approx. 30,000 in 15 bases. Djibouti host military bases of USA, France and Japan. Saudi Arabia and China also have shown their interest to establish



military bases in Djibouti. India has Farkhor Airbase in Tajikistan which is operated with joint effort of Indian Air Force and Tajik Air Force.

## **VII. QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER : -**

1. What are the problems faced by host country due to foreign military bases and why?
2. Is there a need for a definition of a foreign military base?
3. Is there a need for a standardized framework or design for SOFA such that it meets certain basic requirements?
4. Should there be defined crimes for which the personnel of the foreign military base be subjected to the jurisdiction of the host nation?
5. Can there be a monitoring force that can be set up to monitor the activities of the foreign military base?
6. Is there a solution to reducing the negative consequences of foreign military bases, especially concerning human rights?
7. Should all the Foreign Military bases be abolished and eliminated? What shall entail a breach of sovereignty, considering the role of foreign military bases and covert operations?

## VIII. REFERENCES: -

1. <https://www.ufrgs.br/ufrgsmun/2014/files/DIS1.pdf>
2. [http://www.jepeterson.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/foreign\\_military\\_presence\\_in\\_the\\_gulf.pdf](http://www.jepeterson.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/foreign_military_presence_in_the_gulf.pdf)
3. [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/236476AD3257088DC125741000474F20-sipri\\_mar2008.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/236476AD3257088DC125741000474F20-sipri_mar2008.pdf)
4. [https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/public/Research/Africa/0413bp\\_djibouti.pdf](https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/public/Research/Africa/0413bp_djibouti.pdf)
5. <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/foreign-military-bases-and-the-global-campaign-to-close-them>
6. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/sofa.htm>
7. <http://greensmps.org.au/articles/fact-sheet-impact-military-bases>