



Background Guide

United Nations General Assembly [DISEC]

Agenda - Destabilising effect of foreign military
bases in sovereign states

**Jayshree Periwal High School Model
United Nations**

Table of Contents

Background Guide	1
Table of Contents	2
Letter from the Executive Board	3
About the Committee	4
About the UNGA I - DISEC	4
About the Agenda	5
What is a foreign military base?	5
Defining Key Terms	6
Historical Context	7
The Cold War Era	8
Why do foreign military bases exist?	9
Impact on host nations	10
Sustainability of military bases	11
Anti-Base Movements	12
Have these movements reached somewhere?	14
Agreements till date	15
Further Links to Research	16

Letter from the Executive Board

Dear Participants,

It is our pleasure to preside over this United Nations General Assembly at JPHS Model United Nations 2023.

This guide has been prepared with the idea that it will brief you about the issues at hand, and give you a good starting point for further research. So we request you not to see it as an end in itself in terms of preparation. Going beyond the scope of this guide during preparation is not only suggested but is a necessity if you wish to perform well.

As soon as you enter the committee, we would expect you to step in the shoes of a diplomat. This does not only mean being diplomatic and ensuring courtesy but also going the extra mile as all diplomats do. The simulation in question is not only a test of your research or your public speaking but your overall abilities. Your motive in this committee has to be to interact, indulge in logical debates which lead in the right direction and do as many things as you can - while understanding that you are sitting in a very flexible activity, where the concepts of 'right' and 'wrong' fade away.

Reiterating, you must use this document only as a reference point and make your own opinion based on your portfolio along with the research and analysis that were done.

In case of any queries feel free to contact us.

Godspeed! I look forward to seeing all of you soon.

Regards,

Adarsh Kumar Singh
President

Danish Macknight
Vice-President

Anjaneya Singh Shekhawat
Rapporteur

Note: Information contained in this research brief does not possess any evidentiary value, nor does it qualify as proof of the occurrence/non-occurrence or existence/non-existence of any fact. The brief is meant only to provide the participants with a modicum of information upon which further research can be built and does not in any manner whatsoever reflect the views or political leanings of the President, Vice-President or Rapporteur. They shall at all points in time maintain neutrality and not have any political affiliations.

About the Committee

The UN General Assembly is the only universally representative body of the United Nations. The other major bodies are the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretariat, and the International Court of Justice. As delineated in the Charter of the United Nations, the function of the General Assembly is to discuss, debate, and make recommendations on subjects about international peace and security, including development, disarmament, human rights, international law, and the peaceful arbitration of disputes between nations.

It elects the non-permanent members of the Security Council and other UN bodies, such as the Human Rights Council (HRC), and appoints the secretary-general based on the Security Council's recommendation. It considers reports from the other four organs of the United Nations, assesses the financial situations of member states, and approves the UN budget, its most concrete role. The assembly works with the Security Council to elect the judges of the International Court of Justice.

About the UNGA I - DISEC

The First Committee deals with disarmament, global challenges and threats to peace that affect the international community and seeks out solutions to the challenges in the international security regime.

It considers all disarmament and international security matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any other organ of the United Nations; the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; promotion of cooperative arrangements and measures aimed at strengthening stability through lower levels of armaments. The Committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament.

About the Agenda

“Destabilising effect of foreign military bases in sovereign states”

What is a foreign military base?

The establishment of foreign military bases has become a vital aspect of national foreign policy over the past century or so, however, their necessity and scope are highly debated issues. This guide poses the question of whether modern foreign military bases still serve as necessary aspects of international diplomacy and mutually agreed upon foreign responsibilities to safety and stability, or if basing leads to major power rivalry which undermines spheres of influence or intends to shift their boundaries.

The first implementation of foreign military bases can be traced back to ancient Greece during maritime times. During that period, they played a pivotal role in securing the strength and stability of Greek kingdoms by allowing the establishment of spheres of power around the world. After the 20th century, with the passing of World War I and II and the rise of the Cold War, the establishment of foreign military bases adopted the role they are used for today. However, it could also be argued that the question of their necessity was brought up during that same time, since during the Cold War many argued that the USA's vast international political footprint instigated clear conflict between them and the Soviet Union, thus increasing international tension and creating an environment of duress.

Nowadays, foreign military bases are part of an immense mechanism spanning continents, which works to maintain control of the great powers of the world. Foreign military bases have become vital for the survival and necessity of NATO and the European Union, as well as the current developments between Ukraine and Russia. Their importance is clearly at play now with the latter conflict which has been an indication of how military bases may, in fact, damage foreign relations and increase conflict, thus causing great doubt about whether they truly ensure safety. Recent action taken by the international community surrounding the topic includes the closure of the Manta base in Ecuador in 2017 where 400 representatives from 40 different countries came together to mould the future of foreign military base networks.

The conference and the massive anti-base campaign that followed had a massive impact on the actual political landscape of Ecuador. Moreover, since 2003, the Transnational Institute (TNI) has played a massive role in the creation of the

International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases. Overall, in today's political climate, the perception and use of foreign military bases have varied immensely from maritime times. Overseas military bases are no longer primarily used for aggression. They are viewed by many as means of assuring peace and international stability. Recently, however, there has been an increase in anti-base movements due to issues regarding sustainability and the outdatedness of said foreign military bases.

Defining Key Terms

A military base is an establishment specifically designed to serve as support and coordination for military operations and conflicts. These facilities undertake various roles, depending on whether they are navy, land or air bases. Primarily, they carry out test ranges for new weaponry, posts of intelligence operations, platforms for military operations, weaponry stock or even as hosts for military corps.

Sovereignty is a political concept that refers to a dominant power or supreme authority. In a monarchy, supreme power resides in the "sovereign", or king. In modern democracies, sovereign power refers to the ability of a state to govern itself. It rests with the people and is exercised through representative bodies such as Congress or Parliament.

Status of Forces Agreement (SOFAs) is multilateral or bilateral agreements that establish the framework under which U.S. military personnel operate in a foreign country and how domestic laws of the foreign jurisdiction apply toward U.S. personnel in that country. A SOFA provides the legal framework for the day-to-day operations of U.S. personnel while serving in a foreign country.

Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) is an agreement between a country and a foreign nation having military forces placed in that country. Visiting forces agreements are similar to the status of forces agreements (SOFAs), which are outlined above. A VFA typically covers forces visiting temporarily, while a SOFA typically covers forces based in the host nation as well as visiting forces. VFAs are necessary in order to clarify the terms under which foreign military is allowed to operate. Typically, a VFA is mainly concerned with the legal issues associated with military individuals and property.

Jurisdiction refers to the power of a state to affect persons, property, and circumstances within its territory. It may be exercised through legislative, executive, or judicial actions. International law particularly addresses questions of criminal law and essentially leaves civil jurisdiction to national control.

Intelligence Operations is a type of business analytics that allows organizations to generate a performance and feedback loop, providing decision-makers with real-time insights and visibility into business operations findings and information. These insights allow decision-makers to act on the findings and immediately observe the results of those actions. By monitoring business processes, operations intelligence assist companies in identifying inefficiencies or threats and making appropriate decisions in order to optimize business processes via the use of digital intelligence.

Anti-Base movements are campaigns advocating for the removal of foreign military bases primarily through nonviolent protests, although they may escalate into violent tactics such as armed attacks and the destruction of infrastructure. Anti-Base movements can either be pro- or anti-military and generally view military personnel as victims of the corrupt foreign bases system.

Historical Context

From the ancient civilizations of China, Egypt, and Rome to the Middle Ages, foreign military installations have been integral for the establishment of spheres of influence in foreign lands for the Empires of Britain, France, and Spain. The United States is no exception, with the first US foreign military installation dating back to 1898 with the seizure of Guantánamo Bay during the Spanish-American War. After 1898, the United States continued to establish military installations beyond its borders in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Guam, Cuba, and Hawaii. In the early twentieth century, the US military set up more installations due to the growing necessity of foreign intervention in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as in Europe after the beginning of World War I. Nevertheless, after temporary occupation, most of these bases were disbanded.

Another pivotal moment in the topic of foreign military bases was World War II, when the United States truly began to build their massive international military framework. A by-product of the war was that US bases were now spanning all 7 continents. By 1945, the United States had established more than 30,000 military installations at more than 2,000 foreign base locations.

After the war, the military left about half of these bases still in use in order to maintain a foreign presence. Never before were so many US troops stationed permanently overseas. Due to their vast nature, they began to resemble miniature US towns on foreign soil. World War II had immense economic implications for European nations, thus, creating a greater risk for the rise of communism in said nations. This great risk

became prevalent in the USA, and they began to provide external assistance to counteract the growing strength of Communism.

The Cold War Era

During the Cold War, however, the number of US foreign military installations escalated even further. The base network expanded to an immense degree to facilitate US intervention in Korea and Vietnam and contracted after active combat ended. During the Cold War, foreign bases served as a defence against the nuclear threat and improved global communications and intelligence operations. Regional base networks were also developed throughout Central America and the Middle East during the 1980s. Overall, the post-World War II US base regime was imperative as the nuclear-equipped USSR swiftly arose as a formidable opponent to the West and containment required a large US foreign military presence.

The Soviet Union also had a collection of foreign installations, though significantly less, during the Cold War along with the United Kingdom and France, which tended to establish installations in their remaining or former colonies. Other than bases in Cuba and Syria, most Soviet installations were located in Eastern Europe. As the Soviet Union dissolved, Soviet troops left foreign bases in Eastern Europe and Asia, despite the newly formed Russian state attempting to retain as many bases as possible.

Furthermore, since 1988, the Defence Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) procedure has regularly simplified basing, although primarily within the United States. America removed roughly 300,000 military troops from foreign installations in the early 1990s and shuttered or surrendered approximately 60% of its overseas military assets. All in all, the Cold War forward-base posture remained relatively unchanged until the Bush administration, when it launched a Global Posture Review as part of a larger effort led by Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld to transform the United States military forces.

However, following the Cold War's end, the US military vacated around 60% of its overseas installations, setting the precedent for the question of their necessity. Despite the significant reductions, the same military framework remained in place and soon began to expand again with the growing threat of terrorism. Throughout the 21st century, the great powers of the world portray foreign military bases as not an act of personal foreign interest, but rather a global service for all nations. This notion became even more prevalent after 9/11. This war on terrorism shifted US attention from Europe to East Asia and the Middle East. After the start of the US intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq, the military once ageing began to expand its foreign presence in the Middle East. On the other hand, it also dissolved substantial numbers of bases in

Europe. More recently, a plethora of relatively small, secretive “lily pad” bases have sprouted across parts of Africa and central and eastern Europe.

Today, a relatively small number of sovereigns have overseas military installations, including the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and Turkey. China, Japan, and a few other nations each have one foreign military base, in contrast to the United States which currently maintains around 800 overseas military installations meaning that the United States possesses approximately 90%–95% of the world’s foreign bases. In total, the US military now possesses military installations in around 80 states and territories.

Why do foreign military bases exist?

Foreign military installations and attempts by governments to gain access to other key sites beyond their frontiers have become fundamental aspects of their strategic interests. Foreign military installations are progressively being utilized as staging grounds for both non-combat and combat operations in today's modern world. A military base is a structure built or administered by the army or one of its various branches to host military equipment and troops while also facilitating training and operations to achieve a country's national security goals. Military air bases are the hub from which distant destinations for military missions are reached. As such, they are vital for the reliable support and operability of armed forces. This makes them a target for symmetrical and asymmetrical attacks.

Nations' use of foreign military bases is primarily supported by strategic objectives. In the past, major powers built overseas military outposts for further territorial gains, control over distant resources for the economic advantage of the state, invasion plans, and competition with rival states. Nowadays, such conquests are frowned upon, owing in part to the rise of post-war stability and safety ideals.

Today, armed services installations overseas are controlled by legally binding agreements reached between the host and base nations. The use of violence is highly constrained under current international law. As a result, overseas military installations are increasingly utilized for non-military functions. Constructing overseas military outposts in other nations helps a state to project global spheres of influence, such as expeditionary warfare. Depending on their size and infrastructure, they can be used as staging grounds or for administrative, communications, and intelligence support.

Foreign military outposts serve as the main framework of current military activities. Military installations typically facilitate projections of international power and provide the logistical framework necessary for a swift response to any important military

operation. Such installations additionally host various active military personnel and weaponry, including nuclear deterrents. Furthermore, some overseas installations function as information-gathering infrastructure and recon activities. Another role of overseas military installations is to discourage possible threats. Army installations function as physical indicators of the national capability to combat possible threats by international aggressors. The goal of such installations is to combat international aggressors while also reassuring and increasing the safety and stability of allies. Moreover, foreign military installations act as a means of safeguarding national interests. The construction of military outposts is often driven by the necessity to protect one's own interests and function as a force of peace and stability.

Despite the apparent positive role that nation bases take on, they seem to increase tension. This occurs primarily when a nation builds up foreign military bases around a rival state, thus increasing the chance of potential direct conflict.

Impact on host nations

Under normal circumstances, a sovereign state would allow another state's foreign presence in its territory under the condition that they are, in fact, allies and share good diplomatic relations or a common enemy. However, the long-term presence of a state in a host state may have immense political, environmental, and social implications. Although the establishment of foreign military bases may bring stability to the host nation, it may also bring instability. For instance, if SOFA negotiations are reached with unstable or illegitimate local governments, foreign military bases may be perceived as a smear on a country's sovereignty, as control over territory is given up. This acceptance of the loss of territory may result in tension within local government as it legitimizes a status of inferiority, which could result in political unrest on a national level.

Environmentally, military bases may result in substantial consequences at local levels. The testing of new weaponry, which may include chemical and nuclear techniques, could represent a possibility of contamination and accidents. Moreover, uranium-based substances can infect the soil and the water, having drastic consequences for the host nation's population. In general, the maintenance and advancement of weapon stations release harmful substances that directly affect host nations although they never receive any compensation.

Bases can also cause social upheaval. Communities surrounding the military outposts often experience increased levels of rapes committed by foreign soldiers, together with violent crimes, loss of land, and health hazards caused by the testing of

weaponry. This issue is exacerbated by inadequacies in the agreements which permit the creation of the outposts, as in most cases they require that foreign soldiers who perpetrate crimes cannot be held accountable and are granted immunity automatically

Sustainability of military bases

Every presidential administration since the Cold War has attempted to close American military outposts abroad, notably in Europe. Many of the most dramatic decreases were undertaken by President Bill Clinton. President George W. Bush maintained the pattern, closing hundreds of outposts and bringing home tens of thousands of troops. President Barack Obama recalled two Army brigades from Germany in 2012, only to reverse his decision after the Russian seizure of Crimea. In recent times, President Donald Trump launched a proposal this year to withdraw some 12,000 US soldiers from the nation, but Congress vetoed the move. Whether it was to reorient American policy, save capital while avoiding job losses in legislative districts, or avoid conflict after an apparent foreign policy blunder, modern presidents have typically aimed at decreasing US foreign footprint, thus posing the question of the sustainability of foreign military bases.

Foreign military bases typically rack up immense maintenance costs for nations as substantial investments in military infrastructure require increased taxation for funding. Due to issues derived from the establishment of foreign military bases, host nations tend to demand fees from nations looking to create bases on their soil. Negotiations allowing for the temporary stationing of foreign soldiers may replace local overseas infrastructure.

Many overseas military installations suffer similar environmental issues found at domestic bases, including toxins in drinking water, explosives on firing ranges, and noise pollution. At domestic bases, the Department of Defence (DOD) has undertaken vigorous clean-up operations. The Department of Defence is responsible for providing the military forces necessary to deter war and protect the security of the country. The major elements of these forces are the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, which are made up of about 1.3 million men and women on active duty. Most foreign military base agreements were signed before modern-era environmental awareness and, therefore, contain environmental provisions that are open to interpretation. Before the 1980s, the army kept very few documents of exact amounts or places where toxins and explosives were being utilized. Therefore, even at domestic bases, extensive study is required to unearth potential hazards. The United States armed forces have left behind substantial environmental issues, giving rise to multiple complaints by host governments and local institutions. For example, in the

Philippines, only after the U.S. army evacuated Subic Naval Station and Clark Air Base in 1992 did the Filipino government discover tons of toxic chemicals which had contaminated the land and water supply of the base or were buried in vast landfills. Moreover, in Panama 21 people died from explosives left on firing ranges, causing people to fear issues that may occur after the United States Army decides to leave. In Germany, where nearly half of all overseas United States troops are still actively stationed, industrial-grade chemicals, firefighting foams, and waste have destroyed local ecosystems near a couple of military installations. Currently, the Army estimates that amelioration of all United States-caused foreign environmental issues could cost more than \$3 billion.

Due to these social, economic, and environmental implications, it becomes clear that foreign military bases do not constitute a sustainable and efficient method of contemporary diplomacy.

Anti-Base Movements

It is relatively accurate to assume that nearly everywhere throughout history where overseas military installations have existed, they have generated a degree of anger, conflict, and protest. Sources of anti-base opposition include the forceful displacement of locals from their lands, crimes committed by army personnel, building accidents causing death, injury, and property damage, the direct support bases provide for dictators and authoritarian regimes and the substantial environmental damage caused by day-to-day military operations.

Contemporary anti-base movements emerged following World War II. Though the formation of the United Nations (UN) ensured the existence of a process of decolonization and rights to sovereignty, many allied nations welcomed US troop intervention to bases on their sovereign soil during the war. However, some, such as Iceland, began requesting the return of installations and the removal of US troops soon after the conclusion of the war. As part of the proclamation of Austrian neutrality, which included a constitutional prohibition on foreign bases, American and Soviet soldiers were ordered to evacuate from bases in Austria in 1955. As the decolonization effort garnered greater traction in the 1950s and 1960s, newly independent states ousted the US from a myriad of former British and French colonies, including Trinidad, Morocco, and, subsequently, Libya. France, Britain, and other collapsing former European empires were also compelled to abandon most of their foreign outposts due to anti-colonial warfare, nonviolent resistance, and an overall lack of funds to support facilities and troops distant from home.

Regardless of the US' image and reputation as a liberator in World War II and a protector throughout the Cold War, resistance to the US military presence erupted. Despite economic prospects for residents in the shape of on-base employment, contractual possibilities, and clients for regional businesses, opposition grew over time as the fundamental difference of US bases abroad became unavoidable. Even truly democratically governed host nations where the existing population may be fully engaged citizens, are also disenfranchised by the US involvement. They have almost no influence in what the US conducts on their land, US personnel are appointed and not elected, and they are seldom consulted.

The deployment of US nuclear-equipped missiles in Europe throughout the 1980s gave rise to a number of the Cold War's largest and greatest anti-nuclear campaigns. Many of the campaigns demanded the elimination of nuclear weaponry and the dismantling of bases at the same time. The most visible campaign in Europe and across the world was almost certainly the ongoing "Women's Peace Camp" at the US facility on Greenham Common, England. Women began frequently blocking the base's entrances, slowing military activities, and cutting past the perimeter fence to impede military drills beginning in 1981. In December 1982, over 30,000 women gathered at Greenham Common to join hands around the perimeter of the outpost. The next spring, 70,000 people formed a 14-mile human chain connecting the facility to the British nuclear weapons laboratories at Burghfield and Aldermaston.

As the Cold War ended, additional bases came under stress. For example, campaigns in Madrid, Rota, and Zaragoza pushed Spain's government to broker the evacuation of US soldiers from Madrid's Torrejón neighbourhood and Zaragoza. The withdrawal of USSR installations and forces from Afghanistan, Mongolia, former East Germany, and Eastern Europe energized activists allowing them to push for the closure of US bases in their nations.

Moreover, Okinawa has been home to the most contentious US military activity since 1995, as well as the anti-base movement that has regularly garnered the greatest global attention. Despite the strength of the protest, the demonstrations in Okinawa have had mixed results: the most contentious installation, Futenma, which the vast majority of Okinawans want to be dismantled, currently remains functioning. The fact the Japanese government is committed to establishing a successor base has sparked its anti-base campaign. The US government's plan to relocate around 9,000 marines from Okinawa to Guam and other Pacific locations by 2014 has been delayed by nearly a decade. There have been reports of at least 23 further rapes and sexual assaults committed by US servicemen between 1995 and 2011.

Following the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, anti-base protests surged in scale and power. Following the September 11 attacks, international support for the U. S. had swiftly deteriorated as millions protested internationally in 2002 and 2003 to put an end to the war. Thousands worldwide joined prominent international human rights groups, like Amnesty International, in calling for the closure of the Guantánamo Bay Naval Base.

The Italian "No Dal Molin" campaign drew global attention, attracting 50,000-120,000 people to the largest of its rallies in the city of Vicenza of only 115,000 inhabitants. Despite the expectation, the base did not open until 2013. Nonetheless, the shift conserved around half of the acreage initially designated for the base. It was designated as a peace park by the mayor. The irony of the name irritated many campaigners. They disagree on whether this could be deemed a partial win.

Members of a similar sort of movement in South Korea obstructed traffic, placed their bodies in front of construction vehicles, faced severe police treatment, and established a year-long continuous encampment to prevent the development of a Korean navy facility on the island known as Jeju. Residents, other Korean activists, and global supporters were concerned that the base would devastate a fragile and unique volcanic seashore, harm farms and the local people, and contribute to escalating military tensions with China. Before the end of the decade, thousands of local inhabitants, and Korean and foreign supporters attempted and failed to prevent the South Korean administration from acquiring 2,851 acres of farmers' land as part of the US\$11 billion development of Camp Humphreys. The South Korean government made use of riot police and soldiers to enforce the evictions.

Hundreds of people met in Quito, Ecuador, in 2007 for the first-ever worldwide anti-base summit, as part of the No Bases movement. The International Network Against Foreign Military Bases proclaimed the need for the absolute eradication of all overseas military installations. The No Bases movement is largely responsible for at least two other victories: the first, when practically every government in the African continent refused to host the headquarters for the newly formed US Africa Command in 2007, and the second, the Iraqi Parliament's 2011 decision to dismiss a Pentagon request to keep up to 58 bases in Iraq after US occupation ended.

Have these movements reached somewhere?

Anti-base movements currently face a complex and heavily imbalanced struggle for power involving an array of local, national, and international bodies. Key issues arise due to local and regional governments, and transnational, national, and local corporations benefiting from the support of a foreign military footprint. Decisions

regarding bases are rarely made strictly on the premise of military strategy or security considerations alone as economic and political interests play pivotal roles. The fact that support from national elites typically decides the result of basing disputes begs the issue of why such security consensus exist, how they are formed, and what economic and political interests drive them. Due to anti-base movements requiring the support of national governments to accomplish their objectives, the focus of anti-base activism is generally the national government rather than the US military. When the US military expresses discontent with logistical limits imposed by a campaign, it can be useful in limiting usage, increasing operational expenses, and placing indirect pressure on a national government. Finally, the key problem for campaigns seeking to dismantle bases is typically persuading national politicians and decision-makers that the cost of operating the base outweighs any political advantages gained, or that the economic benefits of closing or blocking a base vastly exceed any expenses presumably imposed by the US government.

Agreements till date

A/RES/2165(XXI)

Resolution 2165 of the General Assembly's 21st Session, titled "Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in the Countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America," from 5 December 1966, was the very first resolution created to confront the United Nations' desire to seek conclusions regarding overseas military presence in certain areas around the globe. Countries recognized that this matter is of great significance and demands serious debate because of its implications for world peace and security. This resolution further addressed the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENCD), which demanded for further considerations and studies. The General Assembly summoned the ENCD to investigate this matter in 1967, but the ENCD failed to obtain agreement or clear guidance due to its non-binding nature and the Committee's demise in 1969. The question of military outposts overseas has yet to be discussed in the General Assembly since the 22nd session.

The Oslo Guidelines

The "Oslo Guidelines" were initially developed over two years commencing in 1992. They were the outcome of a joint effort that concluded in a January 1994 global forum in Oslo, Norway and were published in May 1994. The purpose of the current Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defense Assets in Disaster Relief (subsequently known as the "Oslo Guidelines") is to develop the conceptual foundation for standardizing and strengthening the effectiveness of international military and civil defence assets in global disaster response. The standards specify that all humanitarian aid must be offered in conformity with the essential values of

humanism and neutrality, with complete respect for national sovereignty. They are connected to military installation concerns and the promotion of global ties to provide resources in the event of natural catastrophes and other necessities.

No-Bases Network

The No-Bases Network is another significant worldwide activity to address. This civic worldwide collaboration of non-governmental groups and engaged researchers has been seen since the early 2000s. The Network shares two main goals. On the one hand, to support local and regional organizations that are part of the network by providing crucial information, developing joint plans, and helping new campaigns get started. On the other hand, to generate space for international forums such as the UN to discuss both the legality and necessity of foreign bases as a method of foreign military domination and their codes of conduct.

Civic initiatives throughout the world have begun focusing on opposing the growth of military installations, primarily where military involvement has bred political opposition from progressive groups and anti-war activists. The No-Bases Network, also known as "The International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases," outlines that all nations should coordinate local and national movements opposing military involvement. It also seeks to restore decommissioned military locations. Its inaugural worldwide conference took place in Quito and Manta, Ecuador, in 2007, with over 300 activists representing 40 nations attending to investigate the effects of foreign military installations and regional people's battles against their presence. During the summit, there were press conferences on the influence of military bases on ecology, women, human rights, peace, democracy, and sovereignty. The summit was brought to the notice of Rafael Correa, Ecuador's president, who affirmed his plan not to extend the arrangement with the US for the use of the Manta Base, which was due in 2009 and in September the final 15 American personnel left the nation.


Questions to be addressed in the committee

1. What are the reasons for establishing foreign military bases, and what are the benefits and drawbacks of having them?
2. What is the impact of foreign military bases on the sovereignty of the host country?
3. How do foreign military bases affect the security of the host country and the surrounding region?

4. What is the role of international law in regulating foreign military bases, and how effective are these regulations in practice?

5. What is the responsibility of the international community in ensuring that the establishment and operation of foreign military bases do not violate human rights or cause environmental harm?
6. How can the UN and other international organizations facilitate dialogue and cooperation between host countries and foreign military personnel to address the challenges and opportunities of foreign military bases?
7. How do foreign military bases come into play in respect to cross border arms control, and its impact on international agreements like the NPT, ATT, etc ?
8. Threat of misappropriation of equipment and weaponry in foreign military bases by belligerent local groups

Further Links to Research

1. Johnny Harris' explainer on military bases
 The US Military is EVERYWHERE

2. 17 Maps of U.S. Military Bases Abroad from Base Nation,
<https://www.basenation.us/maps.html>

3. “Foreign Military Bases and the Global Campaign to Close Them.”
 Transnational Institute,
<https://www.tni.org/en/publication/foreign-militarybases-and-the-global-campaign-to-close-them>.

4. Why Overseas Military Bases Continue to Make Sense for the United States.”
 War on the Rocks,
<https://warontherocks.com/2021/01/why-overseasmilitary-bases-continue-to-make-sense-for-the-united-states/>

5. Digest, Peace Science. “Overseas Bases Could Do More Harm than Good.”
 Inkstick, Inkstick Media, 3 Apr. 2018,

<https://inkstickmedia.com/overseas-bases-harmgood/>.

6. Editor, Insights. “Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA).” 4 June 2020, <https://www.insightsonindia.com/2020/06/04/visiting-forces-agreement-vfa/>

7. Exploring solutions to US military bases https://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/publictn/eurasia_border_review/Vol32/yara.pdf

8. “US hegemony and its perils” Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the People’s Republic of China https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html