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ABSTRACT

The establishment of foreign military bases is a key matter to understand the distribution of power in spheres of influence throughout the world. Oversea bases are the first mechanism of a mass network, which works to maintain the control exercised by great powers, becoming the infrastructure for wars. The use of military power to access another country’s soil is not a modern practice, but it was from the 20th century onwards, with the two Great Wars and the consequently ascension of the USA and the USSR as superpowers, that the establishment of oversea military bases has assumed the configuration we are known to today. Therefore, foreign military bases became the most important apparatus of organizations as NATO and European Union, and the current developments regarding Ukraine, Russia and Crimea reinforce the strategic importance of it.
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1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.1 ANCIENT GREECE, THE ROMAN EMPIRE, AND MARITIME EMPIRES

To comprehend the current importance of foreign military bases, it is necessary to consider their historical deployment and use throughout history. The presence of foreign troops on the soil of independent nations has traditionally been seen as an unusual and uncomfortable reality. In fact, the use of military bases overseas dates back to Ancient Greece and its city-states (Havarky 1989).

The first written sources related to military bases can be found in the writings of Thucydides, which narrated the Peloponnesian War of fifth century BC. He wrote about how the Athenian empire established the Delian League, a military alliance which built Athens’ navy and, therefore, its power and importance throughout territorial issues (Sealey 1974). On the other side, Sparta, which had been the military leader of the Greek world, set a range of alliances through individual treaties, creating the Peloponnesian League. The dispute between these two leagues included basing issues that emerged during the war, such as those related to supply distribution and foreign help from allied city-states.

Furthermore, both Persians and Romans prized bases that controlled land-access routes to strategic locations since this was crucial for their imperial power and their conquered territories (Calder 2007). It was during Darius’ Persian Empire (modern day Iran) that the imperial route spread – 2,500km long of roads, containing stone warehouses with food and lodging every 29 km. The logistics that accompanied the creation of roads was revolutionary, including benefits for trade and the transport of cargo and people, even assisting communications - a message that previously took months to circulate now went from one side to another on the gigantic empire. These routes upgraded military capacities, since made it possible to conduct simultaneous attacks on multiple fronts.

In modern times, with the 15th century maritime empires’ expansion, expansionist powers managed to set up trading posts, warehouses and oversea bases to consolidate their might and influence, aiming to secure vital interests3. At that time, commercial importance began to walk together with military issues, with basing access turning crucial to defend new lands for exploration. Also, the presence of foreign troops during the Colonial Period is closely related to foreign military bases. The British Empire presence in the Pacific Ocean, especially in Indian Territory, could be explained by its importance – India was an outpost for strategic routes into the Asian continent (Panikkar 1977). In this case, British troops reinforced India’s value

3 As an example of those maritime empires, the Venetian and Genoan republics, the colonial Iberian monarchies, like Portugal and Spain, the Low Countries, France, Italy and, first of all, the British Empire were the leading actors of that time (Lachowski 2007).
as a colony, also giving support for commerce and military needs of the British crown.

The same can be said of the American Presence in the Pacific, when it began to establish its roots to conquer importance in Asia-Pacific. In a further period, during the 19th century, the United States was in a moment of expansion of their industry as well as of their international trade and, therefore, was in need of markets abroad. Based on Alfred Mahan’s thoughts, expressed in his book “The Influence of Sea Power upon History”, Washington believed that the only way to guarantee access into international markets was through the development of a merchant and battleship navy supported by a network of naval bases which would maintain open lines of communication between the United States and its new markets (U.S. Department of State 2013). This is the root of US navy’s power, including the importance of their overseas bases.

1.2 20TH CENTURY

From the 20th century onwards, with the two Great Wars and the consequently ascension of the United States (USA) and the Soviet Union (USSR) as superpowers, the establishment of overseas military bases assumed the configuration we know today. Only from the late 1930s did overseas military bases in other sovereign nations gradually become a more acceptable reality, for both Americans and other states (Calder 2007). The turning point for acceptance was World War II - by 1945, at the end of the war, American policymakers claimed more than 3,000 distinct military installations all over the world - the number approached 20,000 if looser definitions of a military installation are employed, though the actual number matters less than their strategic purpose (Glebov and Rodrigues 2009, 20).

After World War II, the United States deployed its forces to large foreign bases abroad in order to contain the Soviet Union. The distribution of bases in Western Europe and Northeast Asia that received US troops and their dependents are a legacy of the Cold War, specifically the unique situation in the early 1950s, when the so-called global threat of the Soviet Union drove many non-Communist states together, uniting them against a shared enemy (Pettyjohn 2013).

Moreover, World War II had debilitated many of the nations in Western Europe, which required external assistance to counter the Communist bloc, with the United States being the only nation capable of providing such needed assistance. After the Korean War, the fear of Communism impelled the weakened Asian and European nations not only to align with the USA but also to allow Washington to position American troops and their families on their territories at large bases (Pettyjohn 2013).

The Cold War period is characterized by the dispute between two poles, where
the use of military bases abroad deepened the importance of alliances, enhancing the balancing of power in a bipolar system. According to Lachowski (2007), the post-war conflict between the USA and the USSR showed that:

The period of East–West confrontation that started in the late 1940s was exceptional. It led to the unprecedented consolidation of two alliances and to rivalry between two superpowers (...) for global supremacy, containment, control of satellite states and access to sources of energy. Attempts were also made to strengthen the strategic communication lines of each alliance while weakening those of the others. The states of both blocs built up global networks of military facilities in friendly and client countries as part of strategies that aimed to confront, encircle or intimidate the other side. (Lachowski 2007, 2)

While the number of American overseas bases dropped precipitously before the end of the Cold War, during the mid-1980s, for example, the Pentagon still controlled more than 800 installations worldwide. More than 300,000 American servicemen and women were deployed to West Germany alone in 1983 (Glebov and Rodrigues 2009, 20). During the Cold War, bases served both to support nuclear deterrence and to improve global communications and intelligence for the emerging space age4 (Calder 2007). In addition to that, a large number of foreign military bases were located in Eurasia. Most of them today are a legacy of the Cold War and are situated at places that were possible points of engagement between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) (Lachowski 2007).

It is necessary to ponder that the end of the Cold War brought numerous changes in international security policies, creating the urge to demonstrate cooperation and build confidence across former blocs’ divisions. In spite of the declared political partnership between Russia and the USA and huge cutbacks in Western Europe’s heavy armaments, there was no radical realignment of armed forces in the last decade of the 20th century (Lachowski 2007, 3).

Another point of history that is important to consider is related to the French presence in Africa, which had its start in the 19th century. Later, when France’s former colonies in Africa began to gain their independence, between 1960 and 1995, it started to sign bilateral treaties with its former colonies, with a variety of degrees in relation to military cooperation and support. One of the commitments made in these treaties was to allow French military bases in that state’s territory. Therefore, most of the operations involved in protecting French nationals and its allied governments in Africa during the 20th century used such bases (Hansen 2008).

4 Space age began to deepen its importance with the use of space assets in the bipolar dispute between the USSR and the United States, primarily with the launch of Sputnik, in 1957. Across its importance, space technology served, initially, to ensure accurate communications, also seeking approval of public opinion towards the Cold War period.
1.3 21ST CENTURY

At the 21st century, new directions have been taken by the main states that display military bases overseas in relation to the types of efforts involving military bases. The deepening struggle against terrorism has become central, especially after the September 2001 attacks. The key threats to the USA were redefined as growing religious extremism and other asymmetric threats (e.g. unconventional warfare, crime, and the threat of the proliferation of weapons and technologies of mass destruction) (Lachowski 2007). According to Calder (2007),

(...) since 9/11, the United States has also come to face an increasingly complex political basing problem. As the struggle against terrorism has broadened into a global “arc of instability” within the developing world, and as even America's industrialized allies have grown skeptical and weary, the pressures on America to retrench have deepened once again, from Saudi Arabia to Turkey, South Korea, and beyond. Something much larger than an “Iraq War syndrome” is at work, although Iraq has proven to be an important catalyst. (Calder 2007)

The shock of the terrorist attacks led to a significant redirection of US attention (and military assets) from Europe to Central Asia and Middle East, including the Caspian–Caucasus area. The broad international anti-terrorist front that was formed after the attacks on the USA enabled Western forces to be deployed close to certain parts of Asia that had been considered Russia’s traditional sphere of influence (Lachowski 2007, 3-4). Therefore, the US political and military involvement in some East European and Asian states - Afghanistan, Iraq and some Central Asian states - and the proximity of US forces to the borders of China and Russia have created a qualitatively new situation (Lachowski 2007).

France, by its turn, has reduced the size of its forces in Africa, while the USA is increasing its presence on the other side. Along with the counterterrorism force in Djibouti, Washington has secured agreements with southern and western African nations to provide them with logistical support, while it has also worked to build new drone bases in Niger. The US military also has launched a new joint command, US-Africa Command (AFRICOM) to oversee operations on the continent. The command entered in operations in October 2007 out of the offices of the US European Command in Stuttgart, Germany, and is currently seeking a permanent state to host it in Africa (Hansen 2008). This American command could be taken as a sign that the exclusively French military influence and presence in Africa is effectively over, besides its actual presence and actions.
2 STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

2.1 FOREIGN MILITARY BASES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

By definition, a military base is an installation created to serve as support for military operations and logistics (Glebov 2009). These facilities can play different roles, being related to several types of bases, such as navy, land or air bases. Depending on the role it takes, there are many functions that these settlements can exert: test-ranges for new weaponry, posts of intelligence operations, platforms for military operations, weaponry stock or even as host for military corps.

The main controversial issue concerning military bases is its establishment in foreign states’ territory, a common practice related to global distribution of power in spheres of influence. Usually linked with great powers’ foreign policy, military installations abroad have led the international community to many debates associated with the principle of sovereignty.

Sovereignty is a concept which has its roots in philosophers from Socrates to Thomas Hobbes. However, the idea formally became a principle in the Westphalian context where the Nation-states were born (Jackson 2003). It represents the highest authority exerted by a legal state within its territory (Calster, n.d.). Thus, state sovereignty is directly linked with the notion of borders and territory.

Territory is simultaneously a condition for a state to exist and a limitation to its rights: in principle, a state is sovereign only in its territory. (…) Sovereignty, in regard to a portion of the globe, has been described as a right to exercise therein, to the exclusion of any other state, the function of a state (Calster, n.d.).

Therefore, according to this concept of sovereignty, no other state can impose its jurisdiction abroad, only inside its own territory. In other words, the principle of sovereignty of a state clashes with the implementation of military bases belonging to other country inside another one’s territory. In this sense, as the presence of foreign military bases increased since the late of the 20th century, the need to solve this paradox and the importance of regulating this situation based on International Law have become apparent (Manson 2012). The results of this discussion were the Visiting Force Agreement (VFA) and the Status of Force Agreement (SOFA).

2.1.1 THE VISITING FORCE AND THE STATUS OF FORCE AGREEMENTS

The Visiting Force Agreement (VFA) and the Status of Force Agreement (SOFA) have basically the same meanings. The only substantial difference between them is their scope: the VFA covers forces which are temporally present in a foreign
territory, while the SOFA regulates the situation of military installations effectively established in a host state (Manson 2012).

Both agreements are created to formalize the superiority of extraterritorial jurisdiction on civil law. The principle of extraterritoriality refers to the exercise of legal power beyond a state’s territorial borders (Colangelo 2014). It means that countries that maintain military forces abroad have the right to exercise their own exclusive jurisdiction over their installations hosted in foreign states. According to Erik Rosenfeld, researcher at the University of Washington:

> It was unclear how customary international law would deal with criminal jurisdiction over visiting forces, especially the problem of concurrent jurisdiction over crimes committed by visiting forces on foreign territory. In order to resolve these problems, SOFAs were developed for the express purpose of defining the legal rights and responsibilities of military forces stationed on foreign soil. SOFAs are international agreements between states that create obligations concerning the jurisdiction over foreign state’s military or civilian citizen.” (Rosenfeld 2014, p.280)

Thus, VFAs and SOFAs are multilateral or bilateral agreements that generally establish the framework under which a state’s military forces can operate in a foreign country (Manson 2012). However, a formal document which specifies the guidelines of these agreements does not exist yet. Then, VFAs and SOFAs are required by states when it is necessary for a specific purpose, but these agreement’s rules are shaped according to the negotiations among countries involved (Manson 2012).

Commonly, the main issue concerning SOFAs is related to the jurisdiction which will prevail in that specific area, but other provisions dealing with subjects such as taxes and fees, test-ranges for weaponry and number of troops are also included in the SOFAs scope (Manson 2012). It is important to notice that VFAs and SOFAs are not security agreements and do not address the rules of war. According to Manson (2012, p.1): “(...) in the event of armed conflict between parties to a SOFA, the terms of the agreement would no longer be applicable”.

The most important multilateral SOFA is the NATO SOFA, from 1949, among USA and NATO’s countries. This is the only Status of Force Agreement concluded as part of a treaty. Composed of 20 articles, the NATO SOFA is an example of shared jurisdictions:

> Under the shared jurisdiction framework, each of the respective countries is provided exclusive jurisdiction in specific circumstances, generally when an offense is only punishable by one of the country’s laws. In that case, the country whose law has been offended has exclusive jurisdiction over the offender. When the offense violates the laws of both countries, concurrent jurisdiction is present and additional qualifications are used to determine which country will be allowed to assert jurisdiction over the offender (Manson 2012).
This shared jurisdiction gives a cooperative nature to NATO SOFA, unlike what happens with other bilateral agreement such as the VFA between USA and Mongolia. Based on this document, the USA have exclusive jurisdiction over US personnel, according to US laws.

Any offense against Mongolia’s laws shall be referred to US authorities. There is no requirement for the United States to waive jurisdiction, only to give “sympathetic consideration” of any such request. (Manson 2012)

Finally, the other multilateral SOFA of great importance is the United Nations SOFA. It is based on pacific principles, being the official guidelines to peace-keeping operations. Since 2002, in the context of the peace-keeping mission in Bosnia, the USA and other countries started to request immunity to their troops for fear of being prosecuted for a crime by the International Criminal Court (ICC). As a result, UN has adopted a SOFA for peace-keeping operations that provides broader sending-state criminal jurisdiction than the NATO SOFA (Rosenfeld 2003). In other words, the UN SOFA provides exclusive jurisdiction over any criminal offense that may be committed by peace-keeping forces. With this, states’ forces participating in UN actions receive greater protection from ICC prosecution than in other unilateral military action. According to Rosenfeld (2003, p.290), “(...) this protection increases incentives for countries’ participation in UN missions rather than acting unilaterally or through NATO”.

Therefore, with all these agreements, the establishment of foreign military bases has become more regulated in accordance to International Law. With this, great powers can appeal to the principle of extraterritoriality, which is the main base of Visiting Forces and Status of Force Agreements, to extend the protection of their law to their forces installed abroad.

2.2 THE ROLE OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES

The establishment of military bases is a practice which has increased since the Cold War. For the USA, having access to foreign territories meant conquering spheres of influence which were needed to contain the spread of communism represented by the Soviet Union (Pettyjohn 2013). Since then, the USA has become the state which has more military installations abroad in the world and its presence in many strategic regions of different continents has become part of US foreign policy.

Nowadays, according to the Global Research Centre, the USA controls between 700 and 800 bases worldwide. According to Wilbert van der Zeijden (2009), from the Transnational Institute:
(...)

Many of the 300 overseas military interventions and invasions of the US in the past century, like Korean War, Vietnam War and Gulf War, were only possible because the US had well-positioned military facilities to launch and support these military operations (Zeijden 2009).

**Image 1 - The US Military Footprint on the World**

[Map showing US military footprint around the world]

*Source: US Department of Defense, Base Structure Report, 2008*

Other countries, such as France and the United Kingdom, also operate in a significant number of military installations abroad as a remaining of their colonial empires. The French presence in Africa is still very remarkable and dates from the 17th century. However, it was just in the 19th century that African territories under French influence became colonies. The new imperialism practices established in the 1880’s have resulted in the scramble for Africa, when European powers divided and annexed regions of the African continent, during the Berlin Conference of 1884 (Hansen 2008). With the end of World War II, a multiple process of independences started among African states. However, the formal imperialism that dominated Africa was replaced by foreign military presence and strategic economic partnerships (Hansen 2008).
Today, Africa represents an important French supplier of oil and metals and is a significant market for France’s exports (Hansen 2008). Therefore, in order to secure its national interests, France maintains military bases in countries such as Chad, Djibouti, Gabon, Ivory Coast, and Senegal. There are French troops installed in Mali and Libya too, as result of recent peacekeeping operations (Hansen 2008).

The United Kingdom also is an important actor regarding foreign military bases issues. The country has fourteen British Overseas Territories (BOT), which are under UK jurisdiction and sovereignty (Ministry of Defense 2014). According to The Telegraph newspaper (2011), “Britain acquired most of them at the apogee of its national power and prestige, with dates of acquisition ranging from the 17th to the early 20th century”. Bermuda was the first, settled in 1609; Britain claimed the last, the British Antarctic Territory, in 1908. These territories are located in strategic
region of the Caribbean Sea, North and South Atlantic and in the Indian Ocean.

The British National Security Strategy Review (2010) identifies the protection of overseas territories as part of UK security policies. Therefore, the country maintains military facilities in these regions in order to maintain their stability, intervening overseas and using coercive force when it is necessary to guarantee national vital interests (Ministry of Defense 2014).

The British Ministry of Defense provides a permanently military presence of around 1,300 personnel in South Atlantic Islands such as the Falklands/Malvinas and South Georgia. The region is strategic to give UK access to Antarctic, where the country develops the British Antarctic Survey and maintain other permanent scientific stations to do researches about Antarctic environment and resources (The Telegraph 2011).

The British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) also represents strategic issues regarding UK access, due to its localization near the Middle East and Eastern Asia. The BIOT includes 55 islands in the Chagos Archipelago, being Diego Garcia the largest atoll and the most important island concerning military matters, since the area was leased to US in 1970s and still works as a north-American military base (BBC 2008). The atoll had a vital importance in security purposes, such as the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. According to the British Ministry of Defense, around 2,500 US personnel are stationed in there, which represents an important part of Anglo-American defense relationship (Ministry of Defense 2014).

Others military installations in British Overseas Territories are Gibraltar and Cyprus, both significant too due to its access to the Mediterranean Sea. Cyprus hosts 3,000 British troops in the British Sovereign Areas located in Akrotiri and Dhekelia. These areas are retained for military purpose for the Royal Army and the Royal Air Force mostly. Recently, these bases had been used to support operations in Afghanistan, Libya and Iraq (Ministry of Defense 2014). In the other hand, Gibraltar comprises some 900 personnel and is strategic to dominate the western entrance to the Mediterranean Sea in time of conflicts (BBC 2008). Finally, UK has also military installations deployed across states where NATO operates. Since the Iraq War, in 2003, British troops are in this country under Operation Telic scope, namely to restore infrastructure and services and provide security. About 8,000 UK personnel are still in Afghanistan, in order to help Afghan government in its fight against Taliban groups. The country is involved in United Nations peacekeeping operations too. There are about 300 troops scattered in African countries and in the Balkans region.

As the USA, Russia has military bases overseas as consequence of the Cold War. In this period, they both used these installations mainly in Europe to block and deter each other’s presence. The extra-European bases served to provide global mobility and to increase influence in regional conflicts (Lachowski 2007).

After the World War II, the USSR tightened its control over its soviet allies,
setting up a significant number of military installations in their territories in order to decrease its vulnerability caused by its limited access to the high seas and restrict number of ports (Lachowski 2007). Therefore, the Soviet Union has built a vast military infrastructure in soviet states such as Ukraine, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, but also in allied states from abroad as Angola, the German Democratic Republic, Libya, Syria and Vietnam (Lachowski 2007).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, in 1991, Russia had to abandon most of its bases due to international political pressure and budgetary reasons. However, the country continued to play an important role in the domestic issues of former USSR’ states. Institutional arrangements as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) were created to integrate the region under Russia’s leadership. In this context, after the independence of Eastern European states, Russian attention returned to renew basing agreements with its traditional partners, alleging the need to protect their borders and the need to develop peacekeeping operations in areas of domestic instabilities (Lachowski 2007).
Since the September 11 terrorist events, Russia has been reformulating its foreign policy in order to reaffirm its influence in regions that were under US focus, mainly in Central Asia, which were a former USSR territory. According to Russia’s national security doctrine, the deployment of Russia troops in strategically important regions overseas is needed to develop joint security (Lachowski 2007).

Nowadays, Russia has about 25 foreign military bases scattered in former Soviet Union’s countries such as Azerbaijan, Georgia and Tajikistan. Recently, in 2012, Russia has reaffirmed its military partnership with Kirgizstan, which began in 2003, by signing an agreement that allows joint defense trainings between the countries, in addition to the military installations which were already there (Reuters 2012).

The naval base in Tartus, Syria, is the last Russian foreign military base outside the former USSR and has played an important role since the Syrian civil war began, being the primary mean through which Russia intervenes in the conflict, cooperating with Syrian president Bashar Al-Assad’s forces (Washington Post 2013).

Therefore, in general, after the Cold War ended, military installations abroad have remained. Goals such as the War on Terror, control of markets and natural resources and of strategic positions underlie motivations for states to establish bases overseas until today (Dufour 2007). According to Iraklis Tsavdaridis, Secretary of the World Peace Council (WPC):

The establishment of military bases should not of course be seen simply in terms of direct military ends. They are always used to promote states’ economic and political objectives. For example, USA corporations and government have been eager for some time to build a secure corridor for US.-controlled oil and natural gas pipelines from the Caspian Sea in Central Asia through Afghanistan and Pakistan to the Arabian Sea. This region -has more than 6 percent of the world’s proven oil reserves and almost 40 percent of its gas reserves. The war in Afghanistan and the creation of U.S. military Bases in Central Asia are viewed as a key opportunity to make such pipelines a reality. (Dufour 2007)

Currently, the establishment of foreign bases by states is directly linked to issues regarding lines of communication, for example. Having lines of communication opened is an essential matter throughout History. They are routes which connect military and commercial units with its supply base, being important to connect markets and being the main issue regarding military logistics abroad (Khalid 2012). Thus, to install air and navy bases overseas, it is fundamental to control sea lines and air lines of communication, since having the capacity to keep these lines open is as important as assuring the possibility of isolating them in strategic situations (Khalid 2012).

Another modern use of bases abroad refers to intelligence programs. Echelon is the best example of a signal intelligence system which uses states’ foreign military bases as signals receivers. This network was created in 1946 by a treaty among
USA, UK, Australia, Canada and New Zealand and its objective is to collect and analyze international intelligence data. Through the infrastructure of these countries’ overseas, the system monitors the flow of global communication (Zeijden 2009).

Finally, the major and most traditional use for military bases is hosting states’ personnel during an operation, being a platform for military maneuvers, serving as stock or location of test-ranging for weaponry and as transport posts (Zeijden 2009). In cases of peace-keeping operations or of international aid in natural disasters, the infrastructure represented by the military bases is also applied.

Thus, the extensive use of overseas bases creates a massive network which is responsible to project power beyond boundaries, increasing the capacity of response and control over other regional security problems (Peterson 2012). This is possible because these installations serve as a military infrastructure that supports states’ operations abroad. That is why foreign military bases became the most important apparatus of organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (Zeijden 2009).

2.3 IMPACTS OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES IN HOST STATES

Normally, one nation allows another states’ foreign presence in its territory if they are allies or if they share the same perception of a common threat (Pettyjohn 2013). However, the long-term presence of a country in a host state can result in political, environmental and social problems.

The establishment of overseas bases can bring political instability to the region in question. If agreements as SOFA’s are negotiated with non-popular local governments, the foreign presence can be seen as an authoritarian policy by the population and by other states as well (Peterson 2012). Moreover, in the course of time, a military infrastructure can represent a threat to the host country, undermining regional security and representing vulnerability to foreign attacks (Zeijden 2009). Finally, being a host nation effectively means losing sovereignty over part of its own territory to another state (Peterson 2012).

From the environmental viewpoint, military bases can be aggressions practiced at the local level. The testing of new weaponry, including chemical and nuclear weapons, might represent a risk of contamination and of accidents. Substances based on uranium, for example, can infect the soil and the water, reaching the whole population (Zeijden 2009).

Social instabilities are resultants of political and environmental problems associated with crimes that involve foreign personnel as well. According to Zeijden (2009), “(…) communities living around bases often experienced high levels of rapes, violent crimes and loss of lands committed by soldiers”. All these factors
together cause popular movements of resistance against international military presence overseas (Dufour 2007).

2.4 THE SUSTAINABILITY OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES

Keeping military bases abroad represents huge costs to great powers: large investments in infrastructure result in heavy burdens to public budgets, even to the USA (Wohlstetter 1951). Bases system depends on relative positions regarding sources of supply, boundaries of enemies’ territories and targets’ localizations. These conditions associated with costs for defense in the area make international projection an expensive undertaking (Pettyjohn 2013).

It is expected that costs will rise even higher as a consequence of the new self-governing posture adopted by many host countries. Since large foreign presence can bring internal vulnerabilities, it has become a common practice to charge fees from great powers wanting to establish bases in foreign territories (Pettyjohn 2013).

Therefore, sustainability for maintaining overseas bases is decreasing. Agreements that provide temporary presence of foreign troops can substitute the traditional infrastructure developed abroad. It might be a better solution also for the great powers: costs would be lower, there would be fewer causes for retaliation by the local population and states could diversify their international presence easier (Pettyjohn 2013). This framework may represent a change in states’ foreign policies, especially regarding the USA. According to Stace Pettyjohn, a political scientist at the RAND Corporation:

A shrinking defense budget, host-nation opposition to a U.S. military presence, and the increasing vulnerability of many overseas bases are endangering the sustainability of today’s U.S. forward military presence. In the coming years, it is likely that these factors will force the Pentagon to make difficult decisions, which could include divesting some legacy bases or establishing new facilities (Pettyjohn 2013).

Thus, it has become essential to establish international guidelines which regulate the impacts and the sustainability of foreign military bases. The existence of a vast number of situations where military bases abroad are employed makes this an even more complex discussion, which, in the end, aims to create standards by which states and the International Law could control great powers’ presence overseas.
2.5 CASE STUDIES

2.5.1 AFGHANISTAN

Foreign military presence in Afghanistan has historical roots with consequences that last until today. During the Cold War, the state became a strategic area to the Soviet Union. In order to gain influence in Central Asia and spread the communist ideology, the USSR occupied the country in December 1979, as it had been asked by the leftist government that ruled the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan since 1978 (Barfield 2010).

In that period, many insurgent groups named Mujahideen have come to oppose the Soviet intervention. This opposition was in accordance with USA’s interests of containing USSR influence. Therefore, the North-American government sent money and weapons to support the rebels, with the support of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. It was also in this period that Taliban emerged as a political and religious movement against the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. The conflict lasted almost ten years, ending with the Soviet troop’s withdrawal in February 1989 (Barfield 2010).

After the USSR’s departure, the communist government established in Afghanistan eventually fell, in 1992. From this moment on, a civil war started between the Mujahideen groups that fought the Soviets and the Taliban for the control of the country. After four years fighting, the Taliban finally broke into the capital Kabul and dominated about 90% of the region, then establishing the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan (Barfield 2010).

2.5.1.1 The 9/11 attacks and the Afghanistan War

The Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan was a theocratic government against Western presence in the country. Due to its restrictive and radical policies, the Emirate has been international recognized only by Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (Barfield 2010).

Even with the lack of international support, the Taliban’s government was able to control the country until 2001, after the 9/11 attacks. Under George W. Bush’s administration, the USA has blamed the Islamic militant organization, Al-Qaeda, for being responsible for terrorism practices and has accused Taliban of protecting and supporting the organization. It was the beginning of the War on Terror (Gall 2014). As retaliation, Washington unleashed the punitive Afghanistan War in October 2001, with US bombings in Afghan cities. The USA entered in the country under the claim that Osama Bin Laden, leader of Al-Qaeda, was hidden under Taliban’s protection (Gall 2014).
In 2002, after the consolidation of the US presence in the region, Hamid Karzai became president of Afghanistan, under the support of Western powers, anti-Taliban Afghan groups and the United Nations. With the end of the Taliban regime in the country, the USA increased their influence by the establishment of military bases (Gall 2014).

2.5.1.2 Main Foreign Military Bases in Afghanistan

Afghanistan has until today a great number of foreign military bases in its territory. The USA is the country with more installations, but other Western powers, such as the United Kingdom and Germany, have military facilities in the region too. However, nowadays, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has the control of most remaining bases due to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), a NATO mission established by the UN Security Council in December 2001.

The main US air base in Afghan territory is Bagram Airfield. Originally built by the Soviet military during its occupation, this base situated in the north of Kabul can hold up to 10,000 troops and serves as a prison too. In Bagram there is a runway where bomber aircrafts can land as well as huge transport aircrafts (BBC News 2009). According to The State Newspaper, the US have invested about $200 million in Bagram's infrastructure, with $68 million used only in the runway modernization.
The two main airports in Afghanistan, Kabul International Airport and Kandahar International Airport, serve as air bases as well as Bagram Airfield. Both airports were expanded and modernized by the USA and NATO between 2007 and 2009 and now operate civilian and military flights. Their infrastructure includes operational and maintenance facilities and housing and administrative installations (BBC News 2009).

Other bases also have a key role in US and NATO logistics. Camp Joyce, for example, located along the Pakistani border, represents a strategic position since the Taliban is present in Pakistan nowadays (ABC News 2010). Countries such as the UK and Germany still have their bases in Afghanistan as Camp Bastian, the main British installation, and Camp Holland, under German administration (ABC News 2010).
2.5.1.3 USA-Afghanistan Agreements

Shortly thereafter Operation Enduring Freedom – the official name of the US intervention operation –, the Taliban was ousted by north-American and allied forces and many security agreements were concluded with the new Afghan government (Manson 2012). The first diplomatic contact between the two countries in order to discuss the US presence in Afghan territory occurred in September 2002, through an exchange of notes. The north-American government called upon The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961\(^5\) to legitimate its intervention (Manson 2012). According to this act, the USA could apply defense measures against internal and external aggression, including military assistance to friendly countries:

> The act authorizes the President to furnish military assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace and which is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance (Manson 2012, p.7).

Another exchange of notes dated from 2003 was responsible for the accord on foreign personnel status. The US claimed for an agreement equivalent to that accorded under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961. According to the Convention, the north-American were immune from criminal prosecution by Afghan authorities as well as were immune from civil jurisdictions (Manson 2012).

In 2004, the Afghanistan and the USA signed an Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreement, responsible for providing logistic support, supplies and services to foreign militaries in the country (Manson 2012). In 2005, President Hamid Karzai and President Bush issued a joint declaration in which they elaborated prospects for a future agreement to help organize, train, equip and sustain Afghan security forces until the country has developed its own capacity. However, efforts to regulate the relationship between the two states have not progressed (Manson 2012).

The situation of US presence in Afghanistan have remained the same until December 2010, when the USA, under Barack Obama’s administration, announced that US forces would commence a transfer of security responsibility to the Afghan government in 2011, which would be concluded in the end of 2014. Still in 2011, the official Status of Force Agreement begun to be negotiated to guarantee that the presence of US forces in Afghan territory is temporary and that all troops must withdraw from the country after one year of the agreement (Manson 2012).

---

\(^5\) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was an act enacted by US Congress. It was responsible for organize the US assistance programs abroad, including military and economic aid. According to this act, the US would intervene, through assistance programs, in countries which were political and economic unstable, in order to help reinforce democratic values and avoid human rights violations (Manson 2012).
Finally, in 2012, the US-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership Agreement was signed. It is a legally binding executive agreement that provides a framework for the future relationship between both countries (White House 2012). The document reaffirms the cooperation principle and the shared goal of defeating Al-Qaeda and implements mechanisms to support Afghanistan’s social and economic development. In practice, the agreement is a diplomatic measure to reinforce the commitments made by the two nations. Nonetheless, it has not a security role and does not provide for technical and legal issues concerning the US presence in the country (White House 2012).

2.5.1.4 SOFA’s Negotiations

According to NATO and in relation to its International Security Assistance Force, the organization, “as part of the overall International Community effort is working to create conditions whereby the Afghanistan is able to exercise its authority (…), including the development of professional and capable Afghan National Security Forces” (ISAF 2012, p.1). However, Afghan president Harmid Karzai has decided to leave the signature of the Afghanistan-US SOFA to whoever replaces him in the government in 2014. According to NATO’s Secretary General Anders Rasmussen, without the formalization of a legal framework, there cannot be any deployments in Afghanistan after 2014 (UPI 2014).

Since the bilateral SOFA between the two states would provide training and assistance for Afghan forces, the immunity of US personnel in Afghanistan has become a bargaining chip in exchange for benefits such as US military equipment and investments in the country (Clark 2013). Therefore, the regulation of technical issues is essential to provide a legal basis for international troops’ continued presence in the territory beyond 2014 (Clark 2013).

The motivation to Hamid Karzai not to sign the SOFA is probably related to domestic policy. Although Afghanistan can obtain benefits from the agreement, is important to Karzai’s reputation that he plays a political role of defending national interests, since his time as president is over (Panda 2013).

On the other hand, the USA has many strategic interests in continuing its presence in the country. According to an article published by the London newspaper The Guardian (2001), “a pro-western regime in Kabul should give the US an Afghan route for Caspian oil”. Afghanistan's northern neighbors contain great reserves of oil which could be critical to future global supply. In 1998, George Bush’s vice-president, Dick Cheney, said: “I cannot think of a time when we have had a region emerge as suddenly to become as strategically significant as the Caspian” (Mombiot 2001). Since it turns necessary the creation of a route for Western powers, Afghanistan appeared as a promising option,
(...) since transporting the oil through Russia or Azerbaijan would greatly enhance Russia’s political and economic control over the central Asian republics, which is precisely what the West has spent 10 years trying to prevent. Piping it through Iran would enrich a regime which the US has been seeking to isolate. Sending it the long way round through China, quite aside from the strategic considerations, would be prohibitively expensive. But pipelines through Afghanistan would allow the US both to pursue its aim of “diversifying energy supply” and to penetrate the world's most lucrative markets. Growth in European oil consumption is slow and competition is intense. In south Asia, by contrast, demand is booming and competitors are scarce. Pumping oil south and selling it in Pakistan and India, in other words, is far more profitable than pumping it west and selling it in Europe (Mombiot 2001).

Another key matter concerning Afghanistan is the local opium production. Before US occupation started, the Taliban had successfully eradicated the opium crop in the regions, but since 2001 the production has been increasing (Gareev 2010). According to the 2013 Afghanistan Opium Survey released by United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the cultivation reached a high record in 2013.

In 2012, a Mexican spokesman told the newspaper Aljazeera that CIA does not fight drug traffickers. Instead, they try to manage the drug trade (Arsenault 2012). Although there is no effective evidence about US participation in opium trade, there are many multinational corporations interested in it and they play an important role in US foreign policy decisions (Gareev 2010). According to a former commander in the Russian occupation of Afghanistan:

Americans themselves admit that drugs are often transported out of Afghanistan on American planes. Drug trafficking in Afghanistan brings them about 50 billion dollars a year – which fully covers the expenses tied to keeping their troops there (Gareev 2010).

Thus, the US desire to remain in Afghanistan after 2014 has many strategic motivations. In this context, the signature of a Status of Force Agreement between both states can represent access to a region which is key to Western interests in Central Asia. On the other hand, this agreement could also benefit a government that would turn to be a US ally in Afghanistan, increasing its military capabilities through joint trainings and defense cooperation. That is why is important to discuss the guidelines of a possible SOFA between the countries in order to define the terms of this partnership.
2.5.2 JAPAN

The most pressing issue concerning foreign military bases established in Japan is its most strategic territory, Okinawa. It is the Japanese southernmost province and is formed by 169 islands which are together known as Ryukyu Archipelago (Sarantakes 2000).

During World War II, Okinawa was a key region due to its localization near Taiwan, South Korea, Philippines and China. Therefore, north-America’s access and control of the Pacific Ocean were related with US presence in these islands. In this context, the USA has prepared an offensive action in April 1945, penetrating with its naval forces the Japanese waters (Sarantakes 2000). The Okinawa Battle ended in June 22, 1945 and, as a consequence, the US remained in the region since it.

With the end of the Second Great War, Okinawa has become essential to the north-American post war system. The fear of the return of Japanese aggressive expansionism and the need to contain the soviet influence in Asia has stimulated the USA to create a military infrastructure in the Archipelago to consolidate its presence there (Sarantakes 2000). Episodes such as the Korean War (1950-1953) and the Vietnam War (1956-1975) required a great number of combat and support units
which were provided through Okinawa (Fuqua 2001).

Okinawa was under north-American administration until 1972, when the islands were brought back under Japanese sovereignty. However, even today, about 20% of Okinawa’s main island surface is occupied by US military installations (Fuqua 2001).

2.5.2.1 US-Japan Agreements

The bilateral relationship between the USA and Japan after the World War II officially has begun in 1952, with the San Francisco Peace Treaty. The document was responsible for formalizing the end of the war. Article 3 officially led Okinawa under US administration, applying the concept of residual sovereignty. According to this principle, the USA would take care of this Japanese territory but its inhabitants would retain Japanese citizenship. It was a strategy to deal with possible accusations of colonization practices by the USA (Fuqua 2001).
It was in 1960 that the most important treaty concerning US-Japan relations was accorded. The Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security guaranteed the use of Japanese territory by US air, naval and land forces in order to contribute to the security of Japan and the maintenance of international peace and security in Asia (Manson 2010). According to Jacques Fuqua of Indiana University, the document has two key points:

(…) first, Japan and the United States will respond to an attack against either party within Japan's territory. Second, Japan will provide land for U.S. military installations in its dual mission to provide security for Japan and the “Far East.” The first point results from Article IX of Japan’s “Peace Constitution” (the 1947 constitution) which renounces Japan’s sovereign right to wage war as a means of settling disputes and provides the rationale for a U.S. military presence in Japan. As a result, U.S. forces, along with Japan’s own Self-Defense Forces, satisfy Japan’s security requirements. (Fuqua 2001).

Alongside the Security Treaty, the USA and Japan signed, in 1960, their Status of Force Agreement, providing a separate agreement to govern the status of US armed forces in Japanese territory. This SOFA provides extraterritoriality to US members and requires cooperation between both states in criminal investigations (Manson 2010).

Finally, in 2006, the USA, under Bush’s administration, signed an agreement with Japanese government to relocate a US marine air station to a less populated part of Okinawa. The accord has received several critics of the Okinawans who have claimed for the end of US military presence in the region (Fackler 2010).

2.5.2.2 The Future of Okinawa

The foreign military presence in Okinawa has many local impacts. A great number of old installations are now in populated areas since the archipelago were urbanized in the last years. Thus, the population has to live with the extreme noise that comes from air bases and with the pollution coming from the military complexes. The rape of 12 years-old girl by members of US armed forces, in 1995, also has contributed to mobilize people against the crimes committed by US service members (Fuqua 2001).

In this sense, the agreement proposed by the USA in 2006, in order to decrease the number of troops in the region and to relocate US bases, was an attempt to reduce hostilities between Okinawans and north-American troops. However, it has resulted in many popular manifestations against military bases (Fackler 2010).

In 2009, Yukio Hatoyama was elected as Prime-Minister of Japan, promising in his campaign that he would be against the guidelines provided by the accord proposed by the US. During his administration, Hatoyama was pressured by public
opinion and, at the same time, by the desire to maintain Japan-USA relations. Thus, in 2010, he announced that he would not fulfill his main election promise and would proceed with the agreement (Fackler 2010).

In the last years, popular manifestations have increased, asking for the end of the colonial policy practice by the US in Okinawa (Fackler 2010). The fact that, historically, the islands were integrated lately into the Japanese Empire and, therefore, do not share the same culture identity with the rest of Japan, not being seen as “truly Japanese”, explains one of the reasons why Japan’s government do not try to meet popular claims, not transferring the bases to the mainland (Fuqua 2001).

The former US Secretary of State, Hilary Clinton, claimed that the alliance between USA and Japan is the pillar of Asia-Pacific’s security and that this partnership requires close cooperation and coordinated policies (Foreign Policy Bulletin 2010). Thus, according to Clinton, there will be bilateral negotiations to reduce US military presence’s impacts, but the close relationship has to be reaffirmed:

Let me repeat what American officials have said ever since President Eisenhower signed our treaty 50 years ago: The commitment of the United States to Japan’s security is unwavering. To ensure that our alliance is well positioned to adapt and respond to evolving challenges, we must bolster our diplomatic engagement and security arrangements and ensure that our military posture can continue to provide the security that has been so instrumental in the region’s stability for so long. We must do this while reducing the impact on local communities by American military bases, particularly in Okinawa. Our two governments drew up the realignment roadmap with these dual goals in mind, and we look to our Japanese allies and friends to follow through on their commitments (Foreign Policy Bulletin 2010).

Given US strategic interests of projecting influence in Pacific as well as Okinawa’s dependence on Japanese governmental support, the situation is unlikely to radically change. However, it is essential that US military commanders work actively with the Japanese state to further reduce impacts and crimes against local citizens as well as in working to answer local issues and concerns within the broader framework of Okinawa’s reality (Fuqua 2001).

### 2.5.3 Ukraine

The discussion about foreign military bases in Ukraine cannot be dissociated from the Cold War period and Russia’s presence and influences in that territory. In 1954, Nikita Khrushchev controversially “gifted” Crimea to Ukraine, in honor of the 300th anniversary of Russian-Ukrainian unity – action that did not have political consequences until the dissolution of the USSR (Weir 2014). An important issue
to ponder is that Ukraine has a very clear concern with its territorial integrity, where the function of the state is to maintain its territory (Ukraine 1996). The country is divided in 27 units, where the importance of two specific units, the Crimean Peninsula and Sevastopol, is crucial to understand how relations with Russia are established – those are regions with autonomy.

During Cold War, Sevastopol was separated into a special zone by Soviet authorities and governed by Russia. Today, the city of Sevastopol is considered by some countries as a federal city of the Russian Federation and part of the Crimean Federal District, while others consider it as part of Ukraine – this city has a special status, known as a “self-governed” city. Despite that, nearly 60 percent of its population of 2 million identify themselves as Russians (Haaretz 2014).
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Crimean Peninsula, on the other hand, organized a referendum in the beginning of 2014 to vote on its independence and consequently integration.
to the Russian Federation, during an instable period of public manifestations\textsuperscript{6}. The referendum was approved with a majority of almost 95.7% of the Crimean population. It is crucial to point that Ukraine's Constitution – thorough article 134 – considered the Crimean Peninsula as an inseparable part of Ukraine. This leads us to ponder that the constitution was disrespected, representing the fail of Ukraine's political institutions.

Back to the collapse of the Soviet Union, a significant part of Russian military bases abroad was closed. However, today Russia does retain (or has regained) bases throughout much of the former Soviet space. Russian bases or facilities of varying significance exist in Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova and Tajikistan (Lord and Erickson 2014). The largest is the Naval Base at Sevastopol in Crimea. It hosts the main facilities and forces of the Russian Black Sea Fleet\textsuperscript{7}, whose strategic purpose in the Cold War period was to constrain NATO’s maneuvering room in the region and keep it ‘within Turkey’s coastal waters’ (Lachowski 2007).

According to Varshalomidze and Ali (2014),

The Russian Black Sea Fleet has been based in Crimea since the end of the 18th century. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia and Ukraine argued for years about how to divide the fleet. It was finally resolved on May 28, 1997 with an agreement that limited the size of Russia’s fleet to 388 ships and 161 planes, and the deal was valid until 2017 for $98m annually. After Moscow annexed Crimea in March 2014, the Kremlin annulled all of the agreements, took over all 193 Ukrainian military installations and therefore, remains in Crimea for free.

Presuming a shift in Ukraine’s foreign and security policy, Russian decision makers sought to reformulate the use of Sevastopol after 2017 – Russian Defense Minister Ivanov announced that the Russian fleet did not have plans to leave the base, denying the rumors about moving from Sevastopol to another base facility. He reinforced that ‘the principal base of the [Black Sea] was, is and will [exist] in Sevastopol’, leaving the issue of its duration deliberately vague (Lachowski 2007). According to Lachowski (2007), Russia’s naval bases on its own shores—one being developed in Novorossiysk and another planned at a location between Gelendzhik and Tuapse—are not planned as an alternative, but rather as a supplement, to Sevastopol.

Russia and Ukraine almost declared war in the 1990’s due to separatist movements in Crimea and to the disputes under military base of Sevastopol and

\textsuperscript{6} Those manifestations began in November 2013, when president Yanukovytch renounced to sign an accord to initiate the process of integration of Ukraine.

\textsuperscript{7} Before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Black Sea Fleet was stationed in Sevastopol, Odessa, Donuzlav and Poti. The Russian fleet is stationed at Feodosya, Sevastopol and, temporarily, Nikolaev. The air force is stationed at 2 main airfields: Gvardiyskoe and Sevastopol (Kacha).
nuclear arsenal, both legacies from the USSR. It is known that keeping bases in Crimea will enable Russia to exert a certain influence on this part of Ukraine (Simonsen 2000). Another strategic importance of Crimea and Sevastopol for Russia is the access to the Mediterranean Sea and to Northern Africa.

In 2005, Borys Tarasyuk – Ukrainian Foreign Minister – protested against Russian demonstrations of strength, in a case where Russian Special Forces had landed illegally in Crimea during an exercise, also notifying Russia that Ukraine would not extend the 1997 agreement for the deployment of bases in its shores. Relations between Russia and Ukraine got worse at the end of 2005, considering a context of dispute over gas delivery and its prices. Also, Ukraine threatened to raise the cost for the Russian Navy’s deployment at Sevastopol (Lachowski 2007). By the end of 2006, internal dispute between President Viktor Yushchenko and Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovych got turbulent.

Shortly after pro-Russian Viktor Yanukovych was elected president in 2010, he agreed through the Kharkiv Accords to extend the Russian lease until 2042 in exchange for discounts on Russian gas supplies (Haaretz 2014). It is important to consider that Yanukovych tried to outline a policy in two fronts: joining NATO, especially with the creation of a brigade with Lithuania and Poland, considering it as a way to get closer to the European Union (EU), and seeking for conversations with Russia, despite its unstable relations. Other important fact is that the prospects for Ukraine’s accession to NATO had also diminished owing to the public mood, the reluctant stance of the Yanukovich government towards the alliance and NATO’s own ‘Ukraine fatigue’ (Lachowski 2007).

Russian presence could represent a threat to Ukraine in case of conflicts: the recent events exemplify these worries as well as the strategic role of maintaining overseas bases. In the context of protests for an independent Ukraine, Russian President, Vladimir Putin, ordered surprise military drills on the border with Ukraine, and at Russia’s Black Sea Fleet base (The Guardian 2014). Russia has the authority to locate troops on its bases in Crimea, and to move them between those bases and Russian territory through the Agreement between the Russian Federation and Ukraine on the Status and Conditions of the Russian Federation Black Sea Fleet’s Stay on Ukrainian Territory (Posner 2014). Ukraine and Russia’s relations are dual, where we can see an effort from Ukraine to maintain friendly terms and mutual benefit from the US and Russia, besides its intention to join NATO and EU.

---

8 This agreement would expire in 2017.
9 The headline grabbing part of the Kharkiv Accords was focused on the extension of the lease on the Black Sea fleet base of Sevastopol, but Russia and Ukraine in fact agreed to cooperate in a number of areas, for example: nuclear industry, help to cover the budget deficit, space cooperation on the GLONASS satellite navigation system, among others (Copsey and Shapovalova 2010).
2.5.4 Philippines

The Military Bases Agreement of 1947, signed between the Philippine President, Manuel Roxas, and the United States Ambassador, Paul McNutt, on March 14, 1947, ratified and accepted by the US on January 21, 1948, had the purpose of establishing north-American military bases in several areas of the Philippines\(^\text{10}\), such as the Clark Air Base, in the Luzon Island. The main objective of the agreement was to insure the territorial integrity of the Philippines, through mutual protection of both states, and the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. According to a US military specialist on the Philippine bases,

>The final resolution “went a long way” in meeting the U.S. military’s demands. A comparison of the Philippine military bases agreement and the status-of-forces agreements reached with the NATO allies “provides ample evidence that Filipinos were justified in their belief that they received unequal treatment from the United States.” (Shalom 1990, 10)

There were 18 Philippine senators who voted in favor of the treaty and none opposed. However, three senators were recorded as absent for the vote, presumably as a protest. Three other senators had been barred from the legislative body on the grounds of vote fraud, a concocted charge engineered by the Roxas administration. In the United States, the administration decided to consider the bases pact an executive agreement, thus requiring no Senate approval. This could be explained because there was a consensus of Democrats and Republicans favoring the bases, and favoring as well the active foreign policy that the bases would facilitate (Shalom 1990).

The agreement grants the United States the right to retain the use of the bases in the Philippines, agreeing “to permit the United States, upon notice to the Philippines, to expand such bases, to exchange such bases for other bases, to acquire additional bases, or relinquish rights to bases, as any of such exigencies may be required by military necessity” (The Kahimyang Project 2012).

\(^{10}\) Located at the Luzon Islands, the following regions and provinces were cited in the agreement: Baguio, Bataan, Cavite, Manila (Philippines’ capital), Palawan, Pampanga, Rizal and Zambales.

\(^{11}\) Appendix B lists the following bases: Mactan Island Army and Navy Air Base; Florida Blanca Air Base, Pampanga Aircraft Service Warning Net; Camp Wallace, San Fernando, La Union; Puerto Princesa Army and Navy Air Base, including Navy Section Base and Air Warning Sites, Palawan; Tawi-Tawi Naval Base, Sulu Archipelago; Aparri Naval Air Base.
Philippines and the United States set the agreement for a period of 99 years, subjected to extensions. In addition, it would undergo amendments over the years. Remarkably, in the 1966 Amendment, the agreement was cut down to 25 years of the unexpired portion of the 99-year period, expiring in 1991. Herein, the 1979 Amendments would cover full Philippine sovereignty issues over the bases, but, as seen, the nature of military operations does not permit a host state to ever obtain real, effective and complete control over foreign military facilities on its soil. As Angangco e Lotilla (1978, 491) conclude

At a time of ever increasing complexity in the conduct of military operations, no foreign power can afford to allow another state to achieve control over its forces even if these forces are stationed in a base located in the territory of that host state. If such is the case, then there can be no other conclusion but that the Philippines cannot have territorial sovereignty with the presence of a foreign military facility on its soil.

Nowadays, the US-Philippines relations in defense areas are outlined by the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA), which is characterized by both governments as an executive agreement and not as a formal treaty, not requiring the consent of the Senate in neither country (Thayer 2014). This agreement is an important reaffirmation of Philippines’ sovereignty, since the use of Philippines’ territory for north-American military facilities can only be used with invitation of the home country.

3 PREVIOUS INTERNATIONAL ACTIONS

The deployment of foreign military bases occurs mostly by bilateral and multilateral agreements, forging cooperation between host states and countries that maintain military bases in its territory. The situation over these bases can be analyzed at the regional and global levels. At the regional level, SOFAs and VFAs, as already explained, are the main agreements that forge these commitments. However, the main concern about them is that there is no agreed framework between countries to form those agreements. All SOFAs have different lines, differing from case to case. In this sense, the signed agreement could not limit, for example, criminal and civil jurisdictions, taxes and fees, carrying of weapons, use of radio frequency and regulations about licenses and customs requirements. The US-Philippines relations on this subject, primarily after World War II, shows how states agree and disagree in primordial items, like sovereignty and boundaries to hold the validation of the agreement.

On the other hand, at the global level, international efforts for changing this matter, concerning stipulation of guidelines to avoid abuses of power and reinforcing the role of international courts, are noticeable until today. As an
example, two resolutions taken by the General Assembly addressed the importance of ending foreign military presence in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Also, we have the Oslo Guidelines, where the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs outlines international concerns about how and when using foreign help. In addition, before the 2000s, it became common to see civil arrangements to avoid the deployment of foreign military bases and to remove military forces established in a territory – the No-Bases Network is the main civil effort seen in this matter.

The Resolution 2165, from the 21st Session of the General Assembly, named “Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in The Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America”, from December 5, 1966, was the first resolution to address the intention of the United Nations to search for results about foreign presence in some regions around the world. In that session of the General Assembly, countries ratified that “this question is of paramount importance and therefore necessitates serious discussion because of its implications for international peace and security” (UN General Assembly 1966). Also, this resolution transmitted to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENCD)12 the need for further considerations and reports, what was not achieved, as it can be seen at next year’s resolution. In 1967, the General Assembly recalled for the ENCD to explore this issue, but the ENCD did not reach consensus, nor cleared information because of its non-binding character and the end of the Committee, in 1969. Since the 22th session, the issue concerning military bases abroad has not been in discussion again in the General Assembly.

In these matters, another global effort is the Oslo Guidelines - Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defense Assets in Disaster Relief. They were originally prepared over a period of two years, beginning in 1992, resulting from a collaborative effort that culminated in an international conference in Oslo, Norway, in January 1994, and released in May 1994. According to the guidelines “all humanitarian assistance must be provided in accordance with the core principles of humanity, and neutrality with full respect for the sovereignty of the states” (OCHOA 2007). Those guidelines are broad, but they are related to military bases issues in order to prevent abuses from states and to grow an international link to give resources in case of natural disasters and other needs. It would use personnel, equipment, supplies and services installed in military overseas bases, for example, to assist others during difficult times.

Finally, another important international action to consider is the No-Bases Network. This civil international joint of non-government organizations and

---

12 Sponsored by the United Nations in 1962, the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENCD) attempted to establish a dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War. In addition to disarmament, the ENCD considered confidence-building measures and control of nuclear tests (University of Michigan Digital Library 2006).
interested scholars became evident since the beginning of the 2000s. By this time, several civil campaigns around the world started to focus on resisting military bases, joining forces to oppose the spread of it, mainly where military presence has brew political opposition and resistance from progressive movements and antiwar activists. In this regard, known as “The International Network for the Abolition of Foreign Military Bases” or No-Bases Network, it claims for all countries to unite local and national campaigns against military presence and militarization. It also works to rehabilitate abandoned military sites, as in the case of Western Europe (Dufour 2007). It is not known if there are official sponsors for this network, but it is through the internet that this effort maintains its strength. Its first global conference was held in 2007, in Quito and Manta, Ecuador, where over 300 activists from 40 countries from around the world aimed to analyze the impact of foreign military bases and local people’s struggles against their existence. During the conference, there were debates to share experiences alongside discussions of joint strategies for action, where panels focused on the impact of military bases on the environment, gender, human rights, peace, democracy, and sovereignty. The conference came to the attention of Rafael Correa – president of Ecuador -, where he ratified the intention to not renew the Agreement with the US for the use of the Manta Base, due in 2009 (Narváez 2014) – in September, the last 15 American troops left the country.

4 BLOC POSITIONS

The Arab Republic of Egypt believes that the Non Aligned Movement represents the most important framework for developing countries regarding political, economic and social issues. To support collective actions instead of unilateral policies is essential, since this constitutes a challenge for third world countries (State Information Service 2014). According to the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the movement is needed to preserve regional and international stability, particularly with respect “to non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect of their sovereignty, stability and independence of their decision, and the inadequacy of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity to prevent interference in the internal affairs of States” (State Information Service 2014). Besides that, Egypt values its strategic partnership with powers such as the United States and the European Union. Recently, there were some accusations from the international media that US would have established military bases in the country. In this regard, the Egyptian military spokesman, Ahmed Aly, has said that Egypt has no foreign military bases on its soil and this matter is a fixed stance in the national security policy to preserve national sovereignty (Reuters 2012). However, there are 1,600 Multinational Forces and Observer troops from US, Canada, France and other nations in the Sinai, in order
to monitor the 1979 Egypt-Israel peace treaty. According to Egypt’s government, these forces are often mistaken for foreign military installations (Reuters 2012).

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela understands that the world is moving towards the consolidation of a multipolar system. Therefore, the country directs its foreign policy in order to strengthen relations at the regional level and face the traditional hegemonic system (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). Under the leftist government of Hugo Chávez, Venezuela has become the closest South American ally of Russia. This partnership still remains and has been strengthened due to many armament agreements signed between the two nations, which are based on equipment’s deliveries from Russia to Venezuela. These agreements have become more recurrent since 2009, as a reaction to increased US military presence in Colombia (CNN 2009). Recently, the Russian Defense Minister, Sergei Shoigu, has stated that the country has interests in expanding its military presence in strategic locations, including Venezuela, in order to establish international patrol missions (BBC 2014). In his turn, Venezuela’s president Nicolas Madura welcomes the Russian presence as a way to expand cooperation in many areas, which will help to strengthen the national armed forces (Russia Beyond the Headlines 2013).

The Commonwealth of Australia is a strategic territory due to its location in the Asia-Western Pacific region. As a result of Australia-New Zealand-United States Security Treaty (ANZUS Treaty), the country hosts a great number of US military bases all along its coast. According to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australian Government, the cooperation between Australia and other countries, especially the US, represent access to technology and joint training, what maintains its defense capability and contribute to regional security challenges (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2014). Recently, more than 1,000 US marines have landed in Darwin in northern Australia (ABC News 2014).

The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia understands as its mission the permanently work to tackle all security threats in the Horn of Africa, creating favorable conditions for sustained growth and contributing for peace, security and democracy throughout Africa (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). In this regard, Ethiopia values its partnership with western powers in the War on Terror, providing coordinate actions to combat the fundamentalist groups linked to Al-Qaeda. Recently, Sgt. James Fisher, US spokesman for the 17th Air Force, has declared that a number of US personnel are working at the Ethiopian airfield through Arba Minch airport, in order to “provide operation and technical support for our security programs”. The US has spent million dollars upgrading this civilian airport to make it operational for the use of drones (Washington Post 2011). According to the Ethiopian government, the country do not entertains foreign military bases in its territory, but welcomes international cooperation in security programs (BBC News 2011).

Marked by a history of military defeats in the two great wars of the XX
century, the **Federal Republic of Germany** still serves as host for foreign military bases. Once, the international presence in the country was justified by the fear of German expansionism, but today the military facilities in the territory are legitimized through the cooperation in defense issues. Apart from European states such as United Kingdom and France, the United States is the country which has the largest contingent of troops and bases in Germany (German Peace Council 2007). In the last years, Germany has signed agreements to a joint development of defense capabilities with its closest allies, such as the US and France. The country has participated of the War on Terror against the Taliban, establishing German troops in Afghanistan and in Uzbekistan (Ferghana 2013).

Nowadays, the **Federal Republic of Nigeria** is under the People’s Democratic Party’s administration, represented by the president Goodluck Jonathan. The country maintains tie relations with western powers and work together with the United Nations and world leaders to combat terrorism. Due to the repercussion that the United States was interested in establishing a military base in the country, the non-governmental organization Muslims Rights Concern has declared that such would contribute to increase country’s fragile security (Vanguard 2011). In January 2014, Nigeria announced the creation of an Army Special Operations Command (NASOC) at a Counter-terrorism and Counter-Insurgency Lessons Learned Exchange with US, in order to consolidate bilateral cooperation on security matters. Through the US Africa Command (AFRICOM), the United States will be providing NASOC with training and equipment (Foreign Policy Journal 2014).

The **Federal Republic of Somalia** considers security policies as a matter of ensuring national survival. The country reaffirms its democratic values as a way to protect national interests, guaranteeing Somalia’s security. After its independence, in 1960, the country followed the Non-Alignment Movement for a brief period, but during the Siad Barre’s regime, a socialist foreign policy closer to the Soviet Union and China was established. However, since the 1980s, the Somalian state shifted its alignment to the West, reaffirming democratic values (Somali Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation 2014). Somalia integrates the Horn of Africa, a local which is object of US interests in order to combat terrorism in the region. According to US military spokesman, the north-American mission is to enable East African partners to neutralize violent extremists throughout Eastern Africa. Although there are no effective foreign military bases in Somalia, the country receive military aide from US to combat the insurgent groups linked with Al-Qaeda, such as Al-Shaabab (Washington Post 2011).

The current strategic localization of **French Republic**’s military bases is explained through history. Although the country still has small facilities in Germany, originating from the end of the World War II, it is in Africa that the vast majority of French military bases are located. As a result of French colonial policy, which lasted
until the XX century, the state still maintains troops and installation in nations such as Djibouti, Chad and Gabon. The French government argues that the presence of troops in those countries aims to contribute to the maintenance of security and peace, thorough peacekeeping initiatives, as the turbulent independences of these nations have generated many internal conflicts (Council on Foreign Relations 2008). In 2009, France has opened its first military base in the Gulf, at the United Arab Emirates, as a way to consolidate relations between the countries and to face the Iranian threat in the region (The Guardian 2009).

The Federative Republic of Brazil considers the respect for International Law guidelines as essential to discuss international issues. The country believes in a multilateral system and contributes to the empowerment of South America, still maintaining a strong relationship with extra-regional powers (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). In this regard, former president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva was against the increased US military presence on the region as a result of a US-Colombia agreement. Brazil states that regional issues should be solved through regional cooperation. The country also expressed hostility toward the presence of US Navy patrolling the Brazilian coast through the US IV Fleet (BBC 2009). While it hosts no foreign military bases on its territory, Brazil has signed many cooperation agreements on defense with several powers, such as Russia, China and the United States.

Being an important actor in Central Asia, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan hosts a significant number of foreign military facilities in its territory. During the Cold War, the country became essential to guarantee USSR’s influence in the region but, with the decay of the Soviet Union, the communist presence has decreased. Nowadays, Afghanistan is still target of foreign military presence mainly from the US but also from the United Kingdom and Germany, all nations which are there since the 2001 Afghanistan war. The current government, under administration of Hamid Karzai, was established in 2001, after the US Operation Enduring Freedom. The country’s current foreign policy supports Western cooperation and reaffirms the Joint Declaration of the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership as a pivot to Afghanistan’s stability (Afghanistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). According to the Afghan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the United Nations presence in the country plays an essential role too, contributing to national development and international peace. Due to international community’s pressure, the US president, Barack Obama, has announced the withdrawal of all US troops in the country until the end of 2014.

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the network of foreign military bases which is encircling it is a violation of regional peace and security (Press TV 2012). The Iranian government defends that the countries’ defense capability should be developed without military interventions from abroad. In the last decades, hostilities between the Western powers, led by the US, and Iran have increased,
encouraged by the fear that Iran was developing nuclear weapons. Therefore, the international military presence around Iran is huge, suggesting a regional balance in order to contain and isolate the country. According to the US Central Command, there are about 125,000 US troops close to Iran (Aljazeera 2013).

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan hosts north-American bases, some used for logistical support, others – such as the Shamsi airfield - used by the CIA to launch drone operations. It is said that Shamsi is no longer used by the US, but other airfields may still be used for launching drones (Public Intelligence 2012). The American effort to disrupt terrorist groups led also China to be interested in setting military bases in Pakistan, seeing the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) or the Federally Administered Northern Areas (FANA) as an option for those installations, primarily to contain the growth of terrorist activities of Chinese rebels from al-Qaeda-linked East (Asia Times 2011). In 2012, an effort from the Parliamentary Committee on National Security from Pakistan sought to ban foreign military bases, especially American ones. Their draft addressed that it would be needed a parliamentary approval for any use of Pakistani bases by foreign forces (NDTV 2012).

Being a traditional US partner, Japan has hosted many military bases since World War II. Nowadays, the most important US military installations in the country are located in Okinawa. However, due to local impacts, there is a great popular pressure to transfer the bases from Okinawa to Guam, an unincorporated US territory in the Western Pacific Ocean (Fackler 2010). Even with these impacts, the Japanese government recognizes the importance of the US as a strategic ally, contributing to the security and stability of the Pacific Region. On the other hand, Japan also plans to have military installations abroad. In 2011, the country opened its first overseas base since WWII, in Djibouti. The initiative was described by the Djibouti ambassador as an opportunity for Tokyo to play a larger international role in peacekeeping and forge closer relations between the two nations. The objective of this partnership is declared to be to combat piracy in the Horn of Africa’s coast (The Japan Times 2011). According to BBC Asia News, Japan has also begun the construction of a military radar station near Senkaku island group, claimed by China as the Diaoyu islands (BBC News 2014).

Being a traditional US partner in the Middle East, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has become a north-American preferential ally during the Cold War, based on oil trade and military assistance. In this period, the United States Military Training Mission was created to coordinate security assistance efforts and to assist the Saudi Arabian Armed Forces to build a defense capacity to promote regional security. In 1991, during the Gulf War, both countries reaffirmed their historical relationship and a great number of US troops were landed in this Arab territory (Council on Foreign Relation 2011). Although the military bases in Saudi Arabia are mostly from US, there is also the presence of British and French troops in the region as a result of the
Gulf War. The continued presence of foreign non-Muslims personnel in the country causes a reaction from Arab population which has resulted in a withdrawal of US troops from the country and in transference of control of military bases from north-American government to Saudi officials. However, the country reaffirms its strategic partnership with the West and contributes to anti-terrorism initiatives led by US. Recently, the BBC News has reported that US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has been operating a secret airbase for drones in Saudi Arabia (BBC News 2013).

The government of the Republic of Belarus openly promotes a military alliance with Russia, what means that more Russian military bases may be established there soon (Bohdan 2013). The country proclaimed its neutrality near the 1990s, although its current Constitution states that it strives “to achieve neutrality”. The Belarusian government has little choice concerning its national security, therefore leaning in Russian’s help (Bohdan 2013). Also, Belarus and Russia have plans for a Russian air base with fighter airplanes since the 2000s, along with an intention of Belarus to participate in the construction of Russia’s missile defense system (Belarus Security Blog 2013).

The People’s Republic of China believes in peaceful development and a multipolar world as key parts for international stability (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China 2014). Recently, China has been through a military modernization, declaring that the increase of its capabilities is only intended for defense matters. In this sense, it seems that the country is seeking to open its first military base abroad in the Indian Ocean, probably in Pakistan due to the strong bilateral relationship between them, both with rivalries with India (Asia Times 2012). This initiative could be an alternative to maintain a balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Republic of Colombia believes that to achieve progress toward democratic prosperity, a greater diversification of international relations is needed. To do so, new partners and strategic alliances are searched in order to contribute to the strengthening of a multilateral system (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). According to the Colombian government, the state “shall contribute with the national expertise in the struggle against terrorism and the world drug problem; the combat against illicit traffic of small and light arms” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). In this sense, the relationship between Colombia and United States has become closer in recent years. This rapprochement based on the fight against terrorism and drugs resulted in an agreement, signed in 2009, which allowed US personnel to be stationed at seven military bases in the country and also to occupy any installation throughout the entire territory (CNN 2009). Both nations have declared that the US military presence in Colombia is intended only to strengthen the fight against drugs and groups like the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, considered terrorist by the Colombian government (RT 2009).
The History of the Republic of Cuba is permeated by external interference. The country became independent from Spain after the Spanish-American War in 1898, when the US, as victorious, occupied the island. In 1902, the country negotiated its independence, renting to US the southern territory of Guantanamo Bay. Initially, a US naval base was established at Guantanamo. However, since 2001, the area serves as a prison to US war enemies, especially those from the conflicts in the Middle East. International pressure to close the prison at Guantanamo Bay is increasing due to allegations of human rights violations by the US administration. The president Barack Obama has said that, with the end of Afghan War, Guantanamo will be closed no later than one year after the complete withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan (The Guardian 2011). On the other hand, the Cuban government, under the administration of Raúl Castro, stated that the renting agreement signed in 1903 between the two nations is illegal based on International Law and Cuba affirms that is not cashing US Guantanamo rent checks since the Socialist Revolution of 1959 (Reuters 2009). The former president Fidel Castro had gave public declarations demanding the unconditional return of the bay to Cuba’s government. Cuba also hosted Soviet military bases and troops during the Cold War, but, with the end of the USSR, the two countries moved away. However, the newspaper The Diplomat recently reported that the Russian Defense Minister stated that Russia is looking to build military bases in Asia and in the Western Hemisphere, including in Cuba (The Diplomat 2014).

The Republic of Djibouti is located in the Horn of Africa, in a strategic area near the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea, which means access to the Indian Ocean. Shortly after the events of 11 September 2001, Djibouti began to cooperate with the fight against terrorism. Several hundred American troops are located in Camp Lemmonier under US Africa Command (AFRICOM), in order to combat Al-Qaeda groups, especially in Yemen and Somalia. In May 2014, north-American president Barack Obama and Djibouti’s president Ismail Omar Guelleh had signed a 20-years lease on this military installation (The New York Times 2014). The country retains close relations with France too, being host for the largest French foreign military base. According to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the purpose of these military facilities is to promote regional security, since the location of Djibouti allows France to exercise military influence in the Middle East (Council on Foreign Relations 2008). President Guelleh has declared that Djibouti’s Western cooperation means support for international peace and regional stability and contributes to joint programs on economic aid, democratic values and human rights (The New York Times 2014). In 2010, Djibouti also has reinforced its Eastern partnership, thorough an agreement with Japan, which allows the establishment of a Japanese military base in the African country. This installation is intended primary to counter piracy in the region (The Japan Times 2011). Recently, Djibouti’s Defense Minister Hassan Darar Houffaneh has declared the country’s intention in reinforcing military cooperation with China,
which has funded many infrastructure projects in the region. He has also said that Djibouti is ready to allow Chinese military ships to access its ports in order to increase the operational capacity of Djibouti Armed Forces (Global Times 2014).

According to the defense ministry of the Republic of India, the country “will not allow any foreign country to establish a military base on Indian soil”. The context of this declaration was a moment after an American officer being quoted as saying that “the US would station its fighter jets in India and other countries in the future, as part of its larger pivot or re-balancing of forces towards the crucial Asia-Pacific region”. In opposition, the ministry of defense argued that this proposal had never been in discussion between the US and India (Times of India 2013). Another point to be considered is the renovation of a Soviet-era military base (Farkhor/Ayni air base) in Tajikistan, paid by India. There are speculations about India’s perspectives of establishing a military base in Ayni, expanding its strategic ambitions in Central Asia (Asia Times 2010). According to Lachowski (2008), the country will probably envision a promotion and protection of its interests abroad through basing activities due to its rising power in the Asian region.

The Republic of Indonesia is an independent state since 1946 and defends the principle of sovereignty and the guidelines of International Law as pillars of its foreign policy. The country does not host foreign military bases, however, in recent years the cooperation in the defense sector with the US has increased through the US Foreign Military Financing Program and through the US-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership, which includes security cooperation as joint military trainings (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014).

The Republic of Iraq has a history of receiving foreign troops in its shores. In 2012, the government decided to annul all agreements that enabled the presence of foreign troops in its territory. The decision will directly affect Turkey, which has been maintaining bases in Northern Iraq since the 1990s (Durukan 2012). Another part of Iraq’s history is tied to the US-Iraq Status of Force Agreement, signed in 2008 by former president George W. Bush. Many Iraqi groups protested against this SOFA, assuming that it would legitimize and prolong American occupation since the Iraq War, in 2003. In 2011, the govern of Baghdad rejected US offer to maintain bases in the country, after an announcement from Barack Obama stating that all American troops would leave the country until December 2011 (The Guardian 2011). Also, a logistic base for UK forces was based in Basra, south of Iraq. Near 1,600 troops were withdrawn in 2007 after the completion of Operation Sinbad, which was designed to put Iraqis in charge of Basra’s security (BBC 2008).

Being a former member-state of the USSR, the Republic of Kazakhstan believe in its position as a leader of Central Asia, making considerable contributions to strengthening the region’s stability (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). Considering its traditional relationship with Russia as essential, the country hosts some Russian
military facilities, such as the Sary Shagan missile testing range and the Balkhash Radar Station (Eurasianet 2013). Recently, there has been a rumor that the US Manas air base would be reallocated from Kyrgyzstan to Kazakhstan due to the latter’s strategic position on the Russian and Chinese borders, with access to the Caspian Sea. However, the Kazakhstan Foreign Ministry has denied the information (Tengri News 2013).

During the Cold War, the Republic of Korea hosted foreign military bases in order to support its defenses capabilities against the Democratic Republic of Korea, in the north of the Korean Peninsula. Therefore, until now, the country believes that bilateral cooperation between nations which share common values and the participation in multilateral summits are extremely important to ensure international security (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea 2014). In order to contribute to the Asia-Pacific’s stability, South Korea reaffirms its traditional partnership with the north-American government and serves as home to a large contingent of US troops.

Such as Cuba, the Republic of Philippines became independent from Spain after the Spanish-American War, in 1898, being under US control until 1946, when the country became independent. Due to its strategic position in the Pacific, Philippines hosts a significant number of US military bases, appearing as a special ally in the Asia-Pacific region. In the first half of 2014, the two countries signed a ten-year defense agreement. Under this new pact, the US will have access to five new military bases in the country (The Washington Post 2014). According to the Philippine President Benigno Aquino III, this agreement “takes our security cooperation to a higher level of engagement, reaffirms our countries’ commitment to mutual defense and security and promotes regional peace and stability” (ISAPE 2014). The agreement might be understood as a reaction to China’s expansion in the South China Sea. However, this intention was denied by both nations.

The Republic of Singapore is a well located country in Southeast Asia, with access to the South China Sea. Due to its strategic position, the country is a key ally regarding powers’ interests in Asia. Since 2000, the north-American military presence in the country is increasing, and nowadays Singapore hosts dozens of American warships in its Changi Naval Base, which are designed to operate in shallow coastal waters, like those around the South China Sea. This foreign military presence may indicate the new US foreign policy to the Asia-Pacific region, in order to encircle China as a way to respond to the Chinese naval build-up (Foreign Policy 2013). Singapore also maintains bilateral ties with India. Both countries had signed an agreement in 2008 which states the Singapore forces are allowed to train at Indian Army establishments (The New Indian Express 2012).

The Republic of South Africa believes in its potential to grow and leverage its power on the continent to become a leading player on the global space (South
South African foreign policy is based on commitment to mutually beneficial partnerships, working for global political and socio-economic stability, security and peace (South Africa Government Online 2014). In this regard, the country values its strategic allies, such as the BRICS. Although there are no foreign military bases in this country, its bilateral cooperation in defense matters is increasing in recent years, including military joint trainings and the presence of foreign troops. The South African National Defense Force (SANDF) has been developing exchange programs with China. According to Maj-Gen Ntakaleleni Sigudu, from South Africa’s Department of Defense, agreements to provide military training and expertise to help building an Africa-based peacekeeping force is essential in the context of internal instability, which characterized the African Continent (Stratrisks 2013). Other BRICS partners such as India and Russia are also negotiating security cooperation with South Africa’s government. Finally, the country has a stable alliance with the United States of America, working together with it on a range of issues impacting the region and the world and developing combined joint exercises to increase defense ability from both countries. To do this, about 1,000 US military personnel are stationed in South African territory (United States Diplomatic Mission to South Africa 2013).

The Republic of Turkey understands that the emergence of a new international environment conducive to a global lasting peace must be achieved. However, the country considers that traditional security issues as well as new threats such as terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are important matters for Turkish foreign policy, since the state is situated in the Afro-Eurasian epicenter of regional instabilities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). Thus, in order to expand the sphere of peace and prosperity in its region and generate international stability, Turkey values its strategic partnership with great powers such as the Unites States. In this regard, the country hosts two US military complexes of air bases in its territory and NATO early warning missile defender radar. The Turkish government also sent national troops to Afghanistan in the early years of War on Terror, being twice the leader of the International Security Assistance Force, led by NATO. Nowadays, Turkey only maintains a foreign military base in Cyprus, as consequence of the Cyprus dispute between Greeks and Turks (Zanotti 2014).

The Republic of Yemen was created in 1990 as a result of the reunification between the Arab Republic of Yemen and the Democratic Republic of Yemen. The country believes there is an urgent need to reformulate the status of Arab nations and their relations, overcoming national crises and empowering the Arab states in order to create a unified and solid union capable to challenge and face the threats surrounding them (Republic of Yemen’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2014). Currently, Yemen is going through an unstable time, being target of US and UK troops’ interventions and drone attacks. The US government, supported by the
UK parliament, claimed the presence of Al-Qaeda’s members in the country (The Guardian 2014). According to the World Tribune newspaper, the US was planning to build three military bases in Yemen as part of a program to enhance defense and military cooperation with Arab League’s states. It would be a way to reaffirm the commitment between both countries and improve secure, trade and investments in the region (World Tribune 2013).

The geographical position of the Russian Federation hinders its access to hot waters and the low temperatures limit the use of major Russian ports. Therefore, since World War II, it has become important for Russia to set up military bases abroad. With the beginning of Cold War, the Soviet bloc was strengthened and the number of military bases established in USSR member-states has increased as a way to reaffirm the communist’s spheres of influence and neutralize the capitalist bloc’s presence in Eurasia. In this context, soviet military personnel were also present in countries which were not integrated to the USSR but presented communist tendencies such as Cuba, Vietnam, Angola, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Syria (Lachowski 2007). After the Soviet Union’s break-up in 1991, Russia inherited many military infrastructures in Eastern European and Central Asian countries. Although Russia has closed numerous foreign military bases since the end of Cold War, due to high maintenance costs, the country still has influence in the former Soviet Republics and need them to extend its projection capability. This way, in order to guarantee these countries as strategic partners, the Russian Federation led the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). The CSTO plays an important role to maintain Russia’s influence in Eurasia since it prevents member countries to join other military alliances and provides standardization of weapons, a common air defense system and joint military operations (Lachowski 2007). Since the 9/11 attacks, Russia turned its focus back to Central Asia in order to defend its interests from US-led interventions. According to Russia’s military doctrine, the country deploys its troops in strategically important regions aiming at national and allied security. Today, Russia has about 25 military installations in former Soviet Republics, distributed between ground, air and naval bases. This distribution reflects Russia’s strategic priorities in Central Asia and in the southern territories such as Armenia, Georgia and Crimea and in the Western theatre, adjoining the NATO area (Lachowski 2007).

The State of Israel was created in 1948 as a Jewish State. From then on, the balance of power in the Middle East has gained a new member, strongly supported by Western nations. The United States recognized the new state just a few hours after the declaration of independence. According to the Israel Diplomatic Network, both countries share the same democratic values and interests in promoting peace and security in the entire region (Israel Diplomatic Network 2014). In the last decade,
the warm relationship between US and Israel was strengthened due to the threat posed by Iran and by terrorist groups. In this context, the Jewish country hosts a great number of US military facilities in its territory and develops joint trainings as well as joint researches about new military technology (Israel Diplomatic Network 2014). According to a Stratfor report from 2012, Israel holds military bases in Eritrea, on the Red Sea shores, and considers the possibilities of establishing military facilities in Cyprus (Haaretz 2014).

Since the end of the Civil War of 2011, the State of Libya is passing through harsh political instabilities. The country was under administration of the National Transitional Council of Libya, which gave power to the General National Congress to elaborate a new constitution. During the conflict, the Libyan state was target of the military intervention from North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) members in order to implement the United Nations Security Council’s resolution 1973 about the establishment of a ceasefire and of a no fly-zone as well as the imposition of many economic sanctions. Until now, there are troops from countries such as the United States, France and the United Kingdom based in Libya. These foreign military installations are legitimized as a way to provide security transition to democracy and to develop joint military trainings in order to build up the Libyan National Army (Reuters 2013).

After the full independence of the Syrian Arab Republic from France in 1946, the country have signed an agreement with the former Soviet Union, prescribing political support and military help to found Syria’s national army. Since then, both nations have a strategic relationship which lasts until today. Under a bilateral agreement from 1971, a soviet naval base was established in the Syrian city of Tartus. Nowadays, this installation remains the only access from Russia to the Mediterranean Sea and is the last Russian foreign military base outside the former USSR (Washington Post 2013). In 2013, Syrian president Bashar al-Assad also has warned that US bases in Middle East could be target of retaliation for strikes against the country (Daily Mail 2013).

As a former state from the Soviet Union, Ukraine has served as base for innumerous USSR troops and installations during the Cold War. After the end of the socialist regime, the country signed an agreement with the Russian Federation, which allowed the Black Sea Fleet’s to stay in Sevastopol until 2017, giving Russia all the authority to locate troops on its bases in Crimea. However, Russia’s government has declared that the country had no plans to leave from its Ukrainian bases (Lachowski 2007). Recently, with the conflict between the two countries involving the sovereignty of the Crimea Peninsula, Russia has considered its military bases in the region as part of its federation. On the other hand, Ukraine and the majority of the international community recognize these territories as under Ukrainian jurisdiction. Thus, the hostilities including the status of these military forces are still
The history of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is associated with expansionism practices, as a result of its naval capabilities, and strong economic relations with foreign countries. As consequence of its policies, the United Kingdom maintains until now a considerable number of military installations abroad. The UK presence in territories as the Falklands Islands and Gibraltar is seen as legitimate by its government as being part of the British Overseas Territory. The country also has bases in the African continent, in states such as Kenya and Sierra Leone, in order to provide joint trainings for these countries’ national armed forces and to ensure the internal stability of these regimes (GOV UK 2014). The British foreign policy is characterized by its Special Relationship with the United States. This traditional partnership allows the US to have military facilities in UK’s territory, as well as in UK’s strategic sites, as the Diego Garcia atoll, located in Indian Ocean, and UK’s Camp Bastion, in Afghanistan.

The United Mexican States is a relevant country in the American continent, as it is home to the third largest population in America and ranks among the top five of the region's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Mexico shares a 2,000 mile border through the Gulf of Mexico with the United States, being both countries intricately linked together. This bilateral relationship is based on trade, investments, migration, tourism and environmental concerns. Mexico is seen as the principal transit for illicit drugs and possible avenue for the entry of terrorists into the US. This way, even though there is not a complex of military bases on Mexican territory, many US troops are present in Mexico, primarily aimed at fighting the Drug War. In this sense, joint training stations are developed in Mexico’s territory through the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement on Security, signed by both countries (Storrs 2006).

The United States of America has the most assertive role regarding the global network of military bases. According to the Global Research Institute, the US has about 1,000 military bases in 130 countries, being the country with more overseas installation in the world. The number of its bases has increased during the World War II and became enormous in the Cold War, when the dispute for spheres of influence between the capitalist bloc and the communist bloc made military infrastructure abroad really necessary. With the end of the Cold War, the US has gradually decreased its military presence overseas, but the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon represented a new motivation to expand the scope of US bases. However, since 2001, the US has modified the relevance of its areas of operation, shifting focus to traditional European partners to Middle Eastern countries (Lachowski 2007). Asia also plays an important role to the US military network. Traditional Asian partners such as Japan and Philippines were essential during Cold War’s conflicts and now, considering the possible threat of China’s military modernization, the US is turning its attention back to strategic partners in the Pacific region, such as South Korea,
Australia, India and Indonesia (Cordesman 2012). The US classifies its military bases in host countries by its geostrategic purpose. So, its largest and more relevant bases are called Main Operating Bases and have permanently US troops stationed in there. The Forward Operating Sites is the classification of bases with smaller facilities aimed at bilateral military cooperation. The last category is the Cooperative Security Locations, which serves as platform to security cooperation activities (European Parliament 2009). The costs to maintain military infrastructure abroad are high and the international repercussion of US intervention in host countries contributes to delegitimize US Foreign Policy. Nevertheless, the north-America’s government adopts a discourse of mutual cooperation and defense of democratic values to reaffirm its presence overseas.
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