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Topic A: Weaponization of social media

Introduction

Social media has become an integral part of the society since the past decade and longer. It’s aims to bring people close in mind might have been achieved but however has had its share of drawbacks.

Social Media has also played a vital role in the conflict environment ever since its development. Starting with what has been labelled as the first “internet war“, that is, the Kosovo conflict in 1999, developments have steadily progressed ever since. Counter-insurgency campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, several conflicts between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the NATO's operations in Libya and the ongoing war in Syria, the world has seen social media being used more and more strategically by multiple state and non-state actors to create effects in both physical and virtual domains. Social media comprises of different platforms set for different individuals who can come up and display their interests and personal clarifications towards certain problems. Social media such as Facebook and twitter are sites used as common grounds for people to openly express their opinions in a sophisticated way. Social media targets a certain crowd however it has very unpredictable outcomes as to who the audience is to these statements. Social Media targets a certain crowd of intelligence to control the path people take to understand the situation.

Social media has made its effects known in these controversial wars we’ve spoken about already. It has been often highlighted on social websites such as Facebook and Twitter with the use of the famous hashtag (#). The hashtag war has taken the entire scenario to a whole new level with every campaign launched would be accompanied by a suitable hashtag. The authenticity of the campaign being claimed by this in the easiest of terms. These campaigns in recent years have thus raised a certain amount of awareness among people and also have been confirmed useful. Another positive factor of these social networking media campaigns is that it allows certain famous figures to express their individual ideas too and bring about a socially acceptable platform upon which people of all sorts can be brought together under the same light.

General overview

With the rapid development and revolution of technology, Social Network Media has become an essential, influential part of everyday lives in the 21st century. Based on collective structures, social media offers online communications, enabling interactions with comparative ease resulting in global dimensioned connectivity. This new form of communication has certainly brought remarkable benefits to individuals and communities but has also provided a platform of conflict environment over the past 15 years and longer. As it has critical impact on people’s daily lives, it can thus be used for various political purposes, a good example would be cyber terrorism. The forms which cybercrimes take can be diverse as it is able to define any felony that involves the internet networks or computers, but in the
Security Council, the discussion will be limited to political atrocities, as it is a globally impacting type and considered to be a serious issue in the international society, threatening worldwide peace and security. Social media is being used strategically not only by cyber criminals but also by aggressors to create certain effects, expanding their area of operations as armed groups are using social media as a weapon of war. Attacks on nations’ networks can create damages ranging from economic to political, sending messages containing content such as propaganda encouraging enrollment in such activity or the typical hacktivist group. Participants could be whoever with access, creating terms “remote warfare” or “social warfare” frequently in contemporary conflicts. The target typically seems to be young people, the ‘Millennial Generation’, encouraging them to engage in war or join the army. Today terrorist groups have shown an evident example of weaponization of social media. It encourages potential members to join their group, empowers target-determination, and gives chance for propaganda to mass users.

History of the problem

With the war starting in Iraq in March 2003, and afterwards spreading into Afghanistan, the wide, abusive use of social media started to play a crucial role in the warfare. Organizations and groups regarding terror began using social media to undermine the trustworthiness and legitimacy of the US led Multinational Force (MNF), targeting political decision-makers to discontinue remaining in Iraq. Other conflicts in the Middle East between Israel and Hezbollah in Lebanon which happened in 2006 or in Gaza Israel and Hamas in 2009 also show how social media can be used in contemporary warfare circumstances. At first, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) was not especially capable of utilizing informal organization media, giving Hezbollah a favorable position seemingly so extensive that it empowered Hezbollah to depict itself as both the casualty and victor of the contention, relieving the impact of actual military weakness. The IDF has persistently built up their informal organization media ability from that point forward. In the 2009 Hamas-Israel strife, both sides widely utilized various social media sources such as blogs, Wikipedia, YouTube, Twitter and Facebook to tell their diverse renditions of the occasions, making supportive online groups and systems. This has pulled in attention to their interpersonal organization media. This strategy has, to an extraordinary degree, been reflected by the Islamic State in their 2014 interpersonal organization media endeavors.

Status Quo

According to the New America Foundation (NAF) 2015, the average age of raw recruits in western countries leaving voluntarily to enter the IS Army was found to be 24. IS is managing various types of social media accounts, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, to distribute information for promotional purposes and to spread messages, well-made videos containing atrocity acts in order to threaten enemies, hoping it to reach the widest possible audiences and targeting international attention. Its impact is seen to be spreading despite the sanctions. IS is found to be releasing items such as 20-minute high quality videos, photos, pamphlets translated into various languages per day on average. This message actually lured many individuals to hold the belief that engaging in act of violence and warfare will help them to right their pained lives. Some actually balance their own grievances onto the depicted Islamic State ideology. So far, this type of digital propaganda with its openness of the internet,
has motivated more than 30,000 people to be persuaded by this message, leaving their nations to participate in warfare act. IS’s strategic objectives of weaponization are quite straightforward. Gaining international-wide attention and making their message and indoctrination clear. They depict themselves as a more powerful group than they actually are, comparing themselves to other jihadist groups and demonstrating their capacity by releasing propaganda videos showing execution of hostages.

Stance of Involved Nations

Syria

Syria is one of the main operation fields of ISIS. Since information in this region is held by the dictatorial government and it is difficult for reporters to gain access to the inside of Syria, people mostly rely on social media to understand the situation going on within the country. This gives social media the power to shape how the crisis in Syria is portrayed and perceived. Until now, the government, rebel groups and ISIS have made extensive use of social media in their own favor. The problem lies in the fact that it is hard to verify the content of social media and many times, videos are forged and information is falsified.

Iraq

The Iraqi government is putting effort to track and shut down IS social media sites. However, the situation doesn’t seem to improve since new ones immediately appear, created in a different server. The government had once strictly blocked Iraqis’ access to the internet and took down social media and video sharing sites after the conquest of Mosul by ISIS in 2014.

United States

As the leading country of the resist against ISIS, the United States is currently fighting against ISIS in mainly two ways, with airstrikes and on social media. It created a Twitter account called ‘Think Again Turn Away,’ principally showing the brutality of ISIS by providing information regarding the reality of ISIS and testimonials from people who once joined ISIS. It is quite clear that the United States has to work as a key role to further solve this problem, since it is the most influential nation in the global society.

United Kingdom

United Kingdom is also one of the main actors fighting against ISIS. Similar to the US, UK operates a twitter channel (‘UK against Daesh’), yet, they differ in the fact that UK mainly focuses on the communication between the UK government and online followers. Instead of simply informing people with facts and figures one-sidedly, this channel pursues the engagement of citizens in discussing about the IS, thus opening Q&A sessions and conducting surveys on Twitter.

Effects of the problem
Social media has its diverse effects, it can be used to propagate terrorism at one end and on the other extreme it would be an act of activism. It has its effects on political standings of different political leaders and its impact on major reforms makes it an important subject that needs to be studied and understood as we cross into this new age. Hence this makes it important for us to understand that social media works in a rather different way than mainstream media. This can be understood under the factors that social media is unpredictable in its source of information and to whom it preaches it to. Similarly, it also poses as a threat to political authorities with its unpredictability. People active on social media hence, are authors of what the audience reads and believe. Hence, social media poses a great threat to the security to everyone.

Social media can be used to manipulate minds of people. Countries may impose restrictions on their social media. False information may be portrayed to people instead of the actual matter. News Broadcastings would be highly filtered according to the requirements of the government. Social media can be used to change the perception of the world towards a specific subject. For example, Muslim countries are portrayed in a negative way throughout the world because of social media. Africa was perceived to be an underprivileged land of illiterate people even though it underwent many major development and modernization phases. However, it might be, social media and its weaponization has led to extreme cases of ideas being generated and put together and used to dictate how the future of the state might be. The power of social media reaches no boundaries to show its effects on states and the insurance of their future and security.

**Possible Solutions**

Recognizing in the first place the fact that the numerous attempts of conversation and diplomatic persuasion have been dissipated would be fundamental. Reversely, publicizing the contents and the violent actions may turn out to be one solution. Seeing the example of the video of the guillotine of James Foley, it is seen that the IS’s weaponization acts are gradually being more challenged in the social media sphere. The actual messaging and distribution confronted rejection by many social media networks, especially on Twitter. Then a government warned against re-tweeting and was later backed up by Twitter official decisions when a campaign to curb the distribution of the video took off. The act of actively identifying and revealing aggressor’s identities and the specific accounts online may actually have potential benefits. Not only government officials but also the actual stakeholders of the social media should reinforce ways to promote user’s act and active participation in campaigns as such. Also, the stakeholders of each social media platforms should come together to reach solutions. Regulations for antisocial content and censorship terms should be rearranged considering weaponization act via social media networks.

**Future Outlook**

It is evident that the ISIS has already committed abhorrent crimes thus creating international antagonisms, and its impact to users of social media and the world citizens online has also been proved to be gigantic, from both political and military point of view. The anticipated future of the abusive use of social media can be described as ‘volatile’. If the weaponization continues in the social media platform, the danger it can cast will grow viral and so would the aftermath, since social media too is being developed at the moment. Expectations are that if there are no appropriate sanctions inflicted and
no resolutions found, more aggressive actions will be taken in the network. If this continues, possibilities are that it can grow into a global war, both land operation and online-based. However, the rising awareness of social media users may result in the shriveling of hostile actions, since when made conscious, social media websites such as Twitter and Google constantly ban such operations by shutting down accounts permanently according to the “terms of use”.

**Conclusion**

The characteristic of social media has allowed it to pose a threat to not only the related or adjacent countries of Syria, but the whole world. With ISIS cleverly exploiting social media in a way nobody has before, it has actually created a new form of war by which it manipulates the minds of hundreds of people who are continents away. We do not know how much IS will advance, however we do know that in the near future, other aggressive groups will also start to take advantage of social media. Therefore, it is crucial for delegates to come up with effective and immediate solutions to this problem. The biggest point that should be discussed upon during the whole debate is the practical and concrete measures to halt ISIS from exploiting social media. As many countries with conservative views are overlooking the aspect of cyberspace when approaching the issue of ISIS, there isn’t an effective method of resisting ISIS online in the status quo. America is currently the most active nation in fighting ISIS online, but there needs to be more engagement from other nations and social media companies.

**Questions to consider**

Q) How has it created problems globally?

Q) The past actions taken by countries to control this issue?

Q) Which parties are majorly affected and why?

Q) Who is weaponizing social media?

Q) Who is the target of this weaponization? Why are they vulnerable?

Q) How can the characteristics of social media be powerful in aggressive actions?

Q) What messages convince people to become involved in the terrorism?

Q) What can the international society do to overcome social media weaponization?

Q) How should the terminology ‘social media’ be defined in a military context?

Q) Should the use of social network be considered as a subdivision to the debate or as something completely different?

Q) What strategies can be used in the process of social media weaponization?

Q) How can weaponization of social media be prevented in advance?
Topic B: The destabilizing effect of foreign military bases in sovereign states

Introduction

The idea of a state owning military bases on another state’s territory has existed since the time of the Greek city-states. However, the frequency of foreign military bases reached its peak during the Cold War (from 1945 until 1991.) Ever since the end of the Cold War, there has been a reduction in the number of overseas military developments, particularly so from the Soviet side. Currently, the Russian Federation has 25 military bases abroad, mostly located in the ex-Soviet republics of Eastern Europe. France and the United Kingdom both operate extensive overseas military bases. By far the largest network of military bases across the world is that of the United States. While France and the United Kingdom typically operate military bases in nations that were formerly their colonies, the Russian Federation operates military bases mostly in areas that were formerly part of the Soviet Union, and the United States often operates bases in countries where it has fought a major war, such as Germany, Japan, and South Korea. Attitudes towards these bases vary, and serve contentious debate of the necessity of foreign military bases. Proponents of these installations, such as the owners of these bases and some hosts, argue that these bases help promote security and stability worldwide, as well as help the local economy. Critics of these bases believe that, not only do these bases violate national sovereignty; they also foster regional instability and contribute to arms races. This topic seeks to focus on how the spread of foreign military bases across the world has affected host nations and what the best international framework or unified strategy (if any) to deal with the problems posed by such bases would be. While exact numbers depend on definitions, several hundred foreign military bases have been identified; most of them run by the USA on the territory of its allies. These bases are symbols of power projection across the world, and are partly responsible for the tensions between superpowers. In addition they have a whole range of negative effects on their host communities, such as prostitution and violence against women, distortion of local labor markets, cultural and environmental contamination, noise pollution from low flying aircraft, and occupation and destruction of farmland and even residential urban areas. Small surprise that such installations have become targets for peace protests and local mobilizations.

History of the problem

Foreign military bases, particularly those of the United States, have historically been acquired during, or after, wars. Take for example the US base in Guantanamo, Cuba, which was set up after the Spanish American War. The treaty entitling the United States to this base states that the US control is permanent as long as nominal annual payments are made and may be relinquished only by the mutual consent of both the US and Cuba. Obviously, this does not take into account the views of both the Cuban government and populace, which have on many occasions vehemently demonstrated their hostility to a US base on their soil. Besides the Guantanamo Bay base, many of the United States’ bases
around the world were set up as result of wars ranging from the Korean War to the present day conflict in Afghanistan

**Current Situation**

Ever since the development of the modern city-state in Ancient Greece, the concept of military bases outside a nation’s territory has been established. Foreign military bases were at their peak during the Cold War. Ever since the end of the Cold War, there has been a decrease in the number of overseas military developments, particularly so from the Soviet side. However, the number of foreign US bases has not just stayed the same, but increased with the advent of the Gulf Wars from the early 1990s. The Russian Federation has 25 military bases abroad, mostly located in the ex-Soviet republics of Eastern Europe. France and Britain’s overseas military bases are mostly the remnants of past colonies. Undoubtedly the largest network of military bases across the world is that of the USA. The US Department of Defense defines foreign military bases in the following terms: “The term ‘military installation’ means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility or any ship, or any other activity under the jurisdiction of a department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense, including a leased facility, except that such term shall not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbor projects, or flood control projects. An installation is a grouping of facilities, located in the same vicinity, which support the same Air Force operations.” Foreign military bases are controversial for their negative effects on host countries, and for the way that they contravene the international norm of sovereignty. This topic seeks to focus on how the spread of foreign military bases across the world has affected host nations and what the best international framework or unified strategy to deal with the problems posed by such bases would be.

Foreign Military Bases host about 160,000 US citizens: soldiers, civilians and ‘other’ personnel. This figure excludes active duty personnel in ongoing wars and occupations, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan, and also does not include the thousands of military and personnel stationed in US overseas territories such as Hawai’i, Guam, Puerto Rico and Kwajalein Atoll. Base are launching platforms for military maneuvers: Aerial bombings in Pakistan are launched from Diego Garcia; the Manta base in Ecuador is used to coordinate covert military actions in Colombia; military facilities in Iraq and Turkey are used as coordination centers for ‘behind the lines’ intelligence missions into Iran and Syria. Bases are often forward storage facilities for all sorts of weaponry including nuclear arms. Some bases are test-ranges for new weaponry, including nuclear testing; others are training grounds for US soldiers, or joint training locations. Other facilities serve as intelligence operations, such as the world-wide network of “Echelon” bases that monitor all email, phone and data communications traffic. In recent years, we have seen that foreign military bases are also used for the extra-judiciary transport, imprisonment and torture of people. Guantanamo Bay is the best-known example, but many other facilities in Diego Garcia, the Middle East and Europe are implicate

**Effects of the problem**
The establishment of military bases abroad enable a country to project power, e.g. to conduct expeditionary warfare, and thereby influence events abroad. Depending on their size and infrastructure, they can be used as staging areas or for logistical, communications and/or intelligence support. Many conflicts throughout modern history have resulted in overseas military bases being established in large numbers by world powers, and the existence of bases abroad has served countries having them in achieving political and military goals. The British Empire and other colonial powers established overseas military bases in many of their colonies during the First and Second World Wars, where useful, and actively sought rights to facilities where needed for strategic reasons. At one time, establishing coaling stations for naval ships was important. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union established military bases where they could within their respective spheres of influence, and actively sought influence where needed. More recently, the War on Terror has resulted in overseas military bases being established in the Middle East.

Whilst the overall number of overseas military bases has fallen since 1945, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States still possess a substantial number. Smaller numbers of overseas military bases are operated by India, Italy, Japan and Turkey. The United States is the largest operator of military bases abroad, with 38 "named bases" having active duty, national guard/reserve, and/or civilian personnel as of September 30, 2014. Its largest, in terms of personnel, was Ramstein AB, in Germany, with almost 9,200 personnel.

There are two principal problems with foreign military bases:

1. All these facilities are integral to preparations for war, and as such undermine international peace and security. Without the bases in Turkey, Germany, Diego Garcia, Saudi-Arabia and the Gulf States, the Iraq invasion could not have happened. The bases serve to proliferate weapons, increase violence and undermine international instability.

2. Bases cause social and environmental problems at a local level. Communities living around the bases often experience high levels of rapes committed by foreign soldiers, violent crimes, loss of land or livelihood, and pollution and health hazards caused by the testing of conventional or non-conventional weapons. In many countries, the agreement that permitted the base stipulates that foreign soldiers who perpetrate crimes cannot be held accountable, since they are granted immunity.

**Contentious Issues**

The lack of an international framework or consensus on how to deal with the myriad issues raised by the presence of foreign military bases in sovereign states raise several contentious issues that will undoubtedly cause heated debate amongst delegates in the committee room. Status of Force Agreements A Status of Force Agreement (SOFA) is an agreement between a host country and a foreign nation stationing forces in that host country. The purpose of a SOFA is to lay down the rights, privileges and limits foreign personnel serving in a host country are subject to. Globalsecurity.org defines SOFAs as coming in three different forms. “These include administrative and technical staff status under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Privileges, commonly referred to as A and T status; a "mini" status-of-forces agreement, often used for a short-term presence, such as an exercise; and a full-blown, permanent status-of-forces agreement.” As such, a SOFA is not a mutual defense or security agreement, although it may be
part of one. It instead lays down a mechanism for legally protecting the rights of foreign military personnel who are present in a host nation. Delegates are encouraged to research the various SOFA agreements between nations and the controversies stemming from them. There is no singular framework for a SOFA agreement. Each agreement differs from case to case as numerous factors must be taken into account; the current security arrangements and concerns, nature and duration of missions, sentiments of the local populace, and the credibility and rights of jurisdiction. The US has the highest number of personnel posted across the globe. US SOFAs give provisions in criminal issues for U.S courts to have jurisdiction over crimes committed against other servicemen, or as part of their military duty.

Host Nation retains jurisdiction over other crimes. In principle, this holds true; however there are examples of crimes which include murder, rape, thievery and even gross human rights violation where the perpetrators have walked free.

A major issue is that most host nations have mixed feelings over the establishment and the influx of foreign military on their soil. Often demands for renegotiation and local pressure for calls of withdrawal cause political unrest. The difference in legal rights of a person within a host country and the personnel of the bases may differ, possibly resulting in miscarriages of justice. Another issue with agreements arises when there is blatant hypocrisy over the terms of SOFAs signed by a nation. Taking the example of South Korea which has forces stationed in Kyrgyzstan, it has a SOFA which gives diplomatic immunity to its servicemen from being tried in Kyrgyz courts for any crime. This is far in excess of the privileges South Korea objects to in its SOFA with the US. However, according to US analysts, the numbers of accused tried in civilian courts is evident of the fact that SOFAs work.

**Sovereignty of the Host Country**

Foremost on the agenda when such a topic is brought into discussion, are the implications on the sovereignty of the host nation. But before these implications are explored, one must understand the concept of a sovereign nation. According to the UN, a sovereign state has an effective and independent government within a defined territory. Unfortunately, there is no definition of what sovereignty implies as is evident in the words of famed International Law maker Lassa Oppenheim:

“There exists perhaps no conception the meaning of which is more controversial than that of sovereignty. It is an indisputable fact that this conception, from the moment when it was introduced into political science until the present day, has never had a meaning which was universally agreed upon.”

However, there are certain markers generally agreed upon which highlight the sovereign status of a region, namely:

**Absoluteness**

A sovereign power has absolute sovereignty over the governed region only tampered by the rules and regulations decided upon within the country without influence of external actors. These include neighboring nations or the much greyer influence exerted over various nations by intelligence agencies across the world.

**Exclusivity**

This denotes the exclusive right of a nation’s jurisdiction, specifically the degree to which decisions made by the state might be challenged or contradicted by another authority, International Law, or a foreign presence after which represent legal infringement on exclusivity.
**De Jure and De Facto**

De jure or legal sovereignty is concerned with the recognized right to exercise control over a territory. De facto or actual, sovereignty is concerned with whether control exists or not, which includes the cooperation and respect of the locals, control over the national assets, means of security and ability to carry out various functions of governance.

**Internal**

This represents the relation between the governing body and its subjects, and by what right the governing body holds the power of governance.

**External**

This is concerned with the relations between a sovereign power and other states. External sovereignty is connected with questions of international law. For instance, when, if ever, is intervention by one country onto another’s permissible?

**Sovereign**

A government which exercises de facto administrative control over a country and is not subordinate to any other government in that country is a foreign sovereign state.

**Socioeconomic issues**

The establishment of foreign military bases leaves a very distinct footprint on the socioeconomic, political and environmental assets of the host nation. To understand the impact these bases have one must look at the connection established in the book Imperial Footprint: America’s Foreign Military bases, by Zoltan Grossman: “The environmental, political, and economic impact of these bases is enormous and, despite Pentagon claims that the bases simply provide security to the regions they are in, most of the world’s people feel anything but reassured by this global reach. Some communities pay the highest price: their farmland taken for bases, their children neurologically damaged by military jet fuel in their water supplies, their neighbors imprisoned, tortured, and disappeared by the autocratic regimes that survive on U.S. military and political support given as a form of tacit rent for the bases. “Such acts can be seen as violations of the parameters set to measure the sovereignty of a state. The overreaching influence causes the weakening of de facto sovereignty within a nation as people’s mistrust in the government grows because of the inaction to solve the problems as already stated. As already discussed in SOFAs, the right of jurisdiction may be violated even though stated otherwise in the SOFA which impedes the internal sovereign rights of a nation. Even the right of governance and of the populace to live in their locality can be violated as is evident by the tragedy of Diego Garcia, ostensibly a tiny British island-colony in the Indian Ocean. All of the island’s residents were evicted in the 1960s so that it could be occupied by an enormous US base that has served as a lynchpin in every US Middle East invasion and occupation since that time. The residents were not provided with any compensation for this gross violation of de jure sovereignty.
Covert Operations

A covert operation is a military, intelligence or law enforcement operation carried out clandestinely and usually outside official channels. Such operations take place without the knowledge of any other parties except the ones sponsoring or carrying out the operations. Foreign bases play a vital role in such operations as they often serve as forward base of operations and localized intelligence cells reporting back to the foreign nation from the host country without fear of liability because of the immunities often granted in State of Force Agreements. Many infamous covert operations caused great controversy such as the training of rebels in Cuba for the Bay of Pigs invasion, or the training of Afghan rebels during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan at known or hidden military bases at neighbouring countries. A more recent example is the May 2nd 2011 operation against Osama Bin Laden by US Navy Seals in Pakistan which was done without the knowledge of the Pakistani government; this raid was launched from one of the US bases near the Pakistani-Afghan border. Covert operations, in other countries neighboring the host nation or even in the host nation is a contentious issue which represents one of the fundamental violations of the sovereignty of a nation and is often used by the Anti-Base movements as an argument in winning support for foreclosures of bases. Aiding in Natural Disasters

In current times there is a growing trend for armed forces around the world to go beyond traditional warfare and take on humanitarian and development related tasks. The post-cold war repositioning is responsible for some of these factors; other reasons may include the professionalization of armed forces, the phasing out of draft and a greater investment in and management of each soldier’s career pattern has begun a search for new roles as ‘forces for good’ or ‘humanitarian warriors’. It also reflects moves towards more comprehensive approaches to security. So when a natural disaster strikes, not only the Armed Forces of the host country, but also the Visiting Forces, get activated into action. The International Disaster Recovery Association, (IDRA), has been helped during times of natural calamities by Armed Forces of countries around the world, especially by the United States which makes its military assets available for disaster response. Countries like the USA have a stated policy of maintaining an active international role for its military. The fact that they maintain a number of military bases globally enables them to reach the affected countries very quickly.

Similarly, during the Earthquake in Pakistan on October 8th, 2005, the Visiting Forces of the USA and NATO, already present in neighboring country Afghanistan, at the request of the United Nations, were immediately activated and within hours, helicopters and other military assets and personnel were deployed to assist initially in search and rescue efforts, followed by medical and rehabilitation efforts. The responsibility of aiding a populace in case of a natural disaster lies with civilian institutions; however, foreign military involvement in disaster relief has increased over the past 40 years. This raises questions regarding the deployment, degree of involvement and withdrawal of troops from the affected areas. The military is more adept to responding to disasters as they are readily trained to combat any contingency situation, and adapt rapidly to changing situations. The disaster relief provided by foreign military forces, is a two sided coin, on one hand it reduces the load on the disaster hit nation’s civil and military response units. On the other hand though, such endeavours may often be used to further agendas, or establish a foothold in a region otherwise unavailable. The example of Haiti which suffered the devastating earthquake in 2010, easily demonstrates how a military presence can help further the humanitarian effort, and at the same time, present a reason for extended periods of stay of thousands of military personnel, and transference of military from assistance to supervisory roles in relief efforts. A foreign base in the disaster hit country has its advantages as an additional asset for
disaster management and relief, but it also provides an opportunity for the foreign nation to gain access to areas of the host nation otherwise restricted. Therefore the delegates must come to a conclusion whether the benefits outweigh the cons in the overall scenario not just during times of crises.

Rape, Crime, Prostitution and Subsequent Diplomatic Immunity

Privileges and immunities are the handmaidens of international law. - McCormack Crosswell, 1952: v Rule 93 of the Geneva Conventions (1949), Common Article 3(1)(c) of the 1949 Geneva Conventions defines Rape, Prostitution and Other Forms of Sexual Violence, which has been stated which provides that “outrages upon personal dignity” are prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever with respect to persons hors de combat. Hors de Combat literally means "outside the fight". This is a French term, used in diplomacy and international law to refer to soldiers who are incapable of performing their military function. Examples include a downed fighter pilot, as well as the sick, wounded, detained, or otherwise disabled. Soldiers hors de combat are normally granted special protections according to the laws of war, sometimes including prisoner of war status. Foreign military bases are sometimes associated with increases in instances of rape, crime, and prostitution in the host country. Well documented are the atrocities at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba or in Abu Gharaib prison in Iraq, where actively serving men and women of the US Army were photographed and documented sexually abusing prisoners. Governments have long extended to other sovereign states and their representatives The Basis for Immunity from the Countries Laws, affording them rights and facilities not available to ordinary citizens. State of Force Agreements signed by the US protects US military personal on foreign soil from prosecution even in case of serious crimes, such as rape, thievery and even murder. In some cases, soldiers cannot be persecuted for crimes while on duty or even crimes committed in ‘civvies’ by the host country. The SOFA between US and East Timor grants full diplomatic immunity to US soldiers which meant that the domestic authorities could not arrest or hold them, or charge them with a crime making extradition impossible for crimes committed elsewhere or hold them financially or legally responsible for civil matters, including child support. Additionally, many recent agreements made around US military bases –including the East Timor treaty – have included commitments that no US personnel will be sent to the International Criminal Court, an attempt at global human rights protection which the US government has repeatedly refused to ratify. Even if SOFA conditions allow for soldiers to be held liable by the host country, they cannot be handed over unless the charges are formally filed and proven. This makes prosecution exceptionally difficult, and can be understood by observing the reports of crimes committed in Japan by US soldiers including rape, indirect promotion of prostitution and even murder. Particularly alarming though, is that many such protective agreements also cover employees of companies subcontracted by the US Army. The most notorious effect of this has been the failure of any authorities – US or European – to bring to justice a number of workers from Dyncorp, who were exposed as being involved in the trafficking of women and children as sex slaves in Bosnia.

Economics of Bases

The economic strains on the country owning bases in various nations increases exponentially as each new base is set up, the prime example of how much the cost can be, is United States of America with an annual spending of 1.9
Trillion dollars in 2008 on its foreign bases. However, such bases often provide a boost to the economy of the host country, as it creates new opportunities for work, for example the construction of bases is often done by local construction contractors as to reduce the costs for the foreign nation. As long as the base exists it also creates a trade cycle for local business for various items. Besides the obvious, there is a huge economic input in terms of long term leasing and other support infrastructure provided to the foreign nation, and in some cases the host nation is paid a compensating amount as per the SOFAs made. Another economic impact which is often overlooked is in terms of security spending as is exemplified by the presence of US military in the Philippines, which averted the Chinese from laying claim to certain resource rich Islands. When the US army left, the Philippines Navy spending increased by nearly $6 Billion so as to maintain the previous strategic advantage. But there are cases where ideological/political differences result is negative impacts to the economy of the host nation, in terms of increased unrest, violence and damages to property, or if the bases required the eviction and acquisition of prime lands resulting in the loss of real state capital, as in the example of Guam where two maps were compared, one showing the island’s best fishing grounds, agricultural lands and drinking water, the other showed the location of US military bases; the maps were identical. It is difficult to gauge the economic impacts of foreign military bases across the globe as the impacts vary from nation to nation because of many contributing factors such as ideological differences, stability within the country, political standings, and history of the formation of bases. The delegates can clearly see that foreign bases across Europe have a positive impact on the economy as compared to the negative economic reactions seen in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq etc. In looking at economic impacts one also needs to consider the implications on the input to the host nations GDP and local populace of the area in case of foreclosures of bases, Panama was able to recover from the foreclosures, but the same may not hold true in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Past International Actions

Over the years, the efforts of the international committee to address these contentious issues have met with failures, as the key actors have much to lose by the formation of an international binding framework to oversee the construction, maintenance and closure of bases. Including the legal grey areas and issues of diplomatic immunity of soldiers as discussed in the guide so far. However, since 2003 various community campaigns resisting military bases have started to join forces to address the spread of military bases through an international campaign. It is now known as “The international network for the abolition of foreign military bases” or “No Bases Network”. The first global conference was held in 2007 in Quito and Manta, Ecuador where the two main objectives were laid out:
1. To support the local and regional groups that are members of the Network by sharing information, developing joint strategies, and helping new campaigns to get on their feet.
2. To create space in international forums and at the UN for a critical debate both on the legality and necessity of foreign bases as a method of military domination and on the need for codes of conduct or ‘setting minimal standards’ for the use of existing bases. For this, the network actively engages with other international civil society networks and with intergovernmental forums, such as the NPT 2010 Review Process. The Network also lobbies ‘host nation governments’ and in Brussels and Washington.
Major Countries’ Positions

The main division will be between countries who support the continuation of foreign military bases and those host countries who claim to be negatively affected by them.

The United States, United Kingdom, France, and Russia
The United States has the most foreign military bases, with much information about them in the previous sections. Many are controversial, however there are many examples of foreign military bases that are tolerated or accepted by host populations. Likewise, the UK, France, and Russia have a number of bases each around the world. Russia has a base in Syria with whom its relationship has become increasingly controversial over the past 3 years.

China
China opened its first military base in the Seychelles in 2011, signaling its growing naval presence in the Indian Ocean. Countries with expanding military presences, such as China, should think of their future needs in preparing their country position. Japan also has a single military base in Djibouti to help in the international efforts to combat piracy in the Horn of Africa.

Germany
Germany hosts one of the collections of US military personnel, who number almost 30,000 personnel over 15 bases. Whether these troops are a continued hangover from the Cold War or a necessary part of the NATO defence structure remains debatable. Poland has a similarly contentious relationship with Russia due to the presence of US troops.

Afghanistan
Afghanistan hosts military bases for the United States and the United Kingdom. With the winding, down of military operations, many in both the US and Afghanistan would like to see these bases drawn down. However, some have argued that they continue to support the stability of the country.

Questions which should be raised in the committee

Q) Should there be an obligatory or binding global agreement on the regulation of foreign military bases? And, if so, what requirements should it contain?

Q) What is the suitable diplomatic position of foreign troops posted on military bases?

Q) Which guidelines and instructions should there be in signing SOFA agreements to defend civilian populations as well as local cultures?

Q) Is there an explanation or solution to reduce the negative consequences of foreign military bases, particularly concerning human rights?

Q) What effects do foreign military bases have on sovereign states?