

becomes evident when one considers the global reach of the US military. According to the Defense Department's 2003 *Base Structure Report*, the United States has at least 702 foreign bases and installations. Further, it is estimated that these military bases and installations are located in at least fifty-nine countries and separate territories around the world (Editors 2002, 8-9). This list of countries, shown in Table 2, illustrates the global presence of the US military.

Table 2:
Countries and Separate Territories in which US Military Bases are Located
(Includes US Possessions)²⁷

1. Afghanistan	22. Greenland	42. Pakistan
2. American Samoa	23. Guam	43. Peru
3. Antigua	24. Honduras	44. Portugal
4. Aruba	25. Hong Kong	45. Puerto Rico
5. Australia	26. Iceland	46. Qatar
6. Austria	27. Indian Ocean (Diego Garcia)	47. Saudi Arabia
7. Bahama Islands	28. Indonesia	48. Singapore
8. Bahrain	29. Italy	49. Spain
9. Belgium	30. Japan	50. St. Helena
10. Bosnia	31. Johnston Atoll	51. Tajikistan
11. Bulgaria	32. Korea	52. Turkey
12. Canada	33. Kosovo	53. United Arab Republic (Egypt)
13. Colombia	34. Kuwait	54. United Kingdom
14. Cuba	35. Kwajalein Atoll	55. United States
15. Curaçao	36. Kyrgyzstan	56. Uzbekistan
16. Denmark	37. Luxembourg	57. Venezuela
17. Ecuador	38. Netherlands	58. Virgin Islands
18. El Salvador	39. New Zealand	59. Wake Island
19. France	40. Norway	
20. Germany	41. Oman	
21. Greece		

Once a base is established, a series of vested interests emerge which not only seek to maintain the status quo but to increase the size and scope of base operations. Even if we assume that the military bases were installed under the two key assumptions of benevolence and wisdom, it is easy to see

²⁷ Source to Table 2, Editors 2002, 8-9.

how a military installation can take on a life of its own leading to activities that differ greatly from the initial purpose or wisdom. Indeed, as will be discussed, the existence of bases abroad may very well generate significant negative unintended consequences (see Editors 2002).

In addition to military bases and installments, the United States also has a significant global deployment of military personnel. For instance, prior to the 9/11 attacks, Chalmers Johnson estimates that as of September 2001, the United States was deploying over 250,000 military personnel in over 150 countries. When Department of Defense civilians and US dependents are added to the number of military personnel, total US related deployment more than doubles to over 530,000 (Johnson 2004, 154-160). Since 9/11 these numbers have increased. For instance, in a *Los Angeles Times* report, William Arkin notes that since 9/11, “military tent cities have sprung up at 13 locations in nine countries neighboring Afghanistan, substantially extending the network of bases in the region. All together, from Bulgaria and Uzbekistan to Turkey, Kuwait and beyond, more than 60,000 US military personnel now live and work at these forward bases” (2002).

At first glance it may appear that these military bases, and the associated US military personnel, produce worldwide security and stability. Within this context, instead of policing the Western Hemisphere as dictated by the Roosevelt Corollary, the United States now can be seen as policing the world to establish “civilized societies.” However, as in Latin America, the United States’ global presence can produce both goods and bads.

In a recent *Foreign Affairs* article, Alexander Cooley (2006) analyzes the impact of the global US base strategy with particular emphasis on the impact of US bases in nondemocratic countries. Among his conclusions is that, “setting up bases in nondemocratic states brings mostly short-term benefits, rarely helps promote liberalization [in the country hosting the US base], and sometimes even endangers US security” (80). The underlying reason is that the leaders of nondemocratic countries entering into base agreements with the United States are fully aware that US policymakers need their support and cooperation for the success of the broader mission. Realizing this, these same leaders are aware that US officials are more likely to overlook illiberal activities for fear of damaging the military base agreement. In many cases it is not just a matter of looking the other way, but of the United States proactively supporting the existing regime.

In some cases, such as Saudi Arabia in the mid 1990s, the presence of US bases and military personnel provides the very fodder needed by extremists to coordinate others around their anti-US position. One can see