

## IV. Outreach

# Congressional Briefing, October 28, 1999

*In addition to the remarks reproduced here, the Briefing included presentations from the following Summit participants on the effects of toxic contamination from U.S. bases in their own countries: Myrla Baldonado, Philippines; Gisele McCray Brito, Panama; Wanda Colon Cortez, Puerto Rico; Dr. Jorge Ramon Cuevas, Cuba; Rainer Knoll, Germany; Kaori Sunagawa, Japan. Versions of these presentations are included in the country reports.*

## **U.S. Military Base Cleanup, an Environmental Injustice?** **By Rep. Barbara Lee (D-CA)**

Good afternoon, welcome and thank everyone for being here today to discuss this crucial international public health and environmental issue: U.S. Military Base Cleanup. I would like to express my appreciation to the Institute for Policy Studies and Trinity College for bringing this important event together. And I would also like to acknowledge Senator Osmena of the Philippines. It is an honor to have you join us today.

As some of you know, I represent the Ninth Congressional District of California--an area which has been very active and progressive on military base closure and reuse.

In 1993, Congress authorized a national pilot project to study how communities respond to military base closures and Alameda County was selected as one of four national pilot project sites. After two rounds of base closures we have six closed military installations in Alameda County.

As a result, the East Bay Conversion and Reinvestment Commission was formed to meet the challenges of military base closure. To meet the challenges of environmental cleanup and sustainable community reuse of the property, the EBCRC brought together an impressive and inclusive committee of Bay Area environmental justice organizations, concerned citizens, state and federal regulators, military representatives and remediation companies to develop innovative approaches to cleaning up the bases. As a founding member of the EBCRC, I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Commission and its continuing commitment to work with our base closure communities. The Commission has published a book on military base conversion titled, *Defense Conversion: A Road Map for Communities* and its second book, *The Upside of Base Closure: Tools for Reinvesting in Communities*, will be available early next year.

As a member of the California State legislature, I served as the Chair of the California Defense Conversion Council and was involved in formulating a statewide response to converting our closing military bases to new uses for our communities.

Having been involved in this issue domestically, I have had the opportunity to learn about the health, safety, and environmental impacts of military bases on the surrounding communities. It is also my belief that if we have an obligation to cleanup our domestic military bases-- and we do--than our obligation and mandate to cleanup our military installations abroad is just as great.



As a member of the International Relations Committee, it is my belief that we need to focus attention and mobilize around this issue, as the toxic contamination left by U.S. military bases is egregious. It is a moral outrage.

While the Department of Defense is now working to become a global environmental leader, this goal will be unattainable in the absence of a strong commitment to cleanup. As The New York Times noted last December in an editorial, “American forces are withdrawing from military bases all over the world, but in many cases what they are leaving behind is dangerous to the local population and environment. Fuels, cleaning fluids, lubricants and other chemicals are leaching into groundwater, and unexploded shells linger on testing grounds long after American Soldiers leave.”

We are fortunate to have a panel of international experts in ecology, demilitarization, and law to share their research and work with U.S. military base cleanup in their countries.

We know that overseas, the U.S. is under no obligation to negotiate its environmental compliance and cleanup responsibilities with local agencies. Furthermore, there is no line item in the U.S. budget earmarking funds specifically for overseas cleanup. We need to change this reality.

Additionally, if there is one pattern to military base agreements, it is that the U.S. has done more to cleanup our installations hosted by our NATO allies in the Northern hemisphere, than in those in the Southern Hemisphere, smacking of a serious environmental justice issue.

I would like to thank and welcome all of the International delegates who have gathered this week in Washington and developed a Host Country Bill of rights which mandates a set of common standards for military base cleanup comparable to those governing bases on U.S. home soil.

Congress has an essential role to play in establishing a just policy to protect our environmental legacy in those countries where we once maintained bases. Thank you for joining us today to help lay the groundwork for this policy.

# Environmental Justice: U.S. Military Bases at Home and Abroad

By Senator Paul D. Wellstone (D-MN)

I want to thank Representative Barbara Lee for cohosting this event with me today. I also want to thank the Institute for Policy Studies and for all the groups who have organized this important summit. Many of you have been working hard for years on the environmental problems associated with overseas U.S. bases. So, many of you have much more expertise on this issue than I do. But when some committed environmental activists in Minnesota brought the question of our overseas environmental legacy to my attention I immediately recognized that it was an extension of an issue I have long been involved with domestically: Environmental justice.

Both here in the U.S. and around the globe, those who seem to be disproportionately affected by environmental contamination are those who don't have a powerful political voice. In the Senate, I led the fight against attempts to build a nuclear waste site in a poor Latino area in Sierra Blanca, Texas. Whether it be a nuclear dump in Sierra Blanca or contaminated ground water in the Philippines, the poor and politically powerless communities are being taken advantage of. Time and time again, the people who suffer from this type of contamination are almost always people already living in poverty struggling to maintain good health. These people do not also need to contend with a toxic legacy left by the U.S. military. It's wrong when it happens in the U.S., and it's wrong when it happens abroad.

This story is depressingly familiar. A similar scenario unfolds over and over again in different parts of the world, with different names and faces in every situation. Sometimes there is no intention by anyone to discriminate. But pervasive inequalities of income and access to the levers of political power exercise a

## Wellstone Amendment

SEC. 329. RELEASE OF INFORMATION TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES REGARDING ANY ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION AT FORMER UNITED STATES MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN THOSE COUNTRIES.

(a) RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION- Except as provided in subsection (b), upon request by the government of a foreign country from which United States Armed Forces were withdrawn in 1992, the Secretary of Defense shall--

(1) release to that government available information relevant to the ability of that government to determine the nature and extent of environmental contamination, if any, at a site in that foreign country where the United States operated a military base, installation, or facility before the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces in 1992; or

(2) report to Congress on the nature of the information requested and the reasons why the information is not being released.

(b) LIMITATION ON RELEASE- Subsection (a)(1) does not apply to--

(1) any information request described in such subsection that is received by the Secretary of Defense after the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) any information that the Secretary determines has been previously provided to the foreign government; and

(3) any information that the Secretary of Defense believes could adversely affect United States national security.

(c) LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES- The requirement to provide information under subsection (a)(1) may not be construed to establish on the part of the United States any liability or obligation for the costs of environmental restoration or remediation at any site referred to in such subsection.

controlling influence over the access to vital information.

The discussion you are launching this week is urgent and long overdue. As we have withdrawn from our bases around the world, the U.S. military has taken some steps to clean-up contamination at those bases before leaving. But there are still many convincing reports that significant contamination has been left behind. As the New York Times noted last December in an editorial, "American forces are withdrawing from military bases all over the world, but in many cases what they are leaving behind is dangerous to the local population and environment. Fuels, cleaning fluids, lubricants and other chemicals are leaching into groundwater, and unexploded shells linger on testing grounds long after American soldiers leave." This is especially true in the Philippines, where we withdrew from Subic Bay in 1992 and Clark Air Base in 1991. And it will soon apply to Panama where we will finish our withdrawal at the end of 1999. I offered an amendment to the FY 2000 DoD Authorization Bill that was simple, and straightforward and which could have potentially gone a long way toward ensuring that the United States leaves a positive environmental legacy behind when we withdraw from military bases overseas.

My amendment, which was passed in the Senate in May, was intended to protect the legacy of the U.S. in those countries where we maintained bases. It does not look at the environmental issue as a legal issue but as a moral one. At a time when anti-Americanism may be growing in certain parts of the world we need to ensure that in those countries that are our longtime allies, we do what we can to promote a positive image of the U.S. even after we leave our bases.

I understand that the Pentagon has no legal obligations under many of our treaties with these countries to pay for a clean-up of environmental contamination. And my amendment did not call for any funding for such a clean-up. What my amendment required the Pentagon to do was simply to make as much information as possible public and to cooperate in interpreting that information so that nations such as the Philippines can complete environmental studies to tell them exactly what has been left behind. It also required the Department of Defense to report to Congress on what information it has made public. I wish that my amendment could have done more, but realistically this was the best we could get this year.

Unfortunately, as is too often the case here, the Conference Committee behind closed doors weakened it by sharply limiting all information turnover to those bases that were withdrawn from in 1992 so that it will only cover one former site, Subic Bay Naval Base. It exempts all other base withdrawals around the world from any information disclosure, including Clark Air Force Base.

Such a weak-kneed response by our government increases my desire to fight. I am committed to remaining engaged with this cause for the long-term. The problems around the world will not be remedied quickly. My commitment is strengthened every time I read some of the disturbing reports from the sites of our former bases, and meet with men and women like yourselves who are fighting each day for environmental justice and to end this toxic legacy.

## **Lessons from California**

**By Representative Sam Farr (D-CA)**

My district has the honor of housing the largest military base in the United States which has ever been closed. We were forced with the challenge of cleaning up water, fuels, and other contaminants. There were large training ranges to contend with, including an artillery range caused lots of lead to be spread over the base. So far, we have been able to cleanup the dunes. In the process we found out that we could make money off of selling that lead. We also found a way to utilize the contaminated soil by working with another department project that needed soil. Other areas of cleanup are more difficult and less cost effective: our water cleanup will take at least twenty five years to effectively purify the aquifer. There is a big problem with explosive ordnance. To stimulate new ways of thinking on cleanup issues we have pulled together a team of community members including residents, military, civilian, and academic experts to work on common solutions to this problem. These people have great ideas and we're going to try to find the ways that are most effective, least expensive, and most efficient at cleaning up the unexploded ordnance. We hope that our solutions, coupled with new technology, will be able to be transported anywhere in the world.

I think the answer to the question of public participation is key and should be written into every base cleanup plan. In many areas, depending on the government, cleanup plans must meet federal, state and local laws. But these plans must also include a process in which the Secretary of Defense may appoint an advisory committee which is often comprised of concerned civilians. It's a discretionary concept, but if you don't believe that the government is doing an adequate job you can be appointed. I would suggest that if you have any questions about this you look at our website that elaborates the progress of our efforts in California.

My district has one of the most complicated base cleanups because the local government has jurisdiction over the land and California's regulatory agencies have stricter standards than the federal government. So we are faced with two tasks: 1) get a lot of people to agree on how to clean it up and then; 2) find the money to pay for it. I think the military will soon be in a bind if they don't find a better way to cleanup these bases because people are going to say that it is too expensive to clean them up. If this is the case, we might as well just put a big fence around them. I am very much opposed to this idea of fencing off areas because we can't afford to clean them up. I think that is a bad decision because the land is public land and it ought to be used how the public seems fit.

I am interested in seeing across the globe a heightened sense of U.S. responsibility to cleanup any kind of problem that the military has caused in another country. I am glad to be sitting on the subcommittee that deals with that base cleanup and military construction and would be interested in hearing your ideas on how to work toward a common solution.

## **Lessons from the Philippines**

**By Senator Sergio Osmena III, Philippines**

By and large, the efforts to press the United States to accept responsibility for cleaning up toxic contamination left by its bases in the Philippines have been made by individual Filipino Senators and Congressmen. We can't depend much on the Filipino administration. They seem to have a bit more important items of agenda with the United States, such as military supplies and equipment.

We also have a situation where the bases have already begun to be redeveloped. The government has already begun to host hundreds of enterprises on the property, in the knowledge that toxic and hazardous waste exists on those bases. This leaves the government open, in the future, to possible lawsuits. So it's been a myopic approach, it's very unfortunate, because it's going to blow up in their faces one of these years. The



situation is not going to get any better. It's going to get worse, because over the years, these toxins tend to migrate down to the aquifers and water levels. It will be affecting several towns and cities surrounding especially the bases of Clark, because Clark was the largest U.S. military base outside of the continental United States. It's three times larger than Ft. Worth, by the way. So, you have a situation where turning a blind eye won't make the problem go away. It's just going to get worse as those toxins migrate. As you know, in the Philippines, we tend to have heavy rainfall during certain times of the year, and with every rainfall the leeching speeds up. So again, we're not getting too much help from our own government these days, but individual efforts by individual Congressmen and Senators have brought this particular issue to the consciousness of the Filipino people.

## **Overview of Domestic and International Base Cleanup Issues**

**By Saul Bloom, ARC Ecology, San Francisco, CA**

First I'd like to thank Congresswoman Barbara Lee for hosting this very important hearing here on Capitol Hill. The congresswoman and I have known each other for close to twenty years now, and there is I think, on Capitol Hill, no stronger ally in the field of environmental justice than the congresswoman. She has been a brave and courageous advocate for communities of color, for environmental justice, for economic development in her community, and I'm deeply honored to have the opportunity to speak here as this panel that she's hosting today. My presentation is going to be an overview of the conditions prevailing on us military bases overseas. ARC Ecology has been involved in the field of military base contamination and conversion for some fifteen years, sixteen years this November. We serve in various capacities and what I have here is a series of foot charts that will take you through some of the issues that we will be discussing today. Chart I (p.9) is the picture of the military base contamination in the United States that most of us Americans know right now. As you can see, there are some 1,800 installations in the United States, and many hundreds additional of formerly utilized defense sites in the United States, currently contaminating our country. It's a very significant problem, and while many of us have concerns about the way the defense department is going about the cleanup program, at least there *is* a cleanup program in the United States.

Chart II (p.10) presents another view of the same issue. The United States has some 42,700 sq. mi. of military property. If you look to your left, to the right of that chart, you'll see that that is more than a huge number of member states of the United Nations. In fact, one installation, an air force base in Nevada, is larger than the number of nations in the United Nations itself, including many that we know. This gives you an idea of the breadth and scope of the United States' impact on the environment.

Chart III (p.11) gives you an even better look. Here is the spectrum that most Americans don't know. This is America's footprint internationally, militarily, on communities and colonies around the world. The United States, during the peak of the cold war, operated some 1,000 installations overseas. Those installations we used for the widest variety of military activities, from training for warfare, for warfare fighting, to actually holding land occupied during the Second World War.

Like American bases, overseas bases are contaminated by a wide variety of toxic substances. These substances, like in the United States, seriously contaminate the properties. As you will hear from many of the speakers following me, this contamination results in direct health impacts on the communities in which these installations are sited. It is a very significant problem. People right now are being harmed, and killed, by residual American military contamination at these installations. If you look at Chart IV (p.12), you will see somewhat of the top twenty toxins at U.S. military bases. Now of course this does not include unexploded ordnance. We had a good many firing ranges and unexploded ordnance problems at our overseas installations, and so the problem with the U.S. military is significant, substantial, and we are leaving behind an enormous legacy of toxic contamination in our allies and friends' back yards.

Looking at Chart V (p.13) we begin to see that what the U.S. has that our overseas partners lack is a rational process for base closure, so while many of us in the United States are concerned about the failures of our own programs, even this thought process does not exist at our overseas bases. They do not have the three tiered process that you see before you right now. They do not have the environmental certification process, the investigation of contamination, the thorough analysis of the situation, that at least we have an opportunity to have here in the United States, and therefore, as people begin to exploit the resources, they find that at closing bases, they are left with the challenge of unearthing the damage that we have done to those properties to ensure that there people are protected. Unfortunately this is a dubious process because it is extremely expensive, and in the third world, the developing world, in many minority and environmental justice communities around the world, this is simply not possible. The cleanup of two bases in the Philippines is estimated to cost 1/10 of the Philippines' annual national budget.

They also don't have one additional item: they don't have a process of public participation that is meaningful and transparent. What you see on the upper part of Chart VI (p.14), of the United States, are all the states with restoration advisory boards. These are community advisory committees that help the DoD make its decisions about the cleanup standards and activities on their bases. There is no analog overseas. Citizens are often left in the dark to fend for themselves and investigate the contamination affecting them and their families, by themselves, without assistance. In this regard, the United States, in many of its status of courses agreements continues to maintain that the United States is not responsible for returning these bases to the condition in which they were originally found when the us occupied the territory, something that has absolutely nothing to do with the cleanup of military installations, and yet still is used as an evasive linguistic device within our treaties to deny people their due course in terms of toxic cleanup in their communities. I will

summarize by simply saying that on behalf of ARC Ecology and the other organizers of this event, we believe that it is absolutely critical that the United States take a proactive, responsible position. We can argue treaties all day long, we can argue moral responsibilities all day long, but the fact of the matter is you do not build allies, you do not maintain friendships that you do not respect, the properties and lands, communities, and health of your friends and neighbors. And so we call on the United States today to do so, and once again I thank Congresswoman Barbara Lee for opening up this debate on Capitol Hill. Thank you.













## Concluding Remarks

By John Lindsay-Poland, Fellowship of Reconciliation, San Francisco, CA

During the week we have been together, the participants at this Summit have heard about the various problems that have been generated by U.S. military activities and presence overseas and in U.S. colonies. We've been hearing about the problems of health effects, the impact on land use, particularly for bases that have been closed, and restrictions in terms of access: violations of property rights on communities unable to use lands safely or properly. We've also been hearing about the effects of these bases on sovereignty, in terms of access to the sites, and access to information about these sites, both by the public and by concerned government agencies such as environmental agencies and public health agencies. We've also, I think, been seeing that there is

*"There is a growing international consensus that this kind of conduct is not acceptable."*

both an issue of information, in terms of knowing what the problem is on installations that are being controlled by foreign militaries, and the issue of responsibility for cleanup, particularly once a base is closed.

Now there is one particular theme that stands out, and that is the contradiction between the model we in the United States would like to project in the world and what the United States' practice has actually been in our military presence around the world. We present a leadership role as a society that is a model for democratic governments that ought to be emulated in other

parts of the world. And we undermine this image by our conduct with our own forces, our own institutions, which is arrogant, dangerous, and destructive of the environment.

You know, sometimes these international relations issues seem rather abstract. The things that people have been presenting, in terms of pictures and individual human effects, are helpful, but I also find a metaphor or a comparison to be very useful. When we were in kindergarten and first grade, our teacher said, "Ok, if you make a mess, you have to clean it up." When I was in Panama earlier this year, and I was presenting something about the firing ranges in Panama to a group of high school students, one of the students asked, "If the United States fired these objects and put them into the ranges, why don't they know where they are?"

These are very simple things, and I think we can extend the analogy if we say, for example: if you invite a guest to your home, and your guest comes and stays in your home and you have certain agreements about what is going to happen when the guest is in your home, and then the guest leaves, and it turns out, has left a bunch of things under the front porch, which turn out to be explosives, or something else that is dangerous. You might say, "Well, gee, we're not going to invite you back, and more importantly, we want you to deal with these." As Senator Wellstone said, these are fairly straightforward moral propositions. I think it is useful to look at it in those terms. I have not yet heard anyone on the other side of the debate who has been able to tell me why this is not a good analogy.

While we are painfully aware that this moral concern is not currently being translated into U.S. government action on these issues, there is growing in the international arena a set of processes that may be useful and that may come back to haunt the United States in its arrogant conduct. During our Summit this week we have heard about the effects of military base contamination country by

country. But there are also, in the international community, growing movements that are working effectively on problems that are common between countries. In the '50s and '60s, one of these was the problem of nuclear weapons testing and atmospheric testing first, and then comprehensive nuclear testing. Looking at it on an international basis, how can we deal with this problem that is generated by this certain type of military activity? There has also been an international movement that was begun by non-governmental organizations in order to ban the use and deployment of landmines. The chemical weapons convention is another example of an international initiative to address a problem that is generated by a military tactic. Chemical weapons were found to be morally reprehensible, and therefore the international community has agreed fundamentally to eliminate these weapons from the planet. There are also emerging movements to do the same thing with depleted uranium and with persistent organic pollutants, including those persistent organic pollutants which are generated by military activities. I think that we may find in the future that underneath the arrogant conduct of the U.S. government on this issue, there is a growing international consensus that this kind of conduct is not acceptable. So we are going to leave here and go back to our communities and our countries to work toward these aims, and we seek all kinds of collaboration on many different fronts, toward those ends.

## Congressional Meetings

*In addition to convening the public briefing with Reps. Barbara Lee and Sam Farr and Senator Paul Wellstone in the Congressional Briefing, Summit participants met with staffpeople of seven Senators and fifteen Representatives on October 30. Summit participants briefed Congressional staff about the problems of military base contamination in their countries and the Environmental Bill of Rights, and sought commitment to request a General Accounting Office report on the problems of overseas base contamination generally. Congressional staffers spanned a range of knowledge and interest in the issues, including some who expressed interest in requesting such a GAO report and in the reintroduction of an amendment requiring DoD to release environmental information about its overseas bases. Some staffers pointed out that members of the Armed Services and Appropriations committees are necessarily key to such efforts. They also noted that a domestic "angle" is needed for Congress to address the problem effectively.*

# Embassy Meeting

*Representatives from the embassies of Philippines, the United Kingdom, Cuba, South Korea and Panama met with conference participants from these same countries. It was agreed that this meeting was private and off the record in order to facilitate frank discussion. This report, therefore, summarizes the main points made during the two hours of discussions, but does not attribute remarks to particular individuals or necessarily reflect a consensus on the points. In synthesizing the discussion, the main points were:*

\$ **Need for baseline studies of environmental damage on U.S. bases.** Without good baseline studies, it is difficult to measure cleanups. This information must come from the U.S. All of the studies done to date have been inadequate, with the U.S. government often doing a partial or superficial survey which downplays the damage, and governments and NGOs only having funds to do narrow, limited studies. In South Korea, for instance, there are 95 U.S. bases and there has been no objective study of the problems. The only research has been by NGO environmental groups, but it is unsystematic. The Korean government has worked to have U.S. military flights moved to safer areas, but has been stonewalled by the U.S.

In the Philippines, the U.S. issued a report claiming the closed bases were cleaned up, but since then environmental problems have become evident, making it dangerous to use the land for commercial purposes. The Philippines embassy in Washington has been working on clean-up issues since 1992.

In Britain and Bermuda, as well, U.S. environmental impact studies were very inadequate. Similarly, in Panama there is a need for the U.S. to conduct baseline studies and declassify all documents relating to the former U.S. bases.

\$ **No foreign country has sufficient national money for cleanup.** In the Philippines, for instance, no money has been appropriated, but there is an Executive Order pending that would provide \$1 billion over five years for cleanup of U.S. bases. The British government backs Bermuda in its effort to get the U.S. to cleanup former bases closed in 1995. Bermuda estimates that cleanup would cost around \$60 million—as much as one-tenth of its national budget.

\$ **The U.S. government has been unresponsive to foreign governments as well as to community organizations.** Secretary of State Albright has publicly supported private sector involvement. The U.S. Trade and Development Agency (TDA) has expressed an interest in funding feasibility studies as a way of opening markets for U.S. cleanup technologies. Some private firms have offered to do the cleanup for free in exchange for the opportunity to test unproven technologies. But without baseline studies, it is difficult to measure cleanups. The Philippines government has approached TDA to provide seed money for a baseline study. There has been no response from the U.S.

\$ **The U.S. needs to accept the principle that the “polluter pays,” i.e., that the U.S. must cleanup its overseas bases.** The U.S. spends \$1.72 billion for cleanup of domestic bases, but only \$165 million annually for the total overseas cleanup. Most of that amount is devoted to administration and compliance with current standards with only 10 percent

actually invested in cleanup work on existing contamination. The U.S. has also made clear to other countries that the agreement with Canada--giving \$100 million for cleanup efforts in exchange for Canada buying \$100 million of U.S. arms--is not a precedent and other countries should not try to get a similar deal. It is not fair that countries are not provided accurate information about the extent of contamination or that the U.S. treats countries differently on clean-up issues. In Korea, NGO and the government efforts to get the U.S. to renegotiate its treaty have failed. In Panama, the U.S. claims it cleaned all the "practicable" areas, but it did not clean many areas, including the bombing ranges around which more than 60,000 people are living. Panama wants to open discussions with the U.S. about what is meant by "practicable."

\$ **Both foreign governments and citizen groups are becoming increasingly concerned about U.S. base cleanup issues, and this is likely to intensify in the future.** In Korea, anti-communist sentiments have, until recently, prevented much criticism of U.S. bases, but that is now changing and concerns are being openly raised. Government representatives expressed the need for civil society to work with them in pressuring the U.S. government on clean-up issues. In Puerto Rico, the Vieques base closure campaign has been inspired by the movement in Panama and has also been strengthened by the growing sovereignty movement in Puerto Rico. In Cuba, where Guantanamo is the oldest U.S. military base in Latin America, both the government and the people want the base closed. Cuba has carefully documented the serious extent of the environmental damage that the base and its large refugee population are causing to the island and surrounding waters. Although there is no time limit on the U.S. occupation, under international law, agreements with no endpoint are recognized to end after 100 years. Cuba wants total recovery and is hoping that talks will begin soon.

\$ **There are a number of strategies which governments/citizen groups might try and there is a need to have ongoing discussions among the different affected countries.**

**A) Private sector:** In some cases closed bases are being turned into economic zones for private investors, manufacturers, exporters, or tourism attractions. Because it's "a big problem if foreigners start getting sick" from the contamination, private firms, particularly those in the U.S., can help pressure the U.S. government to carry out baseline studies and adequate cleanups.

**B) Joint diplomatic efforts by countries with U.S. bases.** All the government people expressed frustration at the lack of response from the U.S. and urged that, by working together with a common set of demands, they might be able to make a stronger case to the U.S. One idea is to convene a summit of ministers from different countries to work on cleanup issues. The NGOs present urged that there be strong NGO involvement in this type of strategy summit.

**C) Coordination of research.** Foreign governments and NGOs should work together to find out information about U.S. military bases. For instance, the U.S. government's National Archives contains a lot of information about contamination, cleanup, and other issues relating to U.S. bases. Perhaps researchers in Washington could help coordinate efforts at the National Archives. Also, there could be

coordinated efforts by affected countries to demand the U.S. declassify documents about its overseas bases.

**D) Coordinated Legal Action.** There are a number of different types of legal action that should be considered. These include lawsuits in U.S. courts and in the International Court of Justice. The countries need to work together to discuss how to take joint or parallel legal action.

§ **Participants concluded that this was an extremely useful session.** It highlighted the common problems both governments and NGOs are facing regarding clean-up and closure issues around U.S. bases and possible parallel or joint actions which might be taken. One of the remarkable features of the meeting was that despite the political diversity of the countries represented and the often adversarial relationship between NGOs and their governments, what emerged was a sense that all are facing similar problems and that further discussion and efforts to find common strategies was essential.

## List of Embassy Representatives

<p>Fernando Perez Maza First Secretary Cuban Interests Section 2630 16th Street NW Washington, DC 20009 Tel: 202-797-0820 Fax: 202-797-8521 Email: cubaseccion@igc.apc.org</p>	<p>Jorge Miranda Attache Embassy of Panama 2862 McGill Terrace NW Washington, DC 20008 Tel: 202-483-1407 Fax: 202-483-8413 Email: jhm@panaemba-dc. ccmail.compuserve.com</p>	<p>Laura Del Rosario Minister Embassy of the Philippines 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington, DC 20036 Tel: 202-467-9300</p>
<p>Col. Lee, Suk Joong Embassy of Korea 2450 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington, DC 20008 Tel: 202-939-9616</p>	<p>Paula Defensor Lands and Legislative Affairs Division Department of Environment and Natural Resources Visayas Avenue, Diliman Quezon City 1103 Philippines Tel/Fax: 632-926-8059 Email: defensor@philonline.com</p>	<p>Alexandra Hall First Secretary Political Section Embassy of the United Kingdom 3100 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington, DC Tel: 202-588-6500 Fax: 202-588-7870</p>