

The Joint Contact Team Program

Robert T. Cossaboom



DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Joint History Office

Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

THE JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM

**Contacts with Former Soviet Republics
and
Warsaw Pact Nations
1992-1994**



Robert T. Cossaboom



19980416 174

RECEIVED

**Joint History Office
Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Washington, DC
1997**

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cossaboom, Robert T., 1944-

The Joint Contact Team Program : military contacts with former Soviet republics and Warsaw Pact nations, 1992-1994 / Robert T. Cossaboom.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Joint Contact Team Program (U.S.)—History. 2. Military assistance, American—Former Soviet republics—History. 3. Military assistance, American—Europe, Eastern—History. I. Title.

UA23.C6722 1997

355' 03247—dc21

97-2425

CIP

PREFACE

The end of the Cold War and the collapse of communist dictatorships across Central and Eastern Europe provided a unique opportunity for the spread of democracy. As the world's premier democracy, the United States had a leading role in assisting the newly freed states, giving the military a new mission in Europe in the form of the Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP). Providing assistance to fledging democracies was not a new experience for the military, but this time the countries participating in the contact program were all recent enemies. Most were former members of the Warsaw Pact. Some, in fact, had been constituent republics of the Soviet Union.

Events offered by the contact program went beyond military specialties because US planners were concerned that the military establishment in the new democracies would engage in activities disruptive to the civilian government. For this reason, the program was designed to provide information on a broad range of subjects that were expected to highlight the role of the military in a democracy.

The United States European Command (USEUCOM), as the theater command, faced some challenges in implementing the JCTP since finding personnel who were language-qualified was initially difficult and was resolved only by drawing on the National Guard and Reserve. Use of Reserve component members had the added advantage of offering the host nations a firsthand demonstration of the capabilities of citizen-soldiers. All the while working with the host nations, contact team members had to exercise caution not to appear as replacements for the recently departed Russian advisors.

From the development and execution stage of the program, a number of the strengths and weaknesses of US military planning was brought to light. Among the obstacles was a reluctance on the part of the military to accept "non-standard" missions, to fund a new program out of the budget cycle, and to find language-trained personnel. On the positive side, the program highlighted the viability of the "total force" concept, the ability to improvise, and the enthusiasm of the new democracies to establish working relationships with the US military.

In conducting research for this study I was assisted by many individuals. At the Joint Staff, CDR Dirk Deverill, J-5, was especially helpful in arranging access to documentation. I wish to thank Brig Gen Tom Lennon and the staff of the Contact Team Program Office at USEUCOM headquarters, particularly Col Lee Alloway, Col Keith Stalder, Lt Col Keith Snyder, CDR Gary Starr, and Capt Chuck Helms, for opening their files and spending time discussing the early days of the contact program. Documentation tells only part of the contact program's story. It would be difficult to gauge the program's impact without having visited the military liaison teams and having talked to host nation officials. I was fortunate to do both. Individual country desk officers such as Lt Col Ildiko Andrews, CPT Dave Futch, LCDR Bill Gripman, LTC Mark Kogle, and Maj Lee Woodley were very helpful in getting me to "their" individual countries and arranging interviews. Two desk officers deserving special thanks are LTC Dick Dykes, who flew me to Ljubljana and back in his historic Navion, and Maj Fred Olson

for ensuring I had a very productive visit to Lithuania. With each liaison team I visited, members were generous in taking time from their very hectic schedules to explain their efforts and open their files. In a number of cases, the team chief also arranged for me to talk to host country officials for a better understanding of the program's impact. I would like to offer special thanks to Col Lou Boros, Col Oleh Skrypczuk, and COL Charles Crist. And I would be remiss if I did not mention Dr. Frank "Mickey" Schubert from the Joint History Office, who coordinated this study, and Col Harry Raduege from the Air Force C4 Agency, who allowed me to take time to prepare it. I also wish to express my gratitude to Col Juliette Finkenauer from the Joint History Office who was responsible for the editing and publishing of this monograph. Finally, I would like to thank my wife Marcia and daughter Kristen for their understanding and support.

This volume was reviewed for declassification by the appropriate US government departments and agencies and cleared for release. Although the text has been declassified, some of the cited sources remain classified. This volume is an official publication of the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

ROBERT T. COSSABOOM
Historian

Washington, DC
30 April 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

OVERVIEW	1
DISSOLUTION OF SOVIET POWER.....	1
The Gorbachev Phenomenon	1
Democracy in Eastern Europe	2
The Breakup of the Soviet Union	2
THE WESTERN RESPONSE	3
Early American Proposals	3
East Europe Interagency Working Group	4
Expanding the Contacts	6
Bilateral Working Groups	6
European Command's Proposal	7
Proposals in Washington, DC	8
Final Plans	10
Manning the Program	12
FORMING THE JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM.....	12
Four Men in an Attic.....	12
Manning the Liaison Teams: The Foreign Language Requirement.....	13
Budget	14
"Do More Faster"	15
State Partnerships for All	19
The Events	20
PART I ENDNOTES	21

PART II

NEW DEMOCRACIES	25
FACE TO FACE WITH COUNTRY LEADERSHIP	25
Hungary	25
Poland	27
Albania	29
Latvia	31
Estonia	33
Lithuania	35
Romania	38
Bulgaria	40
Czech Republic.....	41
Slovakia	44

Slovenia	46
Belarus	48
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	50
Support	52
The Future	53
PART II ENDNOTES	54
APPENDIX I	57
THE GEORGE C. MARSHALL CENTER	57
Laying the Foundation.....	57
ENDNOTES APPENDIX I	61
APPENDIX II	63
PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THE JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM.....	63
APPENDIX III	71
JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM EVENTS	71
Albania	71
Belarus	72
Bulgaria	73
Czech Republic.....	74
Estonia	75
Hungary.....	76
Latvia	80
Lithuania	82
Poland	83
Romania	87
Slovenia	90
Slovakia	91
Multi-Country	92
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	93
INDEX.....	101
MAP	109

PART I

OVERVIEW

The collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union and the emergence of successor governments in Central and Eastern Europe presented the United States and its allies from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) a major challenge—how to assist the new governments to develop and institutionalize democracy. One particular concern was the functioning of the military in a democratic government. For forty years or more, all of these countries had been communist dictatorships with senior members of the Communist Party occupying seats of rank in the government and military. While in theory the civilian government, usually the president, controlled the military, in practice, the Communist Party was in control. In addition, most military planning was done by the Soviet Union under the facade of the Warsaw Pact.

Since the end of World War II, the United States had little contact with the Soviet military and almost none with its Warsaw Pact clients. Faced with the sudden changes in Central and Eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the United States government, through the Department of State and Department of Defense (DOD), began exploring means to increase military-to-military contacts with the former members of the Warsaw Pact. The Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP), directed by the Joint Staff and executed by United States European Command (USEUCOM), became the means of encouraging the development of democratic military institutions in Central and Eastern Europe.

DISSOLUTION OF SOVIET POWER

The Gorbachev Phenomenon

Mikhail S. Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Communist Party in early 1985 at a time when the Soviet Union was experiencing serious economic and political problems. The economy had stagnated and the standard of living for its citizens was declining. During the tenure of his predecessors, Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev's final years and the quick succession of Yuri V. Andropov (November 1982-February 1984) and Konstantin U. Chernenko (February 1984-March 1985), the political leadership had weakened. By 1985, the Party leadership faced an economic crisis and a decreasing level of credibility with the Soviet population. By March 1985, Secretary Gorbachev stated, "We cannot live like this any longer."¹

He launched a program he called *perestroika*, which could be translated as modernization, reconstruction, remaking, renewal, or reorganization. He meant to revamp the Soviet economy completely. To win public support, Gorbachev introduced *glasnost*, openness. Two years later, in 1987, he commented to his friend Anatoly Chernyaev, "You know, Anatoly, I mean to go far (in reforming the Soviet Union), very far. Nobody knows how very far I mean to go."²

As the process of reform progressed, Gorbachev was less and less able to control the social and intellectual forces he had set loose. As early as 1986, Kazaks had rioted when he replaced the corrupt but native-born party boss of Kazakstan with a Russian. By 1988, the process of reform Gorbachev had initiated had outraced him. In February of that year, disagreement over the continued inclusion of the territory of Nagorno-Karabak in Azerbaijan resulted in the outbreak of armed clashes between Armenians and Azeris, fighting that continued into 1994. Gorbachev's call for reform unleashed two much more powerful forces—democracy and nationalism.

Democracy in Eastern Europe

Between the summer of 1989 and the end of 1990, the Soviet empire in Central and Eastern Europe disintegrated with Gorbachev's tacit approval. The beginning of the end came in May 1989 when Hungary opened its border with Austria. Since passports were obtainable from the West German embassy in Budapest, East Germans could cross into Austria en route to West Germany. During the summer of 1989, East German tourists discovered this chink in the Iron Curtain. A trickle soon became a flood of refugees heading through Czechoslovakia and Hungary toward Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany. Word spread quickly throughout East Germany. Unable to stop the rush without resorting to arms, a scenario President Gorbachev did not support, the East German government tried to manage travel to the West directly from East Germany. On the afternoon of 9 November 1989, a government spokesman announced that "it is now possible for all citizens to leave the country through East German crossing points." Hours later, thousands of East Germans overran the Berlin Wall, effectively reuniting Germany. They wanted not just freedom to travel but an end to the entire communist-dominated economic and political system.

From Poland to Albania, peaceful revolutions swept the communist dictatorships from power. The exceptions were Romania, where a short bloody uprising in December 1989 ended the Ceausescu dictatorship, and Yugoslavia, where Slovenian, Croatian, and Bosnian demands for independent states clashed with the Serbian drive to create a Greater Serbia. Between March 1990 and April 1991, each of the nations of Eastern Europe conducted free elections for the first time in over forty years. On 1 July 1991, the members of the Warsaw Pact voted to dissolve that organization, marking the formal end of Soviet military control of Eastern Europe.³

The Breakup of the Soviet Union

The quest for freedom and independence and the revival of nationalism that swept Eastern Europe did not stop at the borders of the Soviet Union. President Gorbachev's program of *perestroika* and calls for *glasnost* encouraged reform-minded people in each of the Soviet republics to hope for greater freedoms, even the freedom of having their own independent state. Dissatisfaction with Soviet rule was particularly acute in the three Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They had been independent states from 1918 until 1940, when they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union as a result of the German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact. Two other republics—Georgia and Ukraine—had short periods of independence after World War I, and they, too, proved fertile ground for demands for change.

In each of the Baltic states, mass organizations that formed during 1988 to support Gorbachev's call for reform evolved into pro-independence groups by the end of 1989. In an effort to win support for the central government, Gorbachev allowed each of the republics to hold relatively free parliamentary elections. On 24 February 1990, Lithuanians elected a majority of pro-independence deputies, who on 11 March 1990, voted to restore the republic's independence. After holding elections, Estonia and Latvia also moved toward a declaration of independence, followed by the republics of Moldova, Georgia, and Armenia. Leaders of many of the remaining republics, including Ukraine, Russia, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan, expressed support for greater autonomy.⁴

For months, Gorbachev and the Soviet central government groped for a response to the demands for independence or autonomy. Caught between a desire to preserve the Soviet Union and an unwillingness to use the massive force needed to crush the reform and independence movements, Gorbachev wavered. Finally, in April 1991, Gorbachev, the Russian Republic President, Boris N. Yeltsin, and the leaders of eight other republics, agreed to transform the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) into a group of autonomous states, the Union of Sovereign Socialist Republics. The agreement also implied that the six "rebel" republics could negotiate their way out of the new union.⁵

President Gorbachev planned to have the new union treaty signed in August 1991, but on 19 August, before the signing of the treaty, a group of Soviet conservatives in the central government and the senior military leadership staged a coup. Although the coup failed largely because of the opposition of Boris Yeltsin and key military leaders, it destroyed the authority of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. Gorbachev disbanded the Party and within weeks, all of the non-Russian republics declared their independence. On 2 September 1991, President George H. W. Bush announced that the United States recognized the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. On 25 December, Gorbachev announced the end of the USSR. On the same day, President Bush announced that the United States recognized the independence of the twelve remaining former Soviet republics. The day following the US announcement, the Soviet parliament formally abolished the Soviet Union.⁶

THE WESTERN RESPONSE

Early American Proposals

For most of the post-World War II era, the United States treated the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact as a monolithic entity. When military-to-military contacts were necessary, they were conducted strictly with the Soviet Union. Since each member of the Warsaw Pact reacted differently to the Gorbachev reforms, President Ronald W. Reagan and his advisers modified their policy to deal with the members on an individual basis. The American policy now encouraged new bilateral relations in response to improvements in human rights and political freedom carried out by individual countries. But some officials in the administration wished to include expanding military-to-military contacts with the nations in Central and Eastern Europe as part of the new policy.⁷

One of the early voices for expanded military contact was the US ambassador to Hungary, Mr. Robie M. H. Palmer. In 1987, Ambassador Palmer helped convince Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger to approve contact between the US and Hungarian militaries. The Department of Defense developed a two-year program which included exchanges of military historians and marksmanship teams. The first tangible result was the visit to Budapest of US Army and Air Force historians in June 1988 led by Brigadier General William A. Stofft, the US Army's Chief of Military History. Two months later, the ambassador co-hosted an unofficial conference on conventional forces in Europe with representatives from five members of NATO—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and the Federal Republic of Germany—and five members of the Warsaw Pact—the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. In October, a Hungarian marksmanship team competed against a US Army team at Fort Benning, Georgia.⁸

At the same time, DOD expanded the military-to-military contacts to include the Soviet Union and Poland. In July 1988, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., hosted his Soviet counterpart, Marshal Sergi Akhromyev, during a visit to the Pentagon and to a number of American installations. One year later in June 1989, Marshal Akhromyev reciprocated during Admiral Crowe's visit to the Soviet Union.⁹

Each of these military-to-military visits was a separate event arranged by the Department of State and the Department of Defense, the Joint Staff, the US ambassador to the country, and the host country's military and political leadership. Each event marked a significant breakthrough in relations between the US military and the military establishments of Warsaw Pact members. Initially, the number of such events was small and each one received considerably high-level attention.

East Europe Interagency Working Group

By the fall of 1989, the United States recognized that the pace of political change in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe presented unique opportunities for democratic self-determination and the creation of market economies. To take advantage of these opportunities and encourage progress, the US government embarked on a program to expand and normalize the process of developing military-to-military contacts. It chartered an Interagency Working Group (IWG) on defense and military relations with the Soviet Union. This was soon followed by a second IWG on defense and military relations with Eastern Europe. The two groups were composed of representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Joint Staff, the Department of State, the National Security Council (NSC), the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The United States-Soviet Union Interagency Working Group oversaw military-to-military relationships developing between the two countries, and the second IWG performed a similar function for military relations with the communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. They also served as a clearinghouse for proposed military exchanges and for reviewing and approving each of these contacts.¹⁰

In response to the crackdown in the Baltic states in early 1990, the US government slowed the development of military-to-military contacts with the Soviet Union. Simultaneously, the continuing democratization of Eastern Europe and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the region spurred contacts elsewhere in former Soviet domains.

The Interagency Working Group on United States-East European defense and military relations held its first meeting on 15 August 1990. The group issued its first guidance in September and addressed the concern that the military-to-military contact program with Central Europe would provoke the Soviet Union. The program goals were straightforward:¹¹

- (1) Promoting development of non-political militaries accountable to democratically-elected civilian leadership;
- (2) Promoting development of a demilitarized market economy;
- (3) Encouraging smaller militaries with defense postures designed to serve legitimate self-defense needs while posing no external threat;
- (4) Moving toward friendly security relationships;
- (5) Helping the military understand US defense policies and Western society;
- (6) Advancing US objectives in arms control, especially denuclearization;
- (7) Developing regular dialogues about arms sales and other military relationships with third world countries; and
- (8) Coordinating among our allies the broad approaches toward Central and Eastern European defense establishments based on these goals.

The guidelines designed to direct the military-to-military contacts were attuned to the evolving situation:¹²

- (1) Seek and follow political guidance from Washington DC regarding any attempts to find new security guarantees;
- (2) Be sensitive to democratic civilian concerns and avoid programs undermining the authority of civilian leadership;
- (3) Present, whenever appropriate, the US military as a role model of an apolitical organization subordinate to the civil government and supportive of the constitution; and
- (4) Avoid rushing in to fill the void left by the Soviet Union in retreat.

The IWG approved the first Joint Staff two-year plan for military-to-military contacts in November 1990, a plan differentiating between countries based on priorities it established. This plan outlined an initial series of contacts with each country that consisted of confidence-building visits by military chaplains, lawyers, surgeons, and historians.¹³

The growth in military-to-military contacts envisioned by the creation of the Interagency Working Group greatly increased the participation of USEUCOM. All of Central and Eastern Europe was in the command's area of responsibility. It was expected that many of the contacts called for in the two-year plan would be carried out by its headquarters staff. In April 1990, the legal advisor visited military legal experts in Hungary, and in January 1991, Romania. The chaplain visited counterparts

in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania in December 1990, and in 1991 and 1992, the surgeon made a number of visits to his counterparts in Central and Eastern Europe. During those years, the Director of Plans and Policy (ECJ5) visited his counterparts in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, and Romania, and hosted reciprocal visits at Headquarters USEUCOM.¹⁴

Expanding the Contacts

The attempted coup in Moscow in August 1991 and the breakup of the Soviet Union lent increased urgency to the effort of reaching out to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. There was a sense that these events would usher in a period of political and, perhaps, military instability on the territory of the former Soviet Union and that this instability might spread to the new governments of Central and Eastern Europe. These political changes offered an opportunity for the West to assist in the democratic development of these nations.

As part of its response to this situation, the United States government made major military-to-military program changes aimed at expanding the number of contacts and reaching a wider audience. If democracy were to take root in the military establishments of Central and Eastern Europe, the West had to reach out to future, as well as present military leaders. This meant encouraging more participation by mid-level and junior officers. It also meant expanding the variety of subjects covered.

Bilateral Working Groups

As military relationships between the United States and the nations of Central and Eastern Europe expanded, a greater need emerged for a more coherent bilateral program of events tailored toward mutually-agreed priorities in the areas of defense restructuring and reorganization. To assist the nascent democracies in developing their priorities, Secretary of Defense Richard B. Cheney offered to establish a Bilateral Working Group (BWG) with each country. Each BWG operated just below the level of the Secretary of Defense and his counterpart, the Minister of Defense. On the American side, the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Plans chaired the working groups.

During his visit to Prague, Czechoslovakia, and Budapest, Hungary, in December 1991, Secretary Cheney concluded verbal agreements with the host defense ministers to establish Bilateral Working Groups. Formal arrangements were completed, and the United States held the first bilateral meeting with the Hungarians in September 1992. From that time through April 1994, the US held BWG meetings with Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania. The meetings with the three Baltic states—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were scheduled to take place in April 1994.¹⁵

In November 1992, the Joint Staff refined the relationship between the Bilateral Working Groups and the Interagency Working Group, making the BWGs a subset of the IWG. As such, the BWGs served as the senior-level planning meetings for the military-to-military contact program.¹⁶

European Command's Proposal

In November 1991, the Interagency Working Group considerably expanded the role of USEUCOM in military-to-military contacts. The group granted the command the authority to execute all military-to-military contacts within its area of responsibility upon notifying the IWG, provided there was no precedent to the contrary. The only exceptions were for contacts involving policy-level decisions or discussions and for all requests for general or flag officer exchanges.¹⁷

Expanding USEUCOM's authority for military-to-military contacts was a major step toward creating the Joint Contact Team Program. While the Joint Staff and European Command had been conducting military-to-military contacts with nations of Central and Eastern Europe since 1988, almost all of these contacts had been limited to the senior military leadership. Following the August 1991 coup attempt in Moscow, planners at Headquarters USEUCOM, as well as those in Washington began discussing ways to expand military-to-military contacts.

At European Command headquarters, the European/NATO Division (ECJ5-E), a part of the Directorate of Plans and Policy under Major General John M. Davey, was responsible for the military-to-military contacts with Central and Eastern Europe. During the summer of 1991, Lieutenant Colonel Steven J. Ross of the European/NATO Division accompanied General Davey on visits to Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Lieutenant Colonel Ross suggested continuing the contacts by establishing staff talks during which specialists from the staff at USEUCOM or its component commands—United States Army Europe (USAREUR), United States Naval Forces Europe (USNAVEUR), United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE), and the Fleet Marine Force Europe (FMFEUR)—would exchange visits with their counterparts in Central and Eastern Europe.¹⁸

General Davey forwarded Lieutenant Colonel Ross's first concept paper to USEUCOM Chief of Staff Lieutenant General Robert D. Chelberg in August 1991. With Lieutenant General Chelberg's support, this paper was followed by a detailed proposal submitted to General James P. McCarthy, the Deputy Commander in Chief of United States European Command (DCINCEUR or DCINC), on 17 October 1991 and briefings to the Commander in Chief of United States European Command (USCINCEUR), General John R. Galvin, in October and November 1991. At the same time, Headquarters USEUCOM submitted the proposal with the name changed to "staff exchanges" to the Interagency Working Group in October 1991. As part of the US effort to expand and deepen military-to-military contacts, the IWG approved the idea of staff exchanges.¹⁹

The growing importance of military contacts between European Command and the new democracies in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union could be measured by the increasing number of officers General Davey assigned to work on this project. Lieutenant Colonel Ross was the first, followed by Lieutenant Colonel Frederick P. A. Hammersen in July 1991, Lieutenant Colonel David Schrupp in August 1991, and Commander Gary G. Starr in the fall of 1991. They formed a Soviet/East Europe cell within the European/NATO Division with Lieutenant Colonel Ross as cell leader. At first, Lieutenant Colonel Schrupp handled the Balkan states, while Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen dealt with the Visegrad states (Poland, Czechoslovakia, and

Hungary) and the Soviet Union. When Commander Starr arrived, he assumed the Balkan "desk," while Lieutenant Colonel Schrupp took the Visegrad states, and Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen retained responsibility for the Soviet Union.²⁰

With the Interagency Working Group's approval for staff exchanges in hand and the Soviet/East Europe cell in place, European Command pushed forward to expanded military-to-military contacts through an effort named "EUCOM Coordination and Assistance Program" (EUCAP). Under this proposal, European Command envisioned a five-step process beginning with the American side identifying areas on which to focus. The Soviet/East Europe planners suggested areas such as resource management, personnel management, education and training, military legal system, logistics, air traffic control and air defense, chaplaincy, communications, military and security police, internal defense, military medicine, and transportation. Next, the Americans would decide what could be accomplished considering the resources available. Thirdly, the host nation would be approached to determine its interests and capabilities. This was an especially critical part of EUCAP because USEUCOM saw the program as meeting mutually determined objectives. To do so required joint planning. The proposal also foresaw some cost to the host country in the form of personnel and support for visiting American teams. The final step in EUCAP was to carry out the assistance and training.²¹

USEUCOM's proposal called for a staff of twenty-five people for planning and programming, a staff located at Stuttgart, Germany, and a small in-country team. The staff at the headquarters would be responsible for coordinating policy issues with Washington, developing and planning assistance initiatives, and supporting the in-country teams during implementation. Each in-country team of four to six members would provide coordination among the American ambassador, the host country officials, and the headquarters staff.²² Generals McCarthy and Chelberg actively supported EUCAP. They, along with General Galvin, realized the importance of contacts with the military establishments of Central and Eastern Europe.

On 12 February 1992, General McCarthy convened a three-day conference on Eastern Europe to discuss the EUCAP proposal. Among the participants were the US ambassadors to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Although they were concerned about the need to coordinate policy and to ensure their direct input into the planning, they were enthusiastic about EUCAP. Once the proposal was completed, General Galvin forwarded it to the Joint Staff on 27 February 1992 in a "PERSONAL FOR" message to General Colin L. Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.²³

Proposals in Washington, DC

In Washington, efforts of members of the Joint Staff Directorate of Strategic Plans and Policy (J-5) paralleled those of USEUCOM's staff. J-5's Europe Division had been working on ideas for expanding military-to-military contacts since the late fall of 1991.* During his 16 December 1991 staff meeting, General Powell explained his concept for

* It is probable that members of the USEUCOM staff discussed methods of expanding military-to-military contacts before January 1992, but this author found no written records of such conversations.

"contact teams" that would work in each of the former communist states in Central and Eastern Europe. He foresaw teams composed of about 50 American military members deployed to each country for six to twelve months. These teams would teach their host country counterparts how military organizations function in democratic states. They would be similar to military assistance advisory groups without having the responsibility to advise or teach intelligence and operational matters.²⁴

Over the 1991 holiday season, J-5 members fleshed out the chairman's proposal by drafting a concept paper with eight objectives which he approved on 14 January 1992.²⁵

- (1) To promote the development of non-political military forces owing loyalty to a lawful constitution and accountable to democratic civilian leadership.
- (2) To restructure forces for legitimate defensive needs.
- (3) To remove the use of military force from the political process.
- (4) To instill respect for human rights and the rule of law.
- (5) To enhance public respect for the military within the society.
- (6) To expand cooperation/contacts between the armed forces of all nations.
- (7) To promote democratic, free-market economy.
- (8) To enhance understanding of US values and way of life, and to engender support for US positions in international forums.

In the months following, a team made up of representatives from the Joint Staff, the services, OSD, the Defense Security Assistance Agency, and USEUCOM's J-5 staff hammered out the details of the program. As expansion of military-to-military contacts and the sending of semi-permanent teams to Central and Eastern Europe had foreign policy implications, the Joint Staff soon invited representatives from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs to participate in the planning. By the time General Powell received General Galvin's 27 February message, there was very little difference between USEUCOM's proposal and the planning being done in Washington. Although planning continued on both sides of the Atlantic from March 1992 onward, the work was melded into a single effort.²⁶

On 1 April 1992, the planning effort received new impetus when President Bush announced an expanded effort to stabilize the new democracies in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and to promote demilitarization and nuclear safety. Faced with a changed situation in Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), which was formed after the breakup of the Soviet Union, the Interagency Working Group revised the goals and objectives for military-to-military contacts first issued in September 1990 and updated the process for gaining IWG approval for specific events. The Department of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued these changes in a series of four messages beginning on 25 March 1992 with a Joint Staff message on United States-CIS military-to-military contacts. J-5 notified the American defense attachés in Central and Eastern Europe on 17 April of the changes, and the next day, the Department of State notified the American embassies of the changes in security policy toward the region. Finally, on 22 April 1992, the Joint Staff issued what was considered the Joint Contact Team Program charter.²⁷

The Department of State identified its security policy goals as assuring democratic principles in all aspects of government. These aims meant promoting regional integration and cooperation; promoting the use of NATO, the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), and the Council on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE); encouraging democratic concepts of civil-military relations; and supporting moves toward a defensive-oriented military. The Joint Chiefs, in turn, laid down five policy guidelines for military-to-military contacts:

- (1) Promote positive long-term relationships.
- (2) Encourage the move to civilian-controlled military.
- (3) Establish contacts at the junior-officer level.
- (4) Develop bilateral programs roughly in parallel with each other.
- (5) Encourage similar programs to be administered by our friends and allies.²⁸

In the 22 April charter message, General Powell also gave USCINCEUR primary responsibility for planning and carrying out military contacts between the United States and the nations of Eastern Europe. Individual services, defense agencies, and other commanders-in-chief could also plan and carry out contacts with the nations of Eastern Europe, but these had to be coordinated in advance with USCINCEUR.²⁹

Finally, the Director of the Joint Staff outlined a simplified process for approval of individual military-to-military events. European Command retained the authority granted in November 1991 to plan and execute non-policy contacts for which there were precedents. To keep the Joint Staff informed of these contacts, USEUCOM would provide quarterly reports of all proposed contacts, even those beyond the following quarter. These reports would be submitted no later than two weeks before the end of each quarter, although events with a short suspense could be sent anytime. Policy-level contacts had to be approved by the Interagency Working Group. Based on the USEUCOM reports, J-5 would submit these proposed events to the Interagency Working Group for approval. To approve policy-level contacts, the IWG would use "silence procedures," that is, group members would break silence only when they objected to a proposal or had a modification to suggest. Once approval was received from the IWG, the Joint Staff would notify USEUCOM.³⁰

On 19 May 1992, General Powell notified General Galvin that the Interagency Working Group had approved sending contact teams to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Further, he informed USCINCEUR that Hungary was to receive the first team and it would serve as a prototype. Two days later, the Joint Staff provided more detailed guidance to USEUCOM, outlining requirements for personnel and for funding sources and asking them to submit a detailed concept of operations.³¹

Final Plans

European Command's Directorate of Plans and Policy worked closely with the Joint Staff Directorate of Strategic Plans and Policy to prepare the concept of operations submitted on 8 July 1992. It was during that first phase that the program received its official title—the Joint Contact Team Program. In general terms, the program differed little from the EUCAP plan developed by USEUCOM early in 1992,

except for incorporating General Powell's idea of an in-country presence. Overall policy guidance remained vested in the Interagency Working Group. The Joint Staff would act as the intermediary between the IWG and USEUCOM, the command responsible for executing the program. The JCTP would be composed of three elements: a Contact Team Program Office (CTPO) at Headquarters USEUCOM, a military liaison team (MLT) in each country, and the traveling contact teams (TCTs).

The Contact Team Program Office (ECJ5-J) consisted of one country desk officer for each country and functional specialists. A flag officer, either a rear admiral or brigadier general, would head the office. European Command expected the program office to plan, coordinate, and direct the activities of the program, to include training and deploying the military liaison teams and the traveling contact teams.

In each country, a liaison team of four to six members led by a colonel or Navy captain would coordinate operations with the host nation's armed forces and maintain close rapport with the American ambassador. USEUCOM also ensured that the program complied with the law that required separation from the American security assistance program. Subject matter experts would make up the traveling contact teams, and these would be assembled to meet a specific need of the host country. Headquarters USEUCOM would be responsible for assembling, training, and transporting each traveling contact team to be deployed for about a week.³²

The command's proposal envisioned a six-phase program beginning with the formation of the program office. This would be followed by determining requirements, preparing and deploying liaison teams, developing the country-specific program, assembling and dispatching contact teams, and finally, terminating the program. Initially, the Bilateral Working Groups would provide the venue for mutual determination of requirements. Once a liaison team was deployed, the team would coordinate events with the host nation, the American embassy, and USEUCOM's program office. In addition to coordinating policy issues with the Joint Staff, ECJ5-J would work with the command's headquarters staff and component commands to provide members for contact teams, to schedule travel, and to provide support to the deployed liaison teams. Finally, USEUCOM reiterated the earlier estimate of the Joint Contact Team Program operating in each nation for about six to twelve months, although the concept hinted at a follow-on program.³³

Headquarters USEUCOM needed personnel and money to conduct the program, since the initial liaison team in Hungary required an office of nine, including three staff officers, a personnel specialist, a country desk officer, two subject matter experts, an administrator, and an assistant deputy director. A program office that supported liaison teams in six countries would require a total of 26 people—three staff officers, two training specialists, two personnel specialists, six desk officers, nine subject matter experts, two administrative personnel, an assistant deputy director, and a general officer as the Deputy Director for the Joint Contact Team. Needed were subject matter experts in communications, military medicine, education and training, logistics, transportation, public affairs, chaplaincy, law, and finance. At the conclusion of the program, the program office would transition into a ten-person Eastern European Division in ECJ5 headed by a colonel. A request was made to the Joint Staff for 26 authorizations to operate the program office.³⁴

Manning the Program

While awaiting Joint Staff approval, USEUCOM began preparations. On 24 June 1992, General Chelberg directed the headquarters staff to identify personnel resources for an initial Contact Team Program Office of nine by 1 July, with three more people to be assigned by 1 September. The Directorate of Manpower, Personnel, and Administration (ECJ1) recommended that, as an interim measure, ECJ5 provide four authorizations, the Directorate of Logistics and Security Assistance (ECJ4), three; and the Inspector General, one. Administrative support was provided by a temporary civilian position.³⁵


FORMING THE JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM

Four Men in an Attic

In fact, European Command already had the nucleus of the Contact Team Program Office in the four members of the "Soviet/East Europe" cell in the Directorate of Plans and Policy's European/NATO Division: Steven Ross, who had just been promoted to colonel; Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen; Lieutenant Colonel Schrupp; and Commander Starr. Under Colonel Ross's leadership, this group had been expanding military-to-military contacts for almost a year and had done much of the planning for the program. On 1 July 1992, General Davey separated this cell from the European/NATO Division and created the Contact Team Program Office with the office symbol "USEUCOM ECJ5-J" with Colonel Ross as the JCTP Deputy Director. At General Chelberg's direction, office space was found for the new organization in the attic of Building 2315 on Patch Barracks. By late August, the program office had expanded to eleven members, and by November, eighteen.³⁶

From the inception of the contact program idea, General Powell and European Command's leadership understood the need for general officer involvement to demonstrate US commitment to the effort and to insure program success. Since the Air Force had selected General McCarthy's executive officer, Colonel Thomas J. Lennon, for promotion to brigadier general, it was fitting for General McCarthy to give him on 8 September 1992 the assignment of Deputy Director for the Joint Contact Team Program effective immediately. The DCINC's instructions to the new general was to expand the program quickly—"Do more faster."³⁷

The Joint Staff granted USEUCOM seventeen authorizations to operate the program office in support of the contact program in three countries. Command headquarters supplemented these seventeen permanent authorizations with reservists who performed extended periods of active duty with the program office along with people from elsewhere in the headquarters and from the component commands. Because of the rapid growth of the program from the fall of 1992, USEUCOM asked the Joint Staff in May 1993 for nine additional permanent billets for the Contact Team Program Office. Expansion was anticipated into the former Soviet Union. By the end of March 1994, the request was still pending at the Joint Staff, as this was a period of large personnel reductions throughout DOD, and the services were reluctant to commit more permanent authorizations to what had always been described as an interim program. Furthermore,



Brig Gen Thomas J. Lennon, Deputy Director of the Joint Contact Team Program, and Col Danis Turlais, the Latvian Chief of Defense.

the Joint Staff declined to grant European Command sole authority in the area of the former Soviet Union, so the rationale for increased manpower authorizations was negated.³⁸

Manning the Liaison Teams: The Foreign Language Requirement

Since the Joint Staff and European Command expected the teams to remain in each country for a period of six to twelve months, USEUCOM manned the teams with personnel on temporary duty (TDY), thereby eliminating the need for permanent personnel authorizations. Each team had four to six American members. Planners envisioned each team having a warrant officer and one or two senior noncommissioned officers (NCOs). They also wanted as many liaison team members as possible to speak the language of the host country, so they asked the services for volunteers to serve in the liaison teams.³⁹

Finding individuals who possessed language skills was somewhat difficult except for the first liaison team in Hungary. In the aftermath of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, a large number of refugees settled in the United States. A number of the children of these émigrés were serving in the United States Armed Forces and volunteered to serve in Budapest. As the contact program expanded to other countries, however, the Joint Staff found it impossible to find language-qualified officers, especially in the rank of colonel and Navy captain.⁴⁰

The question of language-qualified officers was resolved early in 1993. On 7 January, J-5 hosted a Joint Contact Team Program planners meeting with service representatives and USEUCOM staff to establish a two-step screening process for selecting liaison team members. First, volunteers for a position would be screened for language ability and then for area expertise or experience.⁴¹

The armed forces had one major pool of language-qualified personnel available—the Army's Special Forces, the so-called Green Berets. The 10th Special Forces Group, with one battalion at Panzer Kaserne, Boblingen, Germany, and two battalions at Fort Devens, Massachusetts, had a large number of NCOs who were qualified in one or more of the languages of Central and Eastern Europe. Initially, the IWG was reluctant to assign Special Forces members to the liaison teams because of perceived Russian sensitivities. But the fact remained that the Special Forces personnel were particularly suited to train the armed forces of other countries in basic military skills using the host country's language. Also, duty on a liaison team provided these members an excellent opportunity to polish their own language skills. As the number of countries participating in the contact program increased, and the program extended beyond the initial six months, more Special Forces NCOs were assigned to the liaison teams.

To underscore the joint nature of the military-to-military program, the United States asked each host country to assign personnel to the teams. All host countries supported the idea in principle, but most had a very limited number of personnel who were English-language qualified. But for those assigned to the liaison team, the assignment provided an opportunity to improve their language abilities and to learn how Americans handled staff work. Furthermore, to maximize the learning experience, all team members attended planning meetings together.

Budget

Initial funding for the Joint Contact Team Program presented a problem to members of European Command and the Joint Staff because it was an unprogrammed expense. To solve it, the Joint Staff directed the command to absorb planning and team organization cost for fiscal year (FY) 1992 and directed that the cost of deployment during FY 1992 and FY 1993 be covered by the CINC Initiative Fund, money allocated to each CINC for special projects.* Beyond FY 1993, USEUCOM was expected to program from the JCTP by using the normal budgeting process.⁴²

Headquarters USEUCOM, as part of its proposed concept of operations submitted to the Joint Staff on 8 July 1992, estimated the cost of conducting the contact program in Hungary for FY 1993 at \$4,250,000. This cost included travel, lodging, per diem, housing, office space rental for the liaison team, communications, utilities, translators, and a secretary. In fact, most host countries provided office space for the team in the Ministry of Defense at a military headquarters building. Further, the presence of host country officers on the liaison teams and some language-qualified American team members reduced the need for hiring translators and secretaries.⁴³

As part of the approval message on 24 August 1992, the Joint Staff instructed European Command to submit a request for CINC Initiative Funds to cover the FY 1993 TDY costs, that is, the cost of the liaison team as well as the travel costs for Hungary and two other countries. The Joint Staff indicated that the other two countries would be determined later. For FY 1994 expenses, it instructed European Command to ensure that the US Army, as the service supporting USEUCOM, submit a budget request that would cover contact program operations in four additional countries.⁴⁴

For FY 1993, European Command asked for \$8.561 million in CINC Initiative Fund monies which represented more than one third of total initiative funds available for the fiscal year. Rather than commit such a large percentage of the funds to one project, the Joint Staff asked that USEUCOM submit a series of requests based on program expansion. In fact, the JCTP expanded much faster than the Joint Staff had expected. In September 1992, Headquarters USEUCOM requested \$3 million for the initial effort in three countries—Hungary, Poland, and Bulgaria. Although the request

*The CINC Initiative Fund, Title 10, United States Code 166A, was codified by section 902 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1992 and 1993 on 5 December 1991, Public Law 102-190. For FY 1992, Congress stated that the CINC Initiative Fund was not to exceed \$25 million.

for Bulgaria proved premature, the program quickly expanded to four more countries—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Albania. By November 1992, European Command had submitted a second request for \$1.990 million to cover the cost for the Baltic states and Albania. The Joint Staff approved both requests. Also, USEUCOM received most of a third request totalling \$1.5 million to cover the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Romania. The program office prepared a fourth request for \$1.7 million in anticipation of deploying to Belarus, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine. But since the IWG did not approve expanding command responsibility into these countries, the request for funds was not submitted. By 30 September 1993, liaison teams were deployed to ten countries, but the cost of operating the Joint Contact Team Program was less than initial estimates. Total expenditures for FY 1993 were \$6.049 million.⁴⁵

Securing the funds for FY 1994 proved just as difficult as for FY 1993. As far back as June 1992, USEUCOM's comptroller had notified the Department of the Army that the command's number one unfunded priority for FY 1994 and FY 1995 was the JCTP, estimated at \$13 million per year. During the summer of 1993, the Joint Staff asked the command to estimate the cost of a large-scale program throughout Central and Eastern Europe to include unit exchanges. It responded with an estimate of \$28 million. Realizing that this sum was much more than would be available, the program office developed a \$10-million dollar proposal for FY 1994. In the end, this would be the program's FY 1994 budget, but not before difficult negotiations took place in Washington.⁴⁶

The contact program budget request was embedded in a Department of Defense budget item entitled Global Cooperative Initiative. Congress did not pass the FY 1994 Defense Appropriations Bill until 11 November 1993 and was even slower passing the Defense Authorization Act. President William J. Clinton signed it into law on 30 November 1993. Between 1 October and 30 November 1993, DoD operated under Continuing Resolution Authority (CRA) which limited expenditures to no more than that of the same period the preceding year. For the contact program, the difference in level of activity between the fall of 1992 and the fall of 1993 was enormous. Because of the CRA, the program office had to scale back activities by postponing or canceling many scheduled events.⁴⁷

An even greater challenge to the military-to-military program was a disagreement in Congress over how the Global Cooperative Initiative should be funded. Members of both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Defense Appropriations felt that funds to promote democracy, including the Global Cooperative Initiative, should be included in the Department of State budget under the purview of the Security Assistance Agency. Unfortunately, by the time the appropriations subcommittees made this decision, the Subcommittees on Foreign Operations had already completed work on the Department of State budget. Only with the greatest effort was funding for the Global Cooperative Initiative, including the Joint Contact Team Program, inserted in the Department of Defense appropriations.⁴⁸

"Do More Faster"

General McCarthy appointed Brigadier General Lennon as Deputy Director of Plans and Policy and head of the Joint Contact Team Program with instructions to "Do more

faster." When General Lennon took charge of the contact team program on 8 September 1992, the liaison team in Hungary was partially deployed. Team members were working to develop and get approval for the country work plan, a necessary step before approval could be sought for the traveling contact teams. General Lennon needed no other urging. He, too, realized that time was fleeting when military institutions of the new democracies were malleable.⁴⁹

On 16 October 1992, General Powell notified General Galvin that the services, the Joint Staff, OSD, and the American embassy in Budapest had approved the work plan, clearing the way for the traveling contact teams. Inaugurating the contact program in Hungary also opened the door to extending the program to other countries. Even before the arrival of General Powell's message, Generals McCarthy, Chelberg, and Lennon were pushing to expand the Joint Contact Team Program.⁵⁰

As early as May 1992, the Interagency Working Group had identified Poland and Czechoslovakia as the next priorities. They, along with Hungary, made up the so-called "Phase One" group of liaison teams. However, by fall of 1992, the Czechs and Slovaks had announced their plan to divide Czechoslovakia into two separate nations, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, effective 1 January 1993. The IWG suspended contacts with the two new countries until the political climate stabilized. In Poland, the American ambassador requested that the Bilateral Working Group meet before he would approve deploying the liaison team. The meeting was held 9-10 December 1992 in Warsaw, with all sides agreeing to the deployment of the liaison team in the spring of 1993.⁵¹

In the fall of 1992, USEUCOM urged that Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania be added to the program, as well as the three Baltic states—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The leadership in Stuttgart also set an informal deadline of March 1993 to have all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe included in the program. General Davey, the Director of Plans and Policy, had visited Bulgaria in January 1992 and Romania and Albania in September 1992 and found their leaders interested in expanding contacts with the American military.⁵²

In July 1992, the NACC asked the United States to participate in an assistance visit to Latvia to address military support to civil authorities. As this was primarily a National Guard responsibility, the National Guard Bureau (NGB) prepared the briefing. When the Latvians expressed an interest in learning more, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy asked the NGB to prepare a concept plan for Latvia. While preparing the plan, it approached the J-5, who, in turn, suggested working with the Joint Contact Team Program. As a result, in September 1992, the Joint Staff modified the Unified Command Plan to include the Baltic states into USEUCOM's area of responsibility. This action allowed the command to pursue the contact program with these nations.⁵³

When General Lennon learned of the National Guard effort with Latvia, he argued that all three Baltic nations should be engaged at the same time as part of the Joint Contact Team Program. Given the presence of Russian troops and the delicate ongoing negotiations for their withdrawal, the IWG approved expansion of the contact program

with the caveat that the Guard and Reserve provide the lead. General Lennon agreed that because of the Baltic states' small geographical size, American reserve forces offered the best model. On 22 October 1992, the program office suggested that liaison teams be made up of guardsmen, reservists, and active duty personnel. In November 1992, National Guard Bureau Chief Lieutenant General John B. Conaway and General Lennon visited Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and while meeting with host country leaders and the American ambassadors, explained the military liaison team concept. Leaders from all three nations expressed interest in participating in the program.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, in Washington, the suggestion to expand the JCTP quickly did not receive a uniform reception despite the patronage of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Money and personnel were the two most common causes of delays within DOD. At the Department of State, common reasons for caution were concerns about the maturity level of the new democracies and also the uneasy feelings of American ambassadors in those nations. However, in Washington some shared USEUCOM's sense of urgency. Among key supporters were Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby and Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Walter B. Slocombe. Mr. Libby chaired the Interagency Working Group under the Bush administration, and Mr. Slocombe chaired it in the Clinton administration.⁵⁵

On 24 November, Lieutenant General Henry Viccellio, Jr., Director of the Joint Staff, reviewed for General Chelberg the progress toward expanding the contact program. The IWG had approved contact team planning for Bulgaria and the concept for the Baltic republics, including authorizing USEUCOM and the Guard Bureau to visit the republics for planning purposes. For political reasons, the IWG refused to approve Romania or Albania. From Washington's standpoint, the problem with Romania was the continuing unrest following the overthrow of the Ceausescu regime and the perception that the new government did not embrace the principles of democracy. With regard to Albania, Washington expressed fear that unrest in the Albanian-populated province of Kosovo, a part of Yugoslavia, might spill over the border into Albania. General Viccellio promised that the Joint Staff would continue pushing the Interagency Working Group for approval to expand.⁵⁶

The Interagency Working Group met on 2 December 1992 and approved the dispatch of liaison teams to Albania and Bulgaria. Deploying to Bulgaria was subject to the ambassador's approval and the installation of a new Bulgarian government expected to be operational in January 1993. The IWG would only authorize USEUCOM to plan for liaison teams in Romania, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and the Baltic states. Meeting again on 27 January 1993, it approved liaison teams for the Czech Republic, Romania, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Slovakia was a new nation where the United States had yet to establish diplomatic facilities. Therefore, the IWG postponed deploying a liaison team to Bratislava until August 1993 when an American embassy was in place.⁵⁷

Slovenia was the next nation to receive a military liaison team. US ambassador Allan Wendt visited Headquarters USEUCOM on 22 and 23 July 1993 and after a briefing on the JCTP, expressed interest in offering the program to his host country. As one of the former republics of Yugoslavia, Slovenia was, for the purposes of the JCTP, in an unusual position. It fell under the United Nations arms embargo against former

Yugoslavia. But unlike the other Yugoslav republics, it had a homogeneous population and, by the summer of 1993, no internal or external conflicts. Slovenia was a small peaceful democracy looking to expand ties to the West. With the Interagency Working Group's tentative approval followed by the Slovene Ministry of Defense's permission on 1 October, Ambassador Wendt provided final approval on 4 October. The liaison team's first member arrived in Ljubljana on 1 November 1993.⁵⁸

As early as November 1992, USEUCOM leadership had proposed further expansion of the Joint Contact Team Program into the former Soviet Union beyond the Baltic republics, specifically Belarus, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine. To obtain approval for activities in any of these countries, the command would have to overcome a number of impediments including Russian concerns, political unrest, and American legal and political constraints.

The Russian government was very sensitive to what it perceived as US expansion into its former empire. And, of course, the Clinton administration, desiring to support democratic developments in Russia, was in turn sensitive to Russian interest. Further, the Russians attached great importance to being treated as a great power. The Joint Staff recognized this important fact and elected to retain responsibility for military contacts with Russia.

In Moldova, the government faced major opposition in the Russian-populated Transnistria region, where the people were backed by a former Soviet Army division. In south Moldova, the Gagauz, a Turkic people, also were uneasy. The specter of ethnic conflict was reason enough to postpone any decision on offering the Joint Contact Team Program. That left Belarus and Ukraine.⁵⁹

The Interagency Working Group for the former Soviet Union, concerned with Russian sensitivities, would not approve extension of the program into the former Soviet Union. The group did, however, permit European Command, as well as Pacific Command and Central Command, to conduct military contacts with former Soviet Union members, but specified that military-to-military contacts in that region be funded under the Nunn-Lugar law.* Joint Contact Team funds could not be used.

To overcome these concerns, USEUCOM proposed the concept of facilitating teams for Belarus and Ukraine. Performing a function similar to the military liaison teams, the facilitating teams would be located in Stuttgart. These teams would deploy to Minsk and Kiev for only short periods to coordinate and facilitate the deployments of traveling contact teams. While not officially part of the JCTP, the facilitating teams at the headquarters shared office space with the program office and its support staff and were supervised by General Lennon. In early August 1993, the Interagency Working Group approved their use for Belarus and Ukraine and authorized General Lennon to make presentations to both countries.

*Public Law 102-228 was passed on 12 December 1991 and named "Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty Implementation Act."

On 15 August 1993, General Lennon traveled to Minsk to present the facilitating team concept to Belarussian officials and the American ambassador. The general later explained the contact program and facilitating team concept to the Ukrainians during the Bilateral Working Group in Kiev, 5-6 October 1993. Officials from both countries expressed concern with a permanent American military presence and the fact that each country had a very limited number of English-speaking personnel. They preferred scheduling only a few events. The facilitating team concept seemed to satisfy their concerns.⁶⁰ In Belarus, both the government and the American ambassador approved military-to-military contacts in the form of a facilitating team which made its first visit to Minsk on 5 October 1993.⁶¹ In Ukraine, formal approval awaited the arrival of Ambassador William G. Miller on 19 October 1993, after which the embassy made a formal approach to the Ukrainian government, but received no reply. It was possible that the Ukrainians would wait until the Joint Staff talks scheduled for January 1994. The talks, however, were postponed until April 1994.⁶²

State Partnerships for All

The National Guard Bureau developed a proposed State Partnership Program to link a selected State National Guard with each of the nations participating in JCTP, as well as several former Soviet republics. Working through the theater command, the National Guard Bureau offered help to the nation's Ministry of Defense. The first pairings originated out of the November 1992 trip into the Baltics by Lieutenant General Conaway and General Lennon. Early in 1993, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were paired up respectively with New York (later changed to Maryland), Michigan and Pennsylvania. In arranging these pairings, the Bureau looked at native population centers within the states and geographic or economic factors that the state and European nation might have in common. Through these partnership links, institutional and personal relationships were developed and sustained for a long time. Such connections served as conduits for mutual understanding of the role of the citizen-soldier and for facilitating local government, academic, and industry contacts.⁶³

Citizen-soldiers provided an excellent model for the democratization of the military. In fact, the National Guard provided a compelling example of the use of part-time military to meet national defense needs. For some of the smaller nations with limited resources, this was an appealing alternative to a relatively large standing force. For the JCTP, the partnership program provided additional resources in manpower and money. It offered a source of skills, including language ability, not available in the active force and was a way to build broad, grassroots support for the Joint Contact Team Program.

During the summer of 1993, the National Guard Bureau expanded the proposed pairings in the State Partnership Program to include all countries participating in the JCTP and many of the former Soviet republics. Further, the National Guard, with IWG approval and USEUCOM sponsorship, proposed expanding the partnership to include the Reserve components, thereby making available additional resources for the JCTP. For example, both the Ohio National Guard and the 83d Army Reserve Command (ARCOM), headquartered in Columbus, Ohio, would be paired with Hungary. The Reserve components readily agreed, and this agreement resulted in the following pairings:⁶⁴

Host Country	Partnership State	Reserve Command
Albania	South Carolina	120th ARCOM
Belarus	Utah	96th ARCOM
Bulgaria	Tennessee	125th ARCOM
Czech Republic	Texas	90th ARCOM
Estonia	Maryland	97th ARCOM
Hungary	Ohio	83d ARCOM
Kazakhstan	Arizona	63d ARCOM
Latvia	Michigan	88th ARCOM
Lithuania	Pennsylvania	79th ARCOM
Romania	Alabama	121st ARCOM
Poland	Illinois	86th ARCOM
Slovakia	Indiana	123d ARCOM
Slovenia	Colorado	89th ARCOM
Ukraine	California	124th ARCOM

The Events

Exchanging information on democratic military institutions was the basic reason for creating military-to-military contacts with the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. Traveling contact teams made up of subject matter experts would travel to the countries for short periods of time, usually a week or less. This concept was based on the experience gained from the contacts conducted between 1988 and 1992. The first traveling contact team visit occurred between 19 and 23 October 1992 in Budapest, Hungary. It soon became clear to the staff at USEUCOM that something more was needed. "It is better to see one time than hear ten times," said First Lieutenant Arturas Indicianskis, the Lithuanian member of the liaison team in Vilnius. Thus was born the idea of the familiarization tour, the FAM tour or FAM, an event which afforded military members of the host country an opportunity to visit American units in Germany, England, or the United States to see their counterparts in action.⁶⁵

In December 1992, the liaison team in Hungary arranged the first familiarization tour to the 32d Army Air Defense Command (AADCOM) in Darmstadt, Germany. And, on 17 January 1993, the first FAM tour departed Europe for the United States. Soon, the liaison teams made a practice of grouping together contact teams and FAM tours on the same subject. For example, the liaison team in Romania scheduled an aviation maintenance contact team from Headquarters USAFE, an aviation maintenance and safety FAM tour to naval stations in the United States, and a logistics and civil engineering FAM tour to Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

Work plans identified the major areas of interest to the host country and a list of events in which it desired to participate. Developing the work plan was a joint effort of the host country, the American ambassador, and the liaison team. Each country plan was revised quarterly, coordinated, and forwarded to the Contact Team Program Office at Stuttgart. For each work plan, the program office had two major responsibilities. First, it had to forward any proposed events involving new or questionable topics

to the IWG for approval. Events that might be construed as training—something the JCTP could not fund—received close scrutiny. It also scheduled the events which meant not only finding an acceptable time but also finding people to make up the contact teams and assure the event met the requirements of the host country. Most contact teams were made up of members of the European Command staff or one of the component commands—USAREUR, USNAVEUR, USAFE, or FMFEUR.

Once the Contact Team Program Office received the country work plans, it consolidated the list of proposed events and circulated it to USEUCOM's staff sections and its components in the form of a tasking message. This was followed by a quarterly scheduling conference where responsibility and timing for each event was determined. The first quarterly scheduling conference was held on 17 February 1992. As the military-to-military program expanded, the number of people attending the conferences increased to include the country desk officers, the chief of each liaison team, and the senior host country member of the liaison team.⁶⁶

After an organization agreed to conduct an event, it became responsible to prepare for the activities involved. In the case of the component commands, their headquarters would agree to sponsor an event and often task a subordinate unit to conduct it. Regardless of the organization receiving the final tasking, the country desk officer and the liaison team arranged the in-country support for traveling contact teams which included lodging, transportation, and translation services. For a FAM tour, the liaison team and the country desk officer usually made the transportation arrangements and, when needed, arranged for visas. Many times the liaison team provided an escort officer who would also perform as a translator.⁶⁷

ENDNOTES

- 1 Anatoly Chernyaev, "The Phenomenon of Gorbachev in the Context of Leadership," *International Affairs*, Jun 93, pp. 37-48.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Exact dates and events in this section come from *Current History*, October 1989 through September 1991.
- 4 Martha Brill Olcott, "The Slide into Disunion," *Current History*, Oct 91, p. 342.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 "The Month in Review," *Current History*, Oct 91-Feb 92; Adam Ulam, "Looking at the Past: The Unraveling of the Soviet Union," *Current History*, Oct 92, pp. 339-346.
- 7 JCS J-5 Coordination/Action Sheet, "JCS Tank Briefing by Ambassador R. M. Palmer," 24 Jan 89, info used is (U).
- 8 JCS J-5 Coord/Action Sheet (S/OADR), "JCS Tank Briefing by Ambassador R. M. Palmer, US Ambassador to Hungary, 25 January," 24 Jan 89, info used is (U).
- 9 *Time*, 3 Jul 89, p. 32; Joint Staff Action Processing Form J-5P 236-89 (S/OADR), 10 May 89, info used is (U).
- 10 Memo (C/OADR), Asst Dep Under SecDef (Soviet and Europe Affairs) to Mr. James Swihart, Dept of State et al., "US—East European Defense and Military Relations," (Oct 90), w/2 atchs: Memo (C/OADR) I-63161/90, Princ Dep Under SecDef, "US—Soviet Defense and Military Relations," (Sep 89), and Terms of Reference for Interagency Working Group on US—East European Defense and Military Relations, info used is (U).
- 11 Msg (S/OADR), Joint Staff to CNO, et al., "Goals and Objectives on US—East European Defense and Military Relations," 290935Z Sep 90, info used is (U); LTC Frederick Hammersen, "US Defense and Military Relations with Central and Eastern Europe" (draft), George C. Marshall Center, 19 Oct 93.
- 12 Hammersen, "US Defense and Military Relations with Central and Eastern Europe."
- 13 Background Paper (U), CDR Gary G. Starr, ECJ5-J, "Mil-to-Mil Contact Program," 14 Oct 92.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Memo (U), 352d Civil Affairs Command, "Forwarding After Action Report," 5 Oct 92, w/atch: After Action Report for HQ USEUCOM ODT Assignment 25 Aug-6 Sep 92 (ODT Line #605001).
- 16 "Concepts for Establishing Defense Bilateral Working Groups on Restructuring and Reorganization" (draft) (C/OADR), Office of the Under SecDef for Policy, (Feb 92), Briefing (U), USEUCOM J5-J, "Military-to-Military Contact Program Founding Documents," Jun 93.
- 17 Background Paper (U), "Mil-to-Mil Contact Program," 14 Oct 92.
- 18 Memo (U), USEUCOM Dir of Plans and Policy to USEUCOM Dep CINC, "Mil-to-Mil Contact Guidance," 6 Dec 91, w/atch: Msg (U), JCS/J5 to USCINCEUR/ECJ5, et al., "US-East Europe Military-to-Military Contacts," 261400Z Nov 91; Memo (U), Lt Col Hammersen, Marshall Center, to Lt Karin S. Shuey, USEUCOM J5-J, "Mil-Mil History," 18 Nov 1993.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Memo (U), Lt Col Hammersen, Marshall Center, to Lt Shuey, ECJ5-J, "Mil-Mil History," 18 Nov 93.
- 21 Briefing (U), HQ USEUCOM, "Initiatives with Eastern Europe," (Feb 92); Msg (S/OADR), USCINCEUR to CJCS, "US-Eastern Europe Military-to-Military Contact Program," 270845Z Feb 92, info used is (U).
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Msg (S/OADR), USCINCEUR/ECCC to CJCS, "US-Eastern Europe Military-to-Military Contact Program," 270845Z Feb 92, info used is (U).
- 24 Note (S/OADR), COL Jerry Morelock, Soviet Branch, Europe Div, Dir for Strat Plans and Policy, JCS, 20 Dec 91, w/atch: note (S/OADR), GEN Colin Powell, CJCS, to DJS and Joint Staff, "Shali Request," 17 Dec 91; J-5 Coord/Action Sheet, "Soviet Union Issues: Additional Information for ACJCS," 16 Dec 91, w/atch 2 enclosures, info used is (U).
- 25 Routing and coord cover sheet (S/OADR), J-5A 00080-92, "East European/Commonwealth of Independent States Contact Teams Concept," 8 Jan 92 w/2 atchs: Joint Staff Action Processing Form J-5A 00080-92 (S/OADR), "East European/Commonwealth of Independent States Contact Teams Concept," 8 Jan 92; and Concept Paper (S/OADR), "East European/Commonwealth of Independent States Contact Teams," 8 Jan 92, info used is (U).

- 26 Memo (C/OADR), JCS J5 European Div, "Contact Teams-East Europe/CIS," 28 Jan 92 w/atch: Memo for the Record (C/OADR), "Action Officer Meeting Regarding East European/Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Contact Teams," nd., and Briefing Slides (C/OADR), "Contact Teams Eastern Europe/CIS," (27 Jan 92), info used is (U); Msg (S/OADR), CJCS to USCINCEUR/ECCC, "US-Eastern Europe Military-to-Military Contact Program," 161755Z Mar 92, info used is (U); Info Paper (U), JCS J5 European Div, "Coordination with Stats," (Mar 92).
- 27 Info Paper (S/OADR), JCS J5 European Div, "Eastern European/Commonwealth of Independent States Contact Teams," 27 Mar 92, info used is (U); Paper (S/OADR), JCS J5 European Div, "DOD Programs for Meeting US Strategy Toward New Democracies in Eastern Europe and Former Soviet States," (Apr 92), info used is (U); Msg (C/OADR), JCS/DJS to CSA et al., "Implementation of US-CIS Military-to-Military Contacts," 252025Z Mar 92, info used is (U); Msg (C/OADR), JCS J-5 to USCINCEUR/ECJ5 et al., "US-East Europe Military-to-Military Contacts," 171400Z Apr 92, info used is (U); Msg (U), SecState to AmEmbassy Prague et al., "US Security Policy Toward Eastern Europe and the Baltic States," 181849Z Apr 92; Msg (U), CJCS/DJS to CSA et al., "Implementation of US-East Europe Military-to-Military Contacts," 222130Z Apr 92.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Msg (U), CJCS/DJS to CSA et al., "Implementation of US-East Europe Military-to-Military Contacts," 222130Z Apr 92.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Msg (U), CJCS to USCINCEUR/ECCC, "US-Eastern Europe Contact Teams," 192035Z May 92; Msg (U), JCS/J5 to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "US-Eastern Europe Contact Teams," 210735Z May 92.
- 32 Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5 to JCS/J5, "US-Eastern Europe Joint Contact Team Program," 081125Z Jul 92.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Memo (U), Lt Gen Robert D. Chelberg, USEUCOM C/S to USEUCOM staff, "Joint Contact Team Program," 24 Jun 92, w/4 atchs: "Milestones," "Personnel," "Facilities Requirements," and "Terminology."
- 35 Memo (U), Lt Gen Chelberg, USEUCOM C/S to ECJ1 et al., "Joint Contact Team Program," 24 Jun 92; Briefing (U), Col Ross, USEUCOM J5-Europe/NATO, "Joint Contact Team Program Update" (Jun 92).
- 36 Ibid; Memo (U), Lt Col Hammersen, Marshall Center, to Lt Karin Shuey, ECJ5-J, "Mil-Mil History," 18 Nov 93.
- 37 Intv (U), Brig Gen Thomas J. Lennon by author, 31 Mar 94; Intv (U), CDR Gary G. Starr, ECJ5-J, by author, 4 Mar 94.
- 38 Msg (U), Joint Staff/DJS to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "Expanded Mil-to-Mil Program in Central and Eastern Europe," 242355Z Nov 92; USEUCOM ECJ1 Manning Memo, May 93; Ltr (U), Brig Gen Lennon, ECJ5-J, to Director for Plans and Policy (ECJ5), "Loss of Billets/People from the Joint Contact Team Program"; Memo (U) Europe Division, JCS/J5, to Dir for Joint Hist, "Review of Draft History of the JCTP," 6 Mar 95.
- 39 Memo (C/OADR), Lt Col Claude M. Rountree, ECJ5-J, "Control of USEUCOM Military Liaison Teams (MLTs)," 25 Nov 92, info used is (U); Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5 to Joint Staff/J5, "US-Eastern Europe Joint Contact Team Program," 081125Z Jul 92.
- 40 Msg (C/OADR), Joint Staff/J/PMA to USEUCOM/ECJ5-J, "Joint Contact Team Program," 130049Z Nov 92, info used is (U).
- 41 Memo (C/OADR), European Div, Dir for Strat Plans and Policy, JCS, "Planners Meeting 7 January 1993," info used is (U).
- 42 FAX (U), US Dept of State, Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs to JCS/J5 Europe Div, "Legal Comments," 17 Apr 92; Msg (U), Joint Staff/J5 to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "US-Eastern Europe Contact Teams," 210735Z May 92.
- 43 Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5 to Joint Staff/J5, "US-Eastern Europe Joint Contact Team Program," 081125Z Jul 92.
- 44 Msg (U), CJCS to USCINCEUR/ECCC, "Joint Contact Team Program—Hungary," 241355Z Aug 92.
- 45 Msg (U), Joint Staff/DJS to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "Expanded Mil-to-Mil Program in Central/Eastern Europe," 242355Z Nov 92; Intv (U), Maj Kurt Linden, ECJ5-J, by author, 7 Apr 94.
- 46 Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5-J to Joint Staff/J5/PMA, "Mil-to-Mil Program Resources and Future Plans," 201145Z Sep 93.
- 47 Memo (U), ECJ5-J, "Memorandum for Funding Priorities Oct 93," 1 Oct 93; Memo (U), USEUCOM Comptroller, "Initial Operations for Fiscal Year 1994," 1 Oct 93.
- 48 Memo (U) Asst Dep Dir for Mil-to-Mil Contact Program to Brig Gen Jones, "Congressional Support for Mil-to-Mil and Marshall Funding," 13 Oct 93, w/6 atchs.

- 49 Msg (U) Joint Staff/J-5 to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "US-Eastern Europe Contact Teams," 210735Z May 92; Msg (U), Joint Staff/DJS to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "Expanded Mil-to-Mil Program in Central/Eastern Europe," 242355Z Nov 92.
- 50 Msg (U), CJCS to USCINCEUR/ECCC, "Joint Contact Team Program-Hungary," 162210Z Oct 92; Msg (C/OADR), USCINCEUR/ECCS to Joint Staff/DJS, "Expand Mil-to-Mil Program in Central/Eastern Europe," 160805Z Nov 92, info used is (U).
- 51 Msg (U), Joint Staff/J-5 to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "US-Eastern Europe Contact Teams," 210735Z May 92; Msg (U), Joint Staff/DJS to USCINCEUR/ECCS, "Expanded Mil-to-Mil Program in Central/Eastern Europe," 242355Z Nov 92; Briefing (U), USEUCOM J5-J, "Mil-Mil Contact Program," Nov 92.
- 52 Background Paper (U), CDR Starr, ECJ5-J, "Mil-to-Mil Contact Program," 14 Oct 92; Memo (U), LTC Robert Downes, JCS/J5 European Div, to Brig Gen J. Thomas Hill, JCS/J5 Asst Dep Dir for Political-Military Affairs, (8 Dec 92).
- 53 Memo (U), Dir, Joint Staff, to Asst Sec of Def (International Security Affairs), "Military-to-Military Contacts in the Baltic States," 30 Oct 92, w/atch: Concept Paper, USEUCOM J5-J, "Military-to-Military Contacts in the Baltic States," 22 Oct 92; Concept Paper (U), National Guard Bureau/ZII, "US National Guard Support of Military-to-Military Contacts," 26 Aug 93; Intv (U), Brig Gen Lennon, USEUCOM J5-J, by author, 31 Mar 94; Ronald H. Cole, Walter S. Poole, James F. Schnabel, Robert J. Watson, and Willard J. Webb, *The History of the Unified Command Plan, 1946-1993*, Feb 95.
- 54 Concept Paper (U), National Guard Bureau/ZII, "US National Guard Support of Military-to-Military Contacts," 26 Aug 93.
- 55 Msg (C/OADR), Joint Staff/J5-PMA to USEUCOM/ECJ5-J, "Joint Contact Team Program," 130049Z Nov 92, info used is (U); Intv (U) Brig Gen Lennon, Dep Dir for JCTP, HQ USEUCOM, by author, 31 Mar 94.
- 56 Msg (U), Joint Staff/DJS to USCINCEUR/EDDS, "Expanded Mil-to-Mil Program in Central/Eastern Europe," 242355Z Nov 92.
- 57 Msg (U), Joint Staff/J5-PMA to OSAF/IAC, et al., "Interagency Working Group Meeting, 2 Dec 92," 091445Z Dec 92; Msg (C/OADR), AmEmbassy Prague to SecState, et al., "Mil-Mil Cooperation," 201301Z Jan 93, info used is (U); Memo (C/OADR), Dept of State, Europe/Canada Div, to Asst Dep Under Sec of Def Russian, Eurasian and East European Affairs, "Agenda for the Inter-Agency Working Group on Central/East European Military Contacts," 25 Jan 93, info used is (U); Msg (C/OADR), Joint Staff/J5 PMA to USCINCEUR/ECJ5, et al., "C/EE MLT Implementation," 031129Z Feb 93, info used is (U).
- 58 Chronology (U), ECJ5-J, "Military Liaison Team Development," nd.
- 59 Briefing (U), ECJ5-J, "Mil-Mil Contact Program," (Nov 92).
- 60 Background Paper (U), ECJ5-J, "Belarus," nd.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Background Paper (U), ECJ5-J, "Ukraine," (Dec 93).
- 63 Memo (U), Dir, Joint Staff, to Asst Sec of Def (International Security Affairs), "Military-to-Military Contacts in the Baltic States," 30 Oct 92, w/atch: Concept Paper, "Military-to-Military Contacts in the Baltic States," 22 Oct 92; Memo (U), Chief, National Guard Bureau, to MG Roger W. Sandler, Chief, Army Reserve, et al., "US Reserve Component Participation in the State Partnership Program," 6 Aug 93, w/atch list of Designated State Partners"; Concept Paper (U), National Guard Bureau/ZII, "US National Guard Support of Military-to-Military Contacts," 26 Aug 93.
- 64 Memo (U), Lt Gen John B. Conaway, Chief, National Guard Bureau, to MG Roger W. Sandler, Chief, Army Reserve, et al., "US Reserve Component Participation in the State Partnership Program," 6 Aug 93; Concept Paper (U), NGB/ZII, "US National Guard Support of Military-to-Military Contacts," 26 Aug 93; Chart (U), ECJ5-J, "State Partnership Program as of 23 Sep 93," nd; Briefing (U), ECJ5-J, "National Guard State Partnerships, Bridge to America," (31 Jan 94).
- 65 Intv (U), 1LT Arturas Indicianskis, MLT Lithuanian, by author, 24 Feb 94.
- 66 Memo (U), HQ USEUCOM/Dep Dir for Mil-to-Mil Contact Program, "Third Quarter FY 1993 Mil-to-Mil Scheduling Conference Minutes," (nd).
- 67 Briefing (U), HQ USAFE DCS Plans and Programs, "Military-to-Military Contact Program," (Mar 94); Briefing (U), HQ USAREUR, "USAREUR Military Relations Program," (Apr 94).

PART II

NEW DEMOCRACIES

The underlying concept of the Joint Contact Team Program was to use the United States Armed Forces as a model for a functioning military in a democratic society. By sending traveling contact teams to the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and taking members of host countries on familiarization tours to military installations in Europe and the United States, the program offered an opportunity to see the American model. And the military liaison teams stationed in the participating countries provided a working example for the hosts.

FACE TO FACE WITH COUNTRY LEADERSHIP

Hungary

When Army Colonel Frank Farkas stepped off the aircraft in Budapest, Hungary, in July 1992, he inaugurated the first military liaison team. He entered a country whose transition from a communist dictatorship to a democratic system was as advanced as any in Central or Eastern Europe because it had been experimenting with capitalism for years. Its citizens had held free elections on 25 March 1990, but much still remained unchanged from forty-three years of following the Soviet model, especially in the areas of government bureaucracy and the military.

Colonel Farkas—soon joined by the other members of the liaison team, Major Viktor Jonkoff and Captain Zsolt Rimoczi—faced the challenge of setting up an office, developing a working relationship with the staff at the American embassy, and earning the trust of Hungary's military leaders. Hungarian Minister of Defense Dr. Lajos Fur and Chief of the General Staff of Hungarian Home Defense Forces (HHDF) Colonel General Kalman Lorincz were very interested in establishing the military-to-military program in their country. Both men had visited the United States, the general in December 1990 and the minister in March 1992. Dr. Fur also had hosted Secretary of Defense Cheney in Budapest, and at the time the Secretary had proposed the establishment of a Bilateral Working Group.

Colonel General Lorincz appointed Home Defense Forces Deputy Chief of Staff Major General Janusz Biro as the country's contact for the liaison team in Budapest and provided the team with spacious offices in a nineteenth century building which housed the HHDF's logistics staff in a tree-shaded compound on Sligay Erzsebet Street in Buda. In turn, Major General Biro assigned Major Zoltan Matyus, an English-speaking Hungarian officer, to the liaison team as a full-time member.

Initially, the most important task for the Hungarians and the liaison team was to develop a mutually acceptable work plan outlining the events for the first six months. The team developed the event list based on priorities outlined at the first Hungarian-American Bilateral Working Group meeting in early September 1992. Foremost on

the working group's mind were air defense modernization, equipment modernization, peacekeeping and force development, and military reorganization. The work plan identified specific events to meet Hungarian priorities and, once approved by the HHDF and the American ambassador, it was forwarded to Washington for review. On 16 October 1992, General Colin Powell approved the traveling contact teams to Hungary. Three days later, the first team sponsored by US Army Europe arrived in Budapest to discuss the management of resources.¹

This first traveling contact team consisted of five field grade officers. During their week in Budapest, they met with their Hungarian counterparts to discuss the American military budgeting process, military and civilian pay procedures, the acquisition system, and logistics and storage. Within the next year, there was at least one additional contact team or familiarization tour to discuss each of these subject areas in greater detail. This same pattern held true for each of the priority subject areas identified by the Hungarian military: an initial event generated requests by the Hungarians for more detailed information on specific parts of the general topic.²

By the end of its first year, the liaison team in Budapest had arranged contact teams or FAM tours to expose the Hungarians to the American way of thinking on subjects such as officer and enlisted relationships, the performance evaluation system, leadership, personnel administration, the military legal system, supply and material management, equipment maintenance, communications, military medicine, force planning, public affairs, physical fitness, military clothing, and automation. As the program developed and both sides came to know the other better, events focused on specific, well-defined areas. For example, the Hungarians had a good military hospital system, however, they had a very limited system for the field. During the Gulf War, they had sent a small medical team to witness the American system of medics/corpsmen and field hospitals. The liaison team had arranged a series of visits and tours primarily with USAREUR's 7th Medical Command in Germany to explain and demonstrate the workings of American military medicine.³

As Hungary was the first country to participate in the JCTP, it was only natural that the program staff had developed wide contacts there. Both USAFE and USAREUR established partnership units with the Hungarian Army and Air Force. In the case of the Army, the partnership unit was USAREUR's 3d Infantry Division. By late 1993, the liaison team in Budapest arranged for a Hungarian battalion operations officer to observe a 3d Infantry Division counterpart in Germany for two weeks. At the time of the visit, the US battalion was planning a training deployment to one of the large ranges in Germany, so during the actual deployment, the Hungarian officer was joined by his commander and brigade commander, and he acted as guide and interpreter for the two.⁴

The effects of the contact program on the country and its military were varied. The Hungarian Home Defense Forces were realigned from under the office of the president to that of the Ministry of Defense which reflected Western European practice. The government also developed a proposal for a military justice system that included the protection of a soldier's rights and draft legislation in this field passed its first reading in Parliament in the spring of 1994.⁵



Lt Gen Janos Deak, Chief of General Staff of the Hungarian Home Defense Forces, presents the Hungarian Distinguished Service Medal (First Class) to COL Frank Farkas upon his departure as MLT Chief. Col Farkas was the first American to receive this medal.

On the subject of personnel management, the Hungarians were interested in improving officer performance so they appointed a senior officer commission to review the matter. They expressed an interest in a personnel evaluation system based on performance standards, a revised system of pay and allowances, and an improved physical fitness program. They were also interested in forming a corps of noncommissioned officers. A more basic challenge affecting personnel management was the precept that the military was a life-long career. Officers served until retirement at age fifty-five. There was no concept of a career after military retirement based on skills learned nor was there an up-or-out system. Senior leaders in the Hungarian Home Defense Forces were aware of the problem, but finding a solution would be a difficult and painful undertaking.⁶

Prior to inaugurating the Joint Contact Team Program, Hungary had begun transitioning from an army organization based on regiments to one based on brigades. Following the ouster of communism, the government announced a new national strategy—a defensive strategy that required restructuring and the reduction of the military. The HHDF was able to use information gained from military-to-military events to begin planning for changes and for judging their impact.

Prior to inaugurating the Joint Contact Team Program, Hungary had begun transitioning from an army organization based on regiments to one based on brigades. Following the ouster of communism, the government announced a new national strategy—a defensive strategy that required restructuring and the reduction of the military. The HHDF was able to use information gained from military-to-military events to begin planning for changes and for judging their impact.

As the liaison team's first year was coming to an end, both the Minister of Defense and the new Chief of General Staff, Lieutenant General Janos Deak, pressed the United States to continue contact operations in their country. At a ceremony in July 1993, Colonel Farkas passed the team's leadership to Colonel Louis Boros and also at this time was presented with the Hungarian Distinguished Service Medal (First Class) for his support to the Hungarian Government, the highest award the country can bestow. Based on the year's experience, Ambassador Charles Thomas willingly added his voice to those advocating an extension of the program in Hungary. Despite concern over the availability of funds, the Interagency Working Group approved a one-year extension.⁷

Poland

On 3 February 1993, Colonel Oleh Skrypczuk and Lieutenant Colonel Richard Zak inaugurated the military liaison team in Poland, a country that had maintained the second largest military establishment in the Warsaw Pact. The military was held in high regard among the Poles as a defender of the nation.

By history and tradition, Russia was one of its ancient enemies, and, as a result, Poland was one of the most restless members of the Warsaw Pact. During the 1980s, the *Solidarnosc* (Solidarity) trade union and the Roman Catholic Church were among the leading forces for democratic change in Central and Eastern Europe.



A traveling contact team visits a Polish engineering lab.

On 14 August 1989, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, a member of *Solidarnosc*, became the first non-communist Polish prime minister since 1947. And in December 1990, Lech Walesa, its former head, was elected President. The country's new leadership wished to strengthen ties with the West as quickly as possible. As much as anything else, they wanted Poland to be admitted to NATO, and the Joint Contact Team Program offered a means of assisting their military toward that end.

Within a month, the remaining members of the liaison team joined Colonel Skrypczuk and Lieutenant Colonel Zak at the Military Garrison Hotel Belwederski near the American embassy. They worked in the Ministry of Defense building at ulica Krolewska 1 where Colonel Stanislaw Wozniak, Director of the Department of Foreign Military Affairs was Colonel Skrypczuk's point of contact.* Within the General Staff, Colonel Waldemar Czarnecki, Colonel Wozniak's deputy, was the contact for the liaison team. At a more senior level, Deputy Minister of National Defense Dr. Przemyslaw Grudyzinski was the one who coordinated the contact program in Poland. No Polish officers were assigned to the team.

First, the liaison team prepared a draft of the country work plan. Pending final approval, the American ambassador agreed to let the team work on individual events to introduce subjects of interest to the Poles. By 16 April 1993, Polish authorities and the American ambassador had approved the plan.⁸

Following the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, the country faced the need to reorganize the defense plans to cover all borders rather than just its western boundary. At the same time, the government wished to reduce the number of people under arms. In carrying out the reorganization, Polish officials wanted to prepare for their ultimate goal—membership in NATO. To meet these goals, the work plan identified air defense, education and training, logistics, and information security for contact program events.

* Colonel Wozniak was promoted to brigadier general in November 1993.

The first traveling contact team was made up of air defense experts from USAFE and the second by organizational experts. It was quickly apparent that the Polish military was well trained and sophisticated and what was needed was more detailed information on each subject area. For example, the members of the air defense contact team presented a general overview of USAFE's air defense system. What the Poles wanted was technical information useful at the worker level, data the team was not prepared to discuss. Once the desire of the Poles became known, the contact teams and FAM tours were more tailored to the needs of their host.⁹

In preparing for the second work plan in August 1993, the Poles expressed interest in learning more about research and development, strategic concepts, defense budgeting, disaster relief, support of humanitarian operations, NCO roles and training, mountaineering, and physical fitness programs. They also asked to include academic exchanges and contacts with the US Army Special Forces and exchanges with sister unit affiliations. All of these requests were discussed during the United States-Polish Bilateral Working Group meeting held 15-16 September 1993 in Garmisch, Germany.¹⁰ The BWG agreed to an extension of the contact program through the end of 1994.¹¹

Albania

By reason of geography, language, and politics, Albania had been one of the most isolated countries in Europe for more than fifty years. Set up as an independent country by the Great Powers following the First Balkan War in 1912, it was occupied in turn by the Austrians, Serbs, and Greeks during World War I. After barely twenty years of independence, it was seized again by Italy in 1939 and served as a base for its attempted invasion of Greece in 1940. Following Italy's surrender to the allies in 1943, the Germans took control of the country. In late 1944, communist partisans led by Enver Hoxha replaced the retreating Germans and established a Stalinist dictatorship. Two years later, the United States and Albania broke diplomatic relations.

Wary of all his neighbors, especially Tito's Yugoslavia, and wedded to the Stalinist model, Hoxha sealed Albania behind its borders in the rugged mountains of the southwest Balkan Peninsula. As Tito's rift with Stalin developed in 1947, Hoxha sided with the Soviet Union and broke relations with Yugoslavia. The Soviets move toward de-stalinization and Hoxha's reconciliation with Tito pushed the leader to break relations with the Soviet Union in 1961 and ally his country with Mao's China. But following Mao's death, he ended the special relationship with China in 1977. Although Hoxha died in 1985, conditions changed little in Europe's last Stalinist dictatorship and only hermit nation. News of the Soviet empire's breakup, combined with high unemployment and food shortages, led to large public demonstrations and the collapse of the communist dictatorship in 1990 and early 1991. Albanians held their first free elections in March 1991, and Secretary of State James Baker visited them on 22 June 1991—a first in the annals of the Department of State.

As the poorest country in Europe, the newly emerging nation faced daunting challenges. Unemployment was over fifty percent and relations with its neighbors were tense. The Serbs in the disintegrating Yugoslavia were determined to continue the repression of the Albanian majority in the Serbian province of Kosovo. Greece

championed the cause of the small Greek minority in southern Albania and tolerated a few cross-border raids into Albania and some harassment of its fishing boats. Italian commercial interests vied with those of the Greeks in supplying Western goods. When offered the chance to participate in the Joint Contact Team Program, President Sali Berisha was quick to accept.

Major David M. Aldrich and Lieutenant Commander Joseph W. Tindell arrived in the capital city Tirana on 12 February 1993 to establish the military liaison team. They were soon joined by Colonel Richard L. Freeman, the first team chief, and Sergeant First Class Richard A. Gola. Team members who spoke Albanian were almost impossible to find. Not until June 1993 did Sergeant Tomor Mukaj, a native-born Albanian and a member of the New York National Guard, join the liaison team. For both sides, the team in Tirana provided a unique experience. For Albania, it was the first military contact with the outside world since 1977 and the first contact with the West since World War II. For the United States, it was the first military contact with Albania other than having military attachés.

Albanian Minister of Defense Safet Zhulali and Chief of the General Staff Lieutenant General Ilia Vasho supported the military-to-military program and provided the liaison team office space in the Ministry of Defense/General Staff building on Boulevard Shetitorja Deshmoret e Kombit in central Tirana. To house team members, the government offered to rent the villa built for Memhet Shehu, Hoxha's long-time deputy. Located a short ten-minute walk from the ministry and behind the presidential palace, the villa could house the entire team. As Tirana had an acute shortage of housing, the offer was accepted. The ministry also assigned one of its few English-speaking officers, Lieutenant Colonel Akil Bubesi, to the team.*

Upon arrival, the team had to prepare a country work plan as well as arrange the first traveling contact team, a Coast Guard assessment visit that began on 24 February 1993. The Minister of Defense and Chief of the General Staff had a series of goals they wanted to achieve with the help of the contact team: create a small modern military force—equipped and trained to NATO standards—that could participate in peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance missions and could train a civilian leadership for the Ministry of Defense.¹²

By using those goals as a basis, the team prepared a plan with subject areas such as organization, military legal system, NCO development, engineering, and training. The Ministry of Defense and the American embassy approved it, and the program office at USEUCOM quickly organized traveling contact teams on organization and doctrine, military law, civil engineering, port safety and security, and staff organization. The liaison team dispatched the first familiarization tour to the headquarters to examine a functioning staff.

Team members in Tirana, particularly Colonel Freeman, filled an unusual function as sounding boards for the senior military leadership of their host country. Given Albania's long period of isolation, this was a critical service. It was not unusual for Minister Zhulali or General Vasho to drop in at the team office or ask Colonel Freeman

*Lieutenant Colonel Bubesi was promoted to colonel in April 1994.

to reciprocate. Over coffee, discussions would range from the workings of democracy to the organization and functions of an inspector general (IG) system. The same kind of discussion took place between team members and department and division heads, usually facilitated by cups of thick Albanian coffee. Albanians had struggled to adjust to new ways of doing things, and they considered members of the liaison team a vital link to the West.¹³

Latvia

Latvians first expressed interest in US military expertise in the summer of 1992 in Riga at a NATO-sponsored program. Impressed with the National Guard presentation, they asked for more information on the Guard as a possible model for their own Home Guard. This event was the basis for the expansion of the Joint Contact Team Program into the Baltic states.

Major John A. Birzniaks led the first members of the liaison team on 2 May 1993 with Chief Warrant Officer Thomas W. Burleigh, Chief Warrant Officer Verners Sulcs, and Sergeant Angela C. Grice. Within the month, they were joined by Colonel Owen W. Moon, the team chief. The team composition reflected the agreement between the National Guard Bureau and USEUCOM—at least two members would be guardsmen and one a reservist. As Michigan was the partnership state for Latvia, the Guard Bureau tried to find personnel from Michigan for the liaison team. Colonel Moon and Chief Warrant Officer Sulcs were members of the Michigan Army National Guard, as was the second team chief, Colonel Wayne C. Koppa. Major Birzniaks was a member of the Army Reserve.

Because of the shortage of English speakers in the Latvian military forces, it was important that many of the team members speak Latvian. Determining language competency was a bit of a problem since the Defense Language Institute had no Latvian language examination. The Department of State did however have a Latvian exam which Major Birzniaks and Chief Warrant Officer Sulcs took in 2.5-hour telephone interviews.¹⁴

The Contact Team Program Office expected Chief Warrant Officer Burleigh and Sergeant Grice to be Latvian speakers. In preparing the request for Latvian speakers, the staff erroneously used the form to request Polish linguists. They modified the front of the form to reflect the Latvian requirement, but left the second page unchanged. As a result, rather than receiving Latvian linguists, the team received two Polish linguists. The program office eventually reassigned Sergeant Grice to the liaison team in Warsaw; however, Chief Warrant Officer Burleigh completed his tour in Latvia. During her tour of duty in Latvia, Sergeant Grice was somewhat of a novelty, as the Latvians had never seen a black female NCO.¹⁵

The Latvian team began working out of a side room of Mom's Cafeteria in the basement of the American embassy. A month later, the team moved to a more permanent location in the building housing the Latvian military printing plant directly across the street from the logistics headquarters for the former Soviet Union's Northwest Group of Forces. The building was still used by the Russian military which meant

that uniformed Americans and Russians passed each other daily in the streets of Riga.¹⁶

The first challenge facing the liaison team was preparing the country work plan. With fifty years of Soviet occupation and training and isolation from the West, the Latvians were a people with a pre-1940s and a Soviet mindset. After throwing off the Soviet yoke, they reinstated their constitution


from the 1920s era. Few people in the government in 1991 had a working knowledge of the constitution. There was also a generally recognized need to update it, including those parts dealing with the military. The Soviet experience had left many Latvians with an aversion to accepting responsibility. Decision-making was highly centralized, and it was often difficult to find out who was ultimately responsible.¹⁷

The road to freedom also left Latvia with a divided defense establishment. The Home Guard was an all-volunteer force that attracted Latvian nationalists and was viewed by the government as a reliable force of patriots. On the other hand, most of the officers of the Latvian Defense Forces were citizens who had been career officers in the Soviet forces. They were distrusted by the Home Guard whom they considered amateur soldiers at best.

Working closely with the American ambassador to Latvia, Mr. Ints Silins, and senior government officials as well as the Home Guard and the Defense Forces, Colonel Moon and his team developed a country plan that addressed Latvian interests. Specific areas included the National Guard, military medicine, military justice, training, public affairs, and explosive ordnance disposal (EOD).

Concerned that the military-to-military program quickly demonstrate its value to the Latvians, Ambassador Silins asked that a few events take place as soon as possible. The program office responded by arranging two ship visits, one to a US Navy ship and another to a Coast Guard one, and also three traveling contact teams in June 1993. Two of the teams were assessment visits by members of USEUCOM's medical and legal staff that provided the basis for further events. The third was an EOD team sent to evaluate the condition of former Soviet military firing and bombing ranges.

From the beginning of the program in Latvia, the Michigan National Guard played an active role. By 30 March 1994, guardsmen had conducted seven team visits and assisted in two others. They also hosted six familiarization tours to Michigan and Washington, DC, and sponsored two members of the Home Guard as Minuteman Fellows.



Maj Robert Zak and SGT Angela Grice at their workstation in the Polish military liaison team office.



Medical traveling contact team in Latvia.

These two spent a month with members of the Michigan Guard with much exposure to the American citizen-soldier. The Guard also hosted eleven members of the Ministry of Defense, Defense Forces, and Home Guard on a visit to Michigan and Washington to expose the Latvians to the legislative process and to show them how the National Guard worked at the state and national level.

The impact of the program was difficult to discern, but during the ten months of operation through 30 March 1994, the program office was responsible

for conducting 79 events, including 37 traveling contact teams and 15 FAM tours. The liaison team tried to include members of both the Home Guard and the Defense Forces in each event. So impressed were members of the Home Guard with the professionalism of the Michigan National Guard, that in September 1993, they renamed themselves the Latvian National Guard. Following a visit to Michigan to examine military contracting, the Latvians began a major overhaul of their own system. The country's new National Guardsmen were very interested in developing a core of trained NCOs and moved toward implementing a training program; in the same vein, members of the Defense Forces expressed some interest in developing an NCO program. The staff in the Ministry of Defense took steps to create a Latvian inspector general system after observing how the Americans handled oversight of their complaint system. The longer term impact of the program remained unknown, but it seemed certain that the strong relationship which developed between the Latvian military and the Michigan National Guard would yield benefits to both parties.¹⁸

Estonia

The northern-most of the three Baltic states, Estonia regained its independence in 1991 after fifty years of complete integration into the Soviet Union and rule from Moscow. Following independence, the people were faced with building institutions for a new nation, including a military organization. With its small population, the country was forced to place great reliance on a part-time military similar to the Reserve or National Guard in the United States. By 1993, Estonians had a standing force of four infantry battalions, some independent infantry companies, and an embryonic navy and air force. They also had the paramilitary Border Guard, the Rescue Board, a police rapid-response regiment, and the unpaid Estonian Defense League, the *Eesti Kaitseleit*, a home guard—the largest military organization in the country.

The first members of the military liaison team, Lieutenant Colonel Inguar-Erich Lantzky and Chief Petty Officer Clifton H. Colee, arrived in Tallinn near the end of

April 1993. They were soon joined by the team chief, Colonel Darald R. Stebner, and Major John N. Foster. The Ministry of Defense provided them an office in the *Eesti Kaitseliit*'s headquarters on Aia Street adjacent to the city walls of medieval Tallinn. At first, team members lived in the Hotel Viru overlooking the intersection of Narva and Parnu Boulevards and Mere Street, but soon found apartments to rent that were more economical.

Team members were carefully chosen to provide expertise from the Navy or Coast Guard because of Estonia's long coastline. A conscious effort to include two guardsmen and at least one reservist, among the five or six team members, was made as had been agreed by senior leaders of the JCTP and the National Guard Bureau. One of the guardsmen would be a colonel and, if the ranking officer, the team chief. Where possible, the guardsmen and reservists would be from the partnership state. At first, New York was the partnership state for Estonia, but the Guard Bureau later changed it to Maryland.¹⁹

Among the members of the team in Tallinn, Colonel Stebner was an active duty guardsman while Lieutenant Colonel Lantzky served in the New York Army National Guard and was fluent in Estonian. Captain Andres Ploompuu, a member of the Army Reserve, also spoke Estonian. He arrived in August 1993. Captain Arno Kivi, who was assigned at the Army's 10th Medical Laboratory in Landstuhl, Germany, and fluent in Estonian, joined the team in October 1993. Chief Petty Officer Colee and his replacements, Petty Officer First Class Marcus Wilson and Chief Petty Officer Richard D. Klipich, Jr., were experienced senior Navy NCOs. Estonia's country desk officers were Lieutenant Karin Shuey, an active duty officer, and Lieutenant Commander William Gripman, a Navy reservist. Finally, First Lieutenant William Cronenberg was not only an Army reservist, but as a civilian had been in Tallinn since August 1992 helping to establish the Estonian Defense Academy. When Lieutenant General Conaway of the Guard Bureau and Brigadier General Lennon from USEUCOM met him in a restaurant in November 1992, they invited him to join the team, which he did in October 1993.²⁰

The emphasis on Guard and Reserve membership on the liaison team provided the hosts with examples of professional citizen-soldiers. It also provided USEUCOM additional resources for the JCTP and a larger pool of personnel adept in the language. The last was important because the Estonian military did not have enough English-speaking officers to assign one full time to the liaison team.

Working with the Ministry of Defense and the *Eesti Kaitseliit*, the team prepared the country work plan. Although the country had been without its own military for fifty years, upon gaining independence many Estonians in the Soviet forces joined the regular forces. Many patriots in the home guard had seen prior service, although few had senior staff-level experience. Brigadier General Aleksander (*Kindrelmajor*) Einseln, Chief of the Defense Forces, was an Estonian-American who was also a retired colonel from the US Army.

The first work plan emphasized basic subjects for a democratic military and included traveling contact teams with experts on military law, public affairs, the chaplaincy, personnel management, operations and training management, threat



A Public Affairs traveling contact team making a presentation in Estonia.

assessment, logistics, waterways management, port safety and security, and the US Coast Guard. There were familiarization tours on base administration, logistics, and civil engineering. Estonians were particularly interested in marine pollution since, as a parting gesture, the Russian Navy had sunk any vessel it did not remove. One of the contact teams included in the first work plan addressed this problem.²¹

The country participated in 58 events by the end of March 1994. On a number of subjects, contact teams had been followed by FAM tours for Estonians to see such things as US Navy base administration at Rota, Spain, and US military communications facilities and operations in Stuttgart, Germany. As part of the State Partnership Program begun in November 1993, there was a visit by officials from the Maryland National Guard followed by Estonian tours to a brigade command post exercise and to their state partner's headquarters. This exchange offered military members an opportunity to see American citizen-soldiers functioning in their military and civilian worlds.

Lithuania

Colonel Robert V. Barziloski led the Lithuanian military liaison team into Vilnius in mid-May 1993. Other members of the first team included Lieutenant Colonel Stanley Paulauskas, Major Jesse Deets, Major John Duda, Captain Patrick Hinds, Sergeant First Class Rimantas R. Gavelis, and Petty Officer First Class Stephen L. Hamrick. Three members were fluent in Lithuanian. Team membership reflected the agreement between the Joint Contact Team Program and the Reserve components on manning the liaison teams in the Baltic states. Three members, including Colonel Barziloski, were guardsmen from the partnership state of Pennsylvania, and two were reservists. The Contact Team Program Office selected the two active duty members of the initial team from the Navy and the Marine Corps to provide expertise in naval matters. Country desk officers Marine Major Frederic M. Olson and Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Russell A. Deming supplied added talent to the program in Lithuania.

Colonel Barziloski and his team entered a country that had little experience with independence or democracy. It did have a proud history that reached back to the early Middle Ages. During the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania expanded to stretch from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. A personal union between the Lithuanian and Polish royal houses became a political union in 1569. During the third partition of Poland in 1795, the country became part of the Russian Empire. It regained its independence in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution and the

end of World War I. Scarcely twenty years later, it again lost its independence, being forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940, overrun by the German army in 1941, and reconquered by the Soviet Union in 1944. Following elections in February 1990, the people declared their independence on 11 March 1990. The Soviet Union responded with an economic embargo. Tensions exploded into violence in January 1991 when Soviet military units attempted to seize the television transmitter and the parliament building in Vilnius. A standoff between the Soviets and Lithuanian volunteers ensued. Lithuania formed a nationwide home guard, the *Savanoriskoji Krasto Apsaugos Tarnyba* or SKAT.

The failed coup against the Gorbachev government in August 1991 broke the deadlock in Lithuania. The nations of Western Europe and the United States recognized its independence: the United States on 2 September 1991, the Soviet Union on 6 September. It gained admission to the United Nations on 17 September. The Soviet-Russian military did not complete its withdrawal from bases in Lithuania until September 1993.

The Lithuanian defense forces which Colonel Barziloski and the liaison team came to assist consisted of seven services all under the Ministry of Defense. These included the SKAT, the Iron Wolf Brigade, the Civil Defense Department, the Medical Service, the Border Guards, the Lithuanian Air Force, and the Naval Flotilla. The Iron Wolf Brigade, the Air Force, and the Naval Flotilla comprised the standing forces. Most of the officers of the standing forces had been career officers in the Soviet armed forces. As such, they were not entirely trusted by the SKAT, whom they considered poorly trained amateurs. Lithuania drafted enlisted personnel into the standing forces, but the SKAT enlisted force was all volunteer. Equipment for its armed forces was limited almost entirely to material left behind by the departing Russians.

When the liaison team arrived in Vilnius, the Lithuanians provided an office in the SKAT headquarters building on Laisves Prospektas in the northwest section of the city. At first, team members lived in hotel rooms, but eventually moved to rented facilities scattered around Vilnius. The Ministry of Defense also assigned First Lieutenant Arturas Indicianskis, a SKAT officer, to the liaison team.*

The first task facing the liaison team was to identify the subject areas of interest to the military and develop a country work plan. Until the Americans arrived, the Lithuanians had only the Soviet model upon which to pattern their armed forces. When asked by the team, they had a large number of subject areas on which they wanted information: military justice, disaster preparedness, staff organization, logistics, military medicine, NCO development, and environmental protection.

Lithuanian interest in military justice stemmed from the lack of a written military legal code and the dependence on corporal punishment for almost all infractions. Its military forces had inherited from the Soviet military a system that was often brutal and sometimes fatal. The Ministry of Defense and the senior military leadership understood

* In early 1994, First Lieutenant Indicianskis received a regular commission from the Ministry of Defense.

that this system could not continue. The situation could be especially critical for the SKAT which depended on volunteers.

Professional development and a desire to prepare for membership in NATO led the Lithuanians to request information on logistics, staff organization, military medicine, and NCO development. Most Lithuanian senior officers had limited knowledge of Western military organization. The country also had a shortage of officers with experience at top levels of command and staff. Unlike most Western counterparts, the military had no corps of professional NCOs.

Lithuanian authorities were interested in disaster preparedness because the country faced three distinct threats. The country's flat terrain and wet climate made spring flooding a recurring problem. Secondly, Lithuania's Ignalina nuclear power plant was similar in design to the one which had exploded at Chernobyl in Ukraine in April 1986. The Civil Security planners also worried about Russia's frequent transport of unknown chemicals on the rail line from Kaliningrad Oblast through Vilnius to the Belarussian border.

The actual program included all of these diverse interests. A familiarization tour to USEUCOM's surgeon's conference took place 7-15 May 1993, and by the end of March 1994, Lithuanians had participated in 68 events, including 46 traveling contact teams and 12 FAM tours. Among the most significant events were a tour by five members of its military to the Pennsylvania National Guard; a series of contact team visits and tours on disaster preparedness and civil-military cooperation, including a visit to Saint Louis, Missouri, during the great floods of 1993; and a series of team visits on military justice. Of equal significance, the liaison team tried to include members of the Iron Wolf Brigade and the SKAT on all events.²²

As the team's first year in Lithuania ended, the impact of the program could be seen in a number of areas. Barriers between the Iron Wolf Brigade and the SKAT had been reduced, and the professionalism of SKAT headquarters had increased markedly. The liaison team and the Pennsylvania Guard provided much support to the NCO Academy which the Ministry of Defense established in Kaunas. During a FAM tour to the 10th Special Forces Group at Fort Devens, Massachusetts, Major Aleksandr Temnolonskij of the Iron Wolf Brigade's Operations and Training Department was given a copy of the US Army Ranger handbook translated into Russian. Upon his return to Vilnius, he distributed copies to each Iron Wolf battalion to alleviate the shortage of training manuals. During the spring of 1994, the Lithuanian Civil Defense Department employed some of the insight it developed after various disaster preparedness traveling contact teams and FAMs to respond to the flooding of the Nemunas River. The Department had also revised existing disaster response plans for the Ignalina power plant.²³

From 17 through 29 October 1993, Lieutenant Colonel Charles Trant from the US Army's Fifth Judicial Circuit in Nurnberg, Germany, conducted a contact team visit on military justice. Following the visit, he prepared a draft of a judicial code for the country's military forces. The liaison team provided a translated copy to the Ministry of Defense, which adopted the code with few changes.²⁴

Romania

In the late 1960s and 1970s, the Nicolae Ceausescu regime followed a foreign policy independent of the Soviet Union. This independence won the country membership in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and most-favored-nation status from the United States. In domestic affairs, however, the Ceausescu regime had always been among the more repressive in Eastern Europe. By 1982, Ceausescu's treatment of the population had become so odious that the United States suspended most-favored-nation status.

The people of Romania, aided by segments of their army in 1989, overthrew Ceausescu's government and executed the dictator and his wife on 25 December. Following the dictator's downfall, the actions of the new government, made up largely of Ceausescu's supporters, caused the Americans to doubt its democratic intentions. Democratic elections held in September 1992 helped to revise the American view of Romania. In December, Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy I. Lewis Libbey visited Bucharest and was favorably impressed by the people's commitment to democracy and reform. One result was their subsequent participation in the Joint Contact Team Program.²⁵

The liaison team arrived in Bucharest on 13 April 1993 led by acting chief Lieutenant Colonel Glen E. Lich, Lieutenant Commander Norman G. Harris, Major Bruce A. Cheadle, Captain Timothy R. Noonan, and Chief Petty Officer Paul C. Frank. On 11 June 1993, team chief Captain Sammy L. Foursha arrived. The Romanian defense staff assigned four members to the team: Lieutenant Colonel Marin Chiotea, Lieutenant Colonel Iordache Olaru, Senior Lieutenant Teodor Tanase, and Sergeant First Class Gabriel Dobrota. Team offices were a few blocks east of the Inter-Continental Hotel on the first two floors of a building which also housed the Romanian General Staff Directorate for International Relations and Treaties, a directorate responsible for providing support to the team. Given the severe housing shortage in Bucharest, team members lived in hotels, many in the Inter-Continental Hotel at 4-6 Nicolae Balcescu Boulevard.

Romania had fielded the second largest military among the non-Soviet members of the Warsaw Pact. By late 1993, its military felt the impact of the long years of national economic distress, and in response, initiated a major reorganization and reduction. The winds of democracy which blew through Romania added further impetus to change in the military. The liaison team found a very receptive audience for its presentations on the workings of democratic military institutions.

The first task facing the newly-arrived team was to develop a country work plan based on Romanian priorities. For more than two years the country had had military-to-military contacts with the United States including Navy port visits to Constanta and visits by US medical officers, military historians, military bands, and the Navy's Blue Angels. Some of their military members attended an Army helicopter safety conference and a drug enforcement conference, among others. Some had also attended the Joint Contact Team Program scheduling conference held in February 1993 at USEUCOM headquarters.

The General Staff listed Romania's priority subject areas as civil defense, logistics, military justice, military medicine, training, personnel management, and public affairs. Within medicine, they were particularly interested in field hospitals, eye tumors, reconstructive surgery, and kophosurgery, the surgical treatment of deafness. Much of the logistics interest centered on unit supply and maintenance operations.²⁶

The impact of Western military thinking on Romania varied. The country had begun work on a military justice system to replace the single paragraph in the penal code that dealt specifically with military crimes. By March 1994, parliament was considering legislation to establish a military justice system. Efforts to improve the lot of soldiers were limited by a lack of money. One area where its military was able to improve conditions was with the creation of a chaplaincy. The Joint Contact Team Program assisted this effort by scheduling contact teams and a tour dealing with the work of military chaplains. Before the arrival of the liaison team, Romania embarked on a large-sale reorganization of its military to conform to Western models. Among other things, this strategy involved a change to the corps/brigade system similar to the US Army and a merger of the Air Force and Air Defense Forces. The contact program scheduled a number of events to provide information on various aspects of American military organization.²⁷

An unusual part of Romania's military reorganization was the creation of a division of naval infantry based, in part, on the example provided by the United States Embassy Marine Guards and the Marine officer assigned to the liaison team. The leaders redesignated the Ninth Infantry Division, which was assigned to the Dobrudja, as naval infantry. The division commander, Major General Constantin Zeca, made considerable use of the Joint Contact Team Program in arranging events to assist in the conversion.²⁸

In February 1994, the Ministry of Defense reviewed the main contributions of the contact program. Among its major impacts were increased mutual understanding of the organization and functioning of the nation's power structure. For its military leaders, the program offered a large window on the West and an exchange of ideas with their American counterparts. They felt it had helped them to take important steps for increasing the transparency of command and defense planning and gave senior American leaders greater insight into the changing conditions, which helped to overcome the stereotypes created during the Ceausescu regime. In March 1994, Romania took another step towards transparency with the appointment of its first civilian Minister of Defense in over fifty years.²⁹

At levels below ministry, national defense staff, and general officers, the program gave Romanians a chance to see the level of training of the American military while developing mutual understanding for each other's customs and traditions. It allowed them to explore new military structures such as the chaplaincy and public affairs and to experience the workings of the military in a democracy. It provided a venue for increased mutual understanding and an opportunity to establish personal relationships among future military leaders on both sides. For Romania, the Joint Contact Team Program was confirmation that the West, particularly the United States, was committed to peace and stability.³⁰

Bulgaria

On 13 August 1993, the Sofia daily newspaper reported, "from well informed sources in the midst of the Ministry of Defense, *Duma* has learned that four unidentified American specialists have been roaming about Sofia for about ten days. Without the approval of the government and not known by whose invitation, the guests with US epaulets are staying in the capital's hotel Shipka. What they are doing here is not fully clear."⁵¹ For the next two days, other newspapers explained to the populace the purpose of the American military presence; that is, *Duma* was reporting the presence of the military liaison team. The first members of the liaison team arrived in Bulgaria in late July 1993: team chief Colonel Gary G. Chamberlin, Major Timothy J. Cornell, and Specialist Edwin R. Bochtler. They were joined in early August by Chief Warrant Officer Marva E. McDonald and Bulgarian Lieutenant Colonel Dimitre G. Dimitrov.

Before 1990, relations between the United States and individual members of the Warsaw Pact were cool; those with Bulgaria were among the coldest. Given its history and culture, this was not surprising. Czarist Russia had liberated the country from 500 years of Ottoman rule during the late nineteenth century. It shared Orthodox Christianity, a Slavic language, and the Cyrillic alphabet with its liberators. Following World War II, Bulgaria became a loyal member of the Warsaw Pact. By 1989, however, the people had become thoroughly disenchanted with the communist dictatorship. Their country completed a bloodless transition to democracy by 1992. As shown by the *Duma* article, suspicions of Western intentions were not entirely erased.

American officials had begun discussing participation in the Joint Contact Team Program with the Bulgarians in late 1992. The latter had been hesitant because USEUCOM had asked for office space in the Ministry of Defense building. The question on the location of the liaison team's office was cleared during the ceremonies marking the opening of the George C. Marshall Center for European Security at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, on 5 June 1993. In conversations with Bulgaria's Deputy Minister of Defense, Brigadier General Lennon learned of this concern and assured him that the office did not have to be in the ministry building. Within ten days, the senior leadership agreed to join the contact program and provided office space in the same military hotel where the team was billeted, located next to the Ministry of Defense building at 34A General Tottleben Boulevard.⁵²

As elsewhere, the liaison team's first task upon arrival was to develop a country work plan. The team members soon discovered, however, that not all suspicions had been removed by placing the team offices in the hotel. Further, the Bulgarian system of staff work in which most decisions were made at the highest levels was very much at odds with the American approach. Much patience was required on the part of the Americans to overcome the obstacles and complete the first work plan. The transparency of the contact program and repeated demonstrations of American intention to respond to priorities set by the host nation were the keys to this effort.⁵³

Together, the Ministry of Defense and the General Staff selected five areas in which to concentrate initial events: personnel management, including training; logistics; communications systems, including computers; public affairs; and military medicine. The US ambassador to Bulgaria added a sixth area, engineering, which he hoped might

overcome some of the infrastructure problems associated with the UN embargo against Yugoslavia. The embargo had cut Bulgaria's principal road and rail routes to Western Europe. Transport links to Greece and Romania were limited but, he reasoned, could be improved with engineering assistance.

The plan, completed in November 1993, contained a list of the 16 events that were already completed since the end of July, a plan for the next quarter consisting of 44 events, and a yearly work plan of 15 core events. The quarterly plan covering the period November 1993 through January 1994 contained an ambitious program. Although the contact program was not able to conduct all of the events during the first quarter, the staff did schedule most of them during the remainder of 1994. Among those events was a visit by the Tennessee National Guard designed to begin its state's partnership program with Bulgaria.³⁴

Attempting to gauge the impact of the contact team program after only five months of operation was premature. Colonel Chamberlin and his team did expose Bulgarian staff officers to the American concept of staff work. They were grounded in the Soviet methods which emphasized the process rather than results. Their experience was that as long as each staff officer followed the procedures and passed a project along, he had fulfilled his responsibilities.

As an example, the liaison team needed the passport numbers of English teachers from various military schools to send them on a familiarization tour to the United States. The team forwarded the request through Bulgarian military channels, and their follow-up checks to determine the progress received the response that the request had been forwarded from this office to that office. With time running out, Colonel Chamberlin convinced his counterpart to call the academies directly, and once he did, the team had the passport numbers in about five minutes. The next day, Lieutenant Colonel Dimitrov received permission for the liaison team to coordinate directly across the lines of authority in the Bulgarian staff and the Ministry of Defense. Later, the team was able to extend lateral communications to other ministries and government agencies. After watching the team arrange a traveling contact team on emergency planning, a Bulgarian colonel commented that he now understood why the American staff was so efficient. By working with the liaison team, the hosts were learning something of decentralized management.³⁵

Czech Republic

During the planning for the inauguration of the Joint Contact Team Program, American officials had consistently identified Czechoslovakia as one of the first countries to be included in the program. But, before USEUCOM was able to initiate the military contact program, a political crisis in Czechoslovakia called into question the future existence of the country. The Czechs comprised two-thirds of the population and lived in the western sixty percent of the country, while Slovaks were concentrated in the remaining eastern forty percent. Tensions between Czechs and Slovaks, based on differences in historical experience, culture, and economic development, had emerged soon after the establishment of Czechoslovakia in October 1918. During the communist era, the regime repressed any hint of ethnic strife.



Czech soldiers at Grafenwoehr Training Area during a familiarization tour in Germany.

Czechs and Slovaks cooperated in 1989 to bring about the Velvet Revolution that ousted the communist regime and restored democracy. Within a year, however, tensions had returned, fueled initially by different views on economic reform. Negotiations between Czech and Slovak political leaders and a national election in June 1992 did not resolve the differences. As a result, on 26 August 1992, the leaders of Czechoslovakia peacefully

agreed to divide the country. The division, which occurred on 1 January 1993, resulted in the creation of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic.

The division of Czechoslovakia necessitated postponing the contact program until the Czech Republic established a Ministry of Defense. On 8 April 1993, the Czech Foreign Ministry notified the American ambassador, Adrian A. Basora, that it was ready to participate in the program. The Interagency Working Group met on 22 April and directed the Joint Staff to initiate military-to-military contacts with the Czech Republic. In June 1993, Headquarters USEUCOM selected Lieutenant Colonel Mark L. Kogle as the Czech desk officer. On 12 July 1993, General Lennon introduced the members of the liaison team to Ambassador Basora, Czech Minister of Defense Antonin Baudys, and Chief of the General Staff General Major Jiri Nekvasil. Members included team chief Colonel William J. Deal, Jr., Major Joel E. Melsha, Sergeant First Class Russell E. Preston, and Staff Sergeant Robert P. Babick. On 14 August, Sergeant First Class Randolph L. Tyson replaced Sergeant First Class Preston who transferred to the liaison team in Slovakia. Nine days later Staff Sergeant Michael S. Proctor replaced Staff Sergeant Babick who returned to his unit in Japan.³⁶ The Czechs assigned Captain Dvorak to the team as a full-time member.

The Czechs provided the liaison team office space within view of Prague Castle. The office comprised three rooms on the first floor of the building which housed the office of the Minister of Defense and was located in the military compound at Tychonova 1 in the Djevice district of Prague. The Czech General Staff was housed in a neighboring building. Team members rented rooms in the nearby Hotel International located at Koulova 6.

The team's first priority was the country work plan based on priorities established by the Czech Ministry of Defense and the General Staff, which identified the events, both familiarization tours and traveling contact teams. To set their priorities, the Czechs identified five long-term goals: to integrate the Czech armed forces into NATO,

to establish the roles and functions of a military force in a democratic society, to generate the morale and motivation needed in a professional military, to restructure the armed forces into a professional, career-oriented force, and to participate in world-wide peacekeeping activities. In 1990, the Czechoslovaks began restructuring the military. By 1995, the Czechs hoped to reduce their army to 23,000, the air force to 27,000, and reduce compulsory military training from two years to one. As the armed forces were not the top priority of the Czech government, finding money to carry out all these changes was a challenge. In addition, the Czech military was held in relatively low esteem by the population, a fact that could be traced to a number of causes. Some were the failure of the army to fight the Germans in 1938 and the Warsaw Pact in 1968, and, in line with the practice of most military establishments using the Soviet model, the harsh treatment meted out to conscripts.³⁷

The Ministry of Defense and the General Staff identified fourteen subject areas in which they wished to conduct contact program activities. In an effort to establish priorities, the liaison team grouped the areas of cooperation into three categories—most critical, critical, and important. The most critical included education and training of leaders, logistics, personnel management, air space control, and command, control, communications, and computers (C4). Critical areas were resource management, public affairs, military legal system, military police, and military medicine. The important areas were environmental protection, civil affairs, civil engineering, and cultural exchanges. These priorities formed the basis for determining what events to include in the work plan and for determining relative importance of proposed events.³⁸

On 17 August 1993, Ambassador Basora approved the phase I work plan covering the period July-September 1993, but the contact program had already conducted a few events during July. The Czechs and the liaison team quickly developed a phase II plan covering the period October through December 1993 and a phase III plan for the first six months of 1994. Each plan, based on the areas of cooperation established by the Czechs, proposed twelve events per month.³⁹

As the Czechs gained experience with the contact program, they became more interested in unit-to-unit contacts with the US military, especially in Germany. Geography too, played an integral part since the Czech border was only a few hours' drive from the major US Army training area at Grafenwoehr, Germany. Czech officers could spend a day at Grafenwoehr observing training without staying overnight, keeping costs down. Because Army training did not always adhere to published agendas, scheduling was a problem, but the liaison team and Headquarters USAREUR worked to overcome this difficulty.

The Czech Republic participated in the State Partnership Program with the National Guard of Texas because of its large Czech-American population. Members of the Texas National Guard visited Prague 16-17 March 1994 to inaugurate the partnership program.⁴⁰

The one area of greatest American involvement with the Czech military was the chaplaincy. This cooperation predated the establishment of the military liaison team in Prague. In April 1993, Czech Minister Antonin Baudys asked General Colin Powell to provide assistance in establishing a chaplaincy in the Czech military. The request

was prompted by Dr. Frantisek Novotny, the Minister's advisor on spiritual matters and relations with the churches. Although many Czechs were nominally Catholic, many people had mixed feelings about the Catholic Church. Since the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, the Church had been associated with Habsburg repression in the Czech lands. And, during the first republic, the Czech government had conducted an anti-Catholic campaign. The Church's reputation had been somewhat revived by its resistance to communist repression, especially after 1968, but Minister Baudys' request was still something of a gamble.

The Joint Staff responded to the Czech request for help by sending to Prague in April 1993 Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Supa, an Air Force chaplain who was a native Czech speaker. Chaplain Supa, as a uniformed minister, worked to bridge the gap between the Czech military and the churches. One result of his efforts was the establishment of the Ecumenical Chair for Spiritual Care in the Military at Charles University.* By March 1994, over 50 students had completed the courses offered under this program, and another 40 were enrolled. Minister Baudys also appointed Chaplain Supa as one of the 16 members of the committee to develop a proposal for spiritual care in the Czech military. The committee recommended to the Czech Council of Ministers that the government establish a system of human/spiritual care services in the military similar to the chaplaincy in the United States Air Force, with one important difference. Care providers would not necessarily be ministers or priests, but would be qualified military officers who fulfill the requirements of the service. During its March 1994 meeting, the Council did not complete the approval process.⁴¹

Slovakia

On 1 January 1993, Slovakia became an independent nation, following the dissolution of the Czechoslovak Federated Republic. Upon independence, Slovakia did not have to create an entirely new infrastructure. Under the Czechoslovak Federated Republic, the Slovaks had already been responsible for much of their own internal administration. The newly independent Slovak Republic did have to create its own military and foreign ministry. And at the same time, the United States had to establish diplomatic relations with the new nation and open an embassy in Bratislava. Not until June 1993 did formal discussions on Slovak participation in the Joint Contact Team Program begin.

The Slovak government responded favorably to the military contact program proposal. On 27 July, Slovak Minister of Defense Imrich Andrejcak met Brigadier General Lennon to discuss the details of Slovak support for the military liaison team. Agreement was quickly reached, and Minister Andrejcak asked that the liaison team be in Bratislava by the end of August. Newly arrived American Chargé d'Affaires Eleanor B. Sutter agreed, and on 29 July 1993, the Interagency Working Group approved the quick insertion of the Slovak liaison team.⁴²

* Charles University was the preeminent university in the Czech Republic. It was also the oldest university in Central Europe, founded by the Emperor Karel IV in 1348.



GEN John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on a visit to Slovakia. L. to r.: Walter D. Slocombe, Principal Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Eleanor B. Sutter, Political Officer at US Embassy Bratislava; GEN Shalikashvili; Imrich Andrajcak, Slovak Minister of Defense; and Slovak Lt Tolman Branco, translator.

On 16 August, Slovak desk officer Lieutenant Colonel John F. Scheiner and Sergeant First Class Russell Preston from the team in Prague arrived. They selected the Hotel Forum near Saint Michael's Gate in the center of the city as the initial location for billeting the team members. Team chief Colonel Gary L. Anderson, Captain Julian C. Saramago, and Sergeant Michael Vasquez arrived on 29

and 30 August. The Ministry of Defense provided the team office space in its building in Bratislava, and the General Staff contributed an office at the staff headquarters in the city of Trencin, located about 100 kilometers northeast of Bratislava. A severe shortage of English-language-qualified officers prevented the initial assignment of a Slovak officer to the liaison team. In each of the major staff sections of the General Staff and the Ministry of Defense, there was a point of contact for the team. The Slovaks also began scheduling weekly meetings between Colonel Anderson and Dr. Irene Belohorska, the Assistant State Secretary in the Ministry of Defense. After Dr. Belohorska's transfer to the Foreign Ministry, Colonel Anderson met weekly with State Secretary Igor Urban. In December 1993, the Ministry of Defense assigned Lieutenant Colonel Kucera to the liaison team, and in February 1994, provided apartments to the team.

The liaison team faced two immediate tasks—win approval of the initial country work plan and prepare for the first Slovak-American Bilateral Working Group meeting scheduled in Bratislava on 21 September 1993. The work plan did not receive final approval until 27 December because of the uncertainty over funding for the JCTP in fiscal year 1994. Another factor was the learning process in which both the Slovak military and the liaison team needed to understand each other's requirements and expectations. The Slovaks participated in the first contact program events well before 27 December.⁴³

Among the early military-to-military events, one in particular had great potential for a long-term impact on Slovakia. In one of their early meetings with General Lennon, the Slovaks had asked for a legal advisor to help the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Justice, and the General Staff prepare a military legal system. General Lennon promised American support. On 13 November 1993, Captain Lizann Longstreet, a lawyer in the US Naval Reserve arrived. As a civilian, she was a senior civil servant at the US Court of Military Appeals and possessed wide legal experience. Of particular importance to the Slovaks, Captain Longstreet had practiced law in Louisiana, the only American

state with a legal system based on civil law.* Slovakia's legal system was also based on civil law. Captain Longstreet provided information on the military legal systems of all NATO nations. Once the Slovaks decided what type of military justice system they wanted, she helped prepare the necessary legislation to amend their constitution and establish the system. She then helped draft the military code which implemented a democratic military justice system. To demonstrate such a system in action, Captain Longstreet accompanied three military judges and the State Secretary from the Ministry of Justice on a FAM tour to Germany to witness an American court martial. In addition, she provided legal advice to the Ministry of Defense on problems resulting from land that had been confiscated for military training, and showed how to use the constitution to resolve the issue.⁴⁴ In February 1994, she agreed to become liaison team chief at the end of Colonel Anderson's assignment.

Slovenia


On 8 October 1991, the Republic of Slovenia celebrated its first independence day marking the first time that a state for Slovenes had ever existed. They were the western-most Slavic people of the South, inhabiting a mountainous area northeast of the head of the Adriatic Sea. Following the breakup of the Habsburg Empire at the end of World War I, most of the Slovene-inhabited territory was included in the new Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, later renamed Yugoslavia. The western and southwestern Slovene-inhabited districts were included in Italy. At the end of World War II, the allies awarded these to a Yugoslavia ruled by Josip Tito. Marshall Tito died in 1980, and the federated Yugoslav state he ruled slowly began to disintegrate. This decline was fueled by a declining economy and a fear of the Serbs who were the largest nationality group in Yugoslavia. In the years between the world wars, the state of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes evolved into a Serb-run state.

Responding to Serb repression of the Albanian majority in the Kosovo, the drive for independence by Slovenia and neighboring Croatia grew. On 26 June 1991, Slovenia declared its independence. Within hours, the Serb-dominated Yugoslav Federal Army (JNA) moved to suppress the independence. A ten-day War of Independence between the JNA and the Slovene Territorial Defense Forces followed. Unable to subdue the Slovenes, the Serbs finally recognized the independence of the new state. Within the next six months, other nations recognized Slovenia. The United States did so during April 1992. On 22 May 1992, the United Nations admitted Slovenia.

As a former Yugoslav republic, however, Slovenia was not entirely free from the effects of the fighting which broke out first between Serbs and Croats in Croatia and then, in the spring of 1992, among Serbs, Croats, and Bosnians in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In response to the latter, the UN imposed an arms embargo on all of former Yugoslavia, including Slovenia.

On 22 and 23 July 1993, Ambassador Allan Wendt learned of the Joint Contact Team Program during a visit to Headquarters USEUCOM. He was anxious to improve

* Civil law refers to the body of law, that is based on Roman law and the Code Napoleon, as opposed to common or Anglo-American law which is based on English law.



Major Lewis E. Wald, Jr. with a traveling contact team in Slovenia.

relations with Slovenia as part of the American policy to treat the new nation differently from the other former Yugoslav republics. Although he expressed great interest in seeing Slovenia participate in the contact program, officials at USEUCOM and in Washington were hesitant, given the country's status as a former Yugoslav republic and the fighting elsewhere in the area. But, the ambassador pushed for its inclusion as a means of furthering American interests. And so, on 7 September 1993, the Inter-agency Working Group gave

tentative approval to participate in the Joint Contact Team Program. General Lennon traveled to the Slovene capital of Ljubljana on 28-29 September to brief Slovene Minister of Defense Janez Jansa on the concept of the contact program and to gain approval for deploying a liaison team, which was granted on 1 October 1993.

The liaison team assembled at European Command headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany, in late October 1993. Team chief Lieutenant Colonel Glen E. Rich, Major Lewis E. "Buddy" Wald, Jr., and Sergeant First Class John M. Ferguson, along with country desk officer Chief Warrant Officer Jon W. Concheff, received a JCTP orientation. They prepared proposed events to use in the initial discussions and drove to Ljubljana on 1 November. The Slovenes provided the team office space in the Ministry of Defense building located at Kardeljeva ploscad 26 on the north side of the city. In mid-November 1993, the fourth member of the liaison team, Major Robert N. Hutchings, Jr., arrived. Then the team opened a second office in the General Staff building in central Ljubljana. Members were housed in two hotels in central Ljubljana, the Union and the Slon. As the Slovene armed forces had few English language-qualified officers, no officers were assigned to the team. The Ministry of Defense and the General Staff designated specific points of contact with whom the team would work.⁴⁵

On 3 November 1993, the liaison team met Minister of Defense Jansa who discussed Slovenia's priorities for the team in descending order of importance: airspace command and control, education and training, civilian combat service support, personnel management, military law, civil defense and disaster relief, environmental protection, humanitarian assistance, and the military in a democratic society. Given the fighting in neighboring Croatia and the increase in civilian air traffic, the Slovenes were very concerned about airspace management. Their armed forces developed out of the territorial forces that existed before the break up of Yugoslavia. Most of these were part-time soldiers, accounting for the minister's interest in education and training.⁴⁶

Responding to the priorities outlined by Minister Jansa, the liaison team worked with staff agencies and developed a work plan of proposed events. The plan proposed 61 events in fiscal year 1994. During each quarter, the preponderance of events was

aimed at meeting one or more of his top priorities. For example, first-quarter events highlighted military faculty, militia, and staff development. To some extent, the selection of emphasis for the first quarter also was based on the availability, on short notice, of the right personnel to conduct the events. With the agreement of the Slovenes, sixty percent of the events were directed with the General Staff and forty percent with the Ministry of Defense. This division recognized the fact that most of the subject areas were more appropriate for the General Staff and subordinate units.⁴⁷

In an effort to respond to their hosts' most pressing priorities, the liaison team and the country desk officer worked to schedule a few events quickly. Among the topics covered by events were various aspects of training including basic military skills, NCO development, and development of military faculty. The first item Slovenia acquired with American International Military Education and Training (IMET) funds was a language laboratory. The liaison team included Slovenes in a familiarization tour which examined language training carried out by the Puerto Rican National Guard and by the US Air Force. In January 1994, the Slovenes participated in a familiarization tour that examined air defense artillery and air traffic control. The tour visited the US Army's Air Defense School at Fort Bliss, Texas, and the Federal Aviation Administration's School in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Belarus

Belarus declared its independence from the Soviet Union in August 1991. It was a new country in every sense, with no previous history of independent existence. For centuries, Belarus shared the history of Russia. Culturally and linguistically, Belarus and Russia were very closely related.

The Interagency Working Group for the former Soviet Union, mindful of Russian sensitivities, would not permit United States European Command to formally include Belarus in the Joint Contact Team Program. It did authorize the command, however, to conduct military-to-military contacts. The Contact Team Program Office could oversee these contacts. Nunn-Lugar funds, rather than contact program funds, had to be used for activities in Belarus. In August 1993, General Lennon extended to Belarus the opportunity to participate in military-to-military contacts with USEUCOM.

Government officials accepted the offer but expressed concern about their ability to participate. The country had very few officers who spoke English. They were also concerned about the cost. To overcome these concerns, USEUCOM came up with the proposal of a facilitating team. The military liaison team for Belarus would work at Headquarters USEUCOM and deploy to Minsk only for short periods of time to facilitate events. Belarus agreed to the concept. Initially, the facilitating team consisted of Lieutenant Colonel Mark E. Venner and Sergeant First Class Nick Njegovan, with Major Debra A. Johnson as the country desk officer. Its composition changed in late November and early December 1993 with the arrival of Captain Carl D. Livermore and Staff Sergeant John S. Paulus III and the departure of Sergeant First Class Njegovan. In February 1994, Colonel Ronald L. Gambolati replaced Lieutenant Colonel Venner as the team chief, and Captain Livermore departed. Colonel Gambolati initially joined the Joint Contact Team Program as the chief of the Ukrainian facilitating team. When




Gen Maj Ivan Komarov, Chief of Defense Staff, Belarus, and Lt Col Vitaly Klonchko spent time with Gen Charles G. Boyd, Deputy Commander in Chief, EUCOM, during a visit to Patch Barracks.

Ukraine was slow to respond, General Lennon dispatched him to Lithuania to observe the military liaison team at work and then assigned him to the Belarussian team.⁴⁸

Because of the shortage of English-language-qualified officers, the Ministry of Defense asked that only a few events be scheduled. The request for a limited number of events may also have reflected the government's concern

about cost and a certain uneasiness in the military concerning the intentions of their recent enemy. During the initial deployment to Minsk on 5 October 1993, the facilitating team laid the groundwork for a few events. The first event, conducted in early December, was on physical fitness. On 13 December, the Surgeon's Office at European Command conducted a traveling contact team on eye tumors and related medical topics. Belarus agreed to a single event in January 1994; three in February, including the first familiarization tours; and one in March. During follow-up visits to Minsk, the facilitating team and the Ministry of Defense developed a list of proposed events to cover the remainder of fiscal year 1994. Besides providing information on a specific topic, each of the events helped build confidence and trust. For most Belarussians, participation in a military-to-military event was their first opportunity to meet Americans.⁴⁹



Ukrainian Desk Officer LTC Michael C. Tideman at his desk in his liaison office.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The United States Armed Forces had one great advantage in carrying out the contact program—the Gulf War. In leading the coalition that so readily defeated Iraq's army, the US military had assumed almost mythical stature in the former Warsaw Pact countries and in the Soviet Union. The Iraqi military was equipped with some of the latest Soviet military hardware and for years also received its training. It was considered among the best of the Soviet-trained organizations. Iraq's resounding defeat discredited its Soviet patron and its equipment, training, and doctrine. Participating in the Joint Contact Team Program offered a chance to learn America's secrets, a view shared by many in Central and Eastern Europe.

While there were no "secrets" to the American success, there were some major differences between the Soviet model and that of the United States. Among the contrasts that many participants commented upon were respect for the rights of individual soldiers, the delegation of authority that accompanied the delegation of responsibility, and the role of junior officers and noncommissioned officers. The Soviet model, that all program participants knew well, stressed centralized authority and limited individual initiative and was marked by a great gap between officers and enlisted personnel. There were no noncommissioned officers. Most assignments given to mid-rank and senior NCOs in the US military went to junior officers and warrant officers in the Soviet military. Almost all the enlisted ranks were draftees who were treated very poorly. Corporal punishment, poor food, and poor housing were part of the norm.

The JCTP was designed to provide the country hosts information on whatever subject areas they had selected. Initially, most of them were unsure of what to request. This reluctance was compounded by a certain mistrust of American motives. Under Soviet tutelage, there was always a string attached to any offer. Further, these nations had just rid themselves of the oppressive Soviet master and were wary of substituting another. The transparency of the military liaison team's activities played a large role in overcoming these doubts. In the early stages, the members spent much time simply developing mutual trust with their host. This period of trust building usually coincided with the development of the first country work plan.

Brigadier General Lennon's active involvement was often critical in bridging the gap between hosts and the Joint Contact Team Program. As a rule, he visited each country once every two months to discuss the needs senior leaders might have. These leaders were favorably impressed by the fact that the United States considered the contact program important enough to assign a general officer to oversee its implementation. In making his rounds, General Lennon developed a warm rapport with many of the country's leaders, both military and civilian. The relationships he nurtured allowed him and the hosts to consider sensitive subjects without invoking national pride.

Although each host country selected its own subject areas and set its own priorities for the program, the Contact Team Program Office suggested a few subjects to all participants, one of these being the chaplaincy. Since the United States believed the military chaplaincy was a critical element in protecting individual rights and religious



L. to r.: CW2 Jon Concheff, Desk Officer; LTC Glen Lich, military liaison team chief; and Brig Gen Thomas Lennon, Deputy Director for the Joint Contact Team Program, at a Slovenian-American planning meeting.

freedom, and also ensuring the human rights of military members, especially among the lower ranks, the program office had two chaplains assigned. Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Supa and Commander Gary R. Pollitt were both instrumental in helping the host nations establish chaplaincy programs.⁵⁰

Beyond the chaplaincy program, the subject priorities and events reflected the

desires of the host countries and the constraints of the JCTP. Each country had unique characteristics, so the liaison teams and the country desk officers took those into account in working out requests submitted by the hosts. Each event was prepared to meet the unique requirements of the audience, although many of the country plans covered identical subjects. Subject areas most often presented by a traveling contact team or examined during a familiarization tour were military medicine, military justice, communications, maritime operations, military organization and force structure, air defense and airspace management, personnel management and NCO development, training management, engineering, and logistics.

One very popular presentation was one prepared by USEUCOM's Public Affairs Navy Captain Gordon I. Peterson, Jr., who covered the workings of the press, including the military press, in a democracy. He emphasized the need for openness and discussed the successes and failures of American military public affairs. In most countries, a part of the program included discussions of television, radio, and print journalism. When possible, Captain Peterson also made a presentation to journalism students at local universities. The public affairs presentation elicited many favorable comments from the audience and was often followed up by a FAM tour. In Bulgaria, the Deputy Minister of Defense for Policy and Security listed public affairs as his top priority. After the contact team visit in September 1993, a tour to Washington exposed the minister and Bulgarian legislators to the workings of public affairs and legislative oversight of the military. A similar sequence of events occurred in other countries with the aim of showing how the military could function openly in a democracy.

Another very popular event was the performance of the Air Force's TOPS IN BLUE showcase, a group of winners of an annual talent competition who performed for various military and civilian audiences around the world. During 1993, the Joint Contact Team Program sponsored TOPS IN BLUE performances in Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania. Beyond providing popular entertainment, performers gave military and civilian audiences in Eastern

Europe additional insight into individual freedoms enjoyed by members of America's armed forces.

From the beginning of the contact program's implementation, planners realized that certain types of requests could not be met. Requests for excess equipment and training related to the acquisition of equipment were part of the Foreign Assistance Security Act, not the Joint Contact Team Program. And participation in joint exercises, another frequently voiced request, was beyond the purview of the program.⁵¹

Members involved in an event faced a number of challenges in achieving audience comprehension because of the language barrier, which proved to be a major obstacle. Translating briefing slides into the host language and using translators solved part of the problem. But, when more than one event was scheduled in the same country at the same time, it could create a hardship because of the search for individuals with necessary language skills.

The major differences in experience level and the differing expectations between the audience and their briefers were equally large impediments to the comprehension of ideas and concepts. When Lithuanians expressed an interest in military historians, the program office staff arranged to send the Command Historian from USAFE as part of a traveling contact team event. During the course of the visit, the historian realized what his hosts wanted was information on establishing a library. Regardless of the subject, contact team members often found that more time was needed than had been anticipated during a briefing to resolve misunderstandings of that kind.

Support

Obtaining supplies and equipment for Headquarters USEUCOM's Contact Team Program Office presented a series of challenges to the small support staff. An even greater challenge was supporting the military liaison teams scattered throughout Eastern Europe. In late 1992 and early 1993, the contact program changed from a short-term program to one of longer duration. At the same time, it expanded from one country to twelve countries. The resulting rapid growth in personnel forced the program office out of the attic of Building 2315 to two of the four temporary buildings overlooking Patch Barracks' football field and running track. By late 1994, it had expanded into another of the temporary buildings.

The budget to provide furnishings and equipment for the expanding staff did not grow at the same rate as the program. The shortage in funds was partially offset by the excess of equipment that the drawdown of the US military forces in Germany created. The challenge for the staff was to locate this excess equipment and transfer it to the Stuttgart headquarters to meet the demands of the rapid expansion of the program.

Problems associated with supporting the liaison teams were magnified by the distances separating host countries from USEUCOM headquarters, the lack of established transportation networks oriented toward Western Europe, local shortages of essential items, and a limited telephone network. Each team office was outfitted

with at least one computer provided by the headquarters, a fax machine leased in Germany, and one or more vehicles, usually Volkswagen vans that were acquired from excess Army equipment.

Delivering the equipment and supplies to the liaison teams was also the responsibility of the program office support personnel. In many cases, though, the initial delivery was made by members of the liaison team themselves who drove a fully-loaded van to the host country. For destinations such as Prague, Budapest, Bratislava, Ljubljana, or Warsaw, this was a relatively easy drive as much of the trip was through Germany or Austria. For more distant capitals, the trip could be very taxing.

An incident on 5 March 1994 illustrated this point. The Bulgarian team's Volkswagen van was stolen, and the members were left without a vehicle. It was decided that the team in Tirana, Albania, could part with its Volkswagen van and have it replaced by a 4-wheel drive vehicle—a vehicle much more appropriate for Albanian roads and weather conditions. Therefore, two support personnel departed for Albania from USEUCOM headquarters on 15 March in a 4-wheel drive Toyota loaded with supplies to make the exchange. Because of the fighting in the former Yugoslavia and the international embargo imposed on Serbia, the best route to Tirana was closed. This left the drivers the alternate route over the Alps and down the east coast of Italy to the port of Bári. From Bári, they had to cross the Adriatic Sea to the port of Durrës, Albania, and on to Tirana, their destination. This trip took a total of two days. From the Albanian capital, the two drove the Volkswagen van east across Albania and Macedonia to Sofia, Bulgaria, on roads that were often poorly maintained. Following the grueling two-day trip to Sofia, the two individuals flew back to Stuttgart.

Once a liaison team deployed to the host nation, personnel at the CTPO were responsible for providing support. Depending on the country, the team members might need personal supplies along with computer paper and toner cartridges for printers and fax machines, none of which were available on local markets. Because of this situation, liaison teams received supplies from a number of sources. Members of traveling contact teams or FAM tours who passed through USEUCOM headquarters before traveling to the host country, members of the program office visiting Eastern Europe, and even General Lennon, carried supplies to the liaison teams. Making shipping arrangements for the delivery of supplies and equipment depended on close cooperation between the country desk officers and the support personnel.⁵²

The Future

The Joint Contact Team Program did not end on 31 March 1994 because it had been funded through the end of the fiscal year. The liaison teams had country work plans already prepared, and later in the year, Congress funded the program for fiscal year 1995.

During the spring of 1994, the Air Force reassigned General Lennon to the Air Staff and Colonel Lee Alloway moved up to become the Deputy Director. At about the same time, USEUCOM headquarters reassigned some of the policy-making functions from the CTPO to the Director of Plans and Policy. In January 1994, NATO had

inaugurated its Partnership for Peace program to open military-to-military relations with the former communist and neutral nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Unlike the contact program, Partnership for Peace included joint training and joint exercises. There was speculation at Headquarters USEUCOM that the JCTP might become the American contribution to Partnership for Peace. No decision was announced.

One of the most important questions facing the initiators of the Joint Contact Team Program was to determine its overall impact. In the short term, many of the host nations made organizational changes, introduced a chaplaincy corps, or started an NCO school, and in most of them, the United States was the first to offer help. In many of the countries, the liaison team provided the first opportunity to experience a Western military presence, and in some, it remained the only such possibility. This alone won friends for the United States. To determine whether democratic institutions would take root in the military establishments of these countries could only be answered by gathering more information over a long period of time. But the contact team program represented a promising start.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Memo (U), Asst Adj, 353d Civil Affairs Cmd, to HQ USEUCOM, "Forwarding of After Action Report," 5 Oct 92, w/atch: Memo (U), "After Action Report for HQ USEUCOM ODT Assignment 25th August-6th September 1992," 16 Sep 92; Msg (U), CJCS to USCINCEUR/ECDC and USNMR, SHAPE, "Joint Contact Team Program—Hungary," 162210Z Oct 92; Ltr (U), Team Chief, MLT Hungary, to Dir, Mil-to-Mil Contact Program, US European Cmd, "After Action Report MLT—Hungary, for Jul 92 to Jul 93," 9 Jul 93.
- 2 Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECDC to CJCS, "Joint Contact Team Program Update," 020930Z Nov 92.
- 3 Intv (U), Col Louis Boros, Chief, MLT Hungary, by author, 2 Mar 94.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ltr (U), Chief, MLT Hungary, to Dir, Mil-to-Mil Contact Program, USEUCOM, "After Action Report MLT—Hungary, for Jul 1992 to Jul 1993," 9 Jul 93; Intv (U), Col Boros, 2 Mar 94.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Ibid; Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5-J to Joint Staff/J5 PMA, "Hungary—One Year into the Mil-to-Mil Program," 061515Z Jul 93; Msg (U), CJCS to USCINCEUR, "Extension of Hungarian Military Liaison Team," 082328Z Jul 93.
- 8 Rpt (U), Col Oleh Skrypczuk, Chief, MLT Poland, "Mil-to-Mil Contact Program Poland," 6 Aug 93.
- 9 Memo (U), LTC Dan D. Kiender, Dep Cmdr 601st Ops Gp, "After Action Report—Air Defense TCT, 24-27 Mar 1993," 28 Mar 93; Rpt (U), COL Skrypczuk, MLT Poland, "Mil-to-Mil Contact Program Poland," 6 Aug 93.
- 10 Ibid; Memorandum for Dep Dir for Mil-to-Mil Joint Contact Program (U), Polish Desk Off, "After Action Report—US—Poland Bilateral Working Group, 15-16 Sep 93," 30 Sep 93.
- 11 Memo (U), Lt Shuey, USEUCOM/J5-J, "Trip Report—Brigadier General Lennon, Colonel Stankovich, and Lieutenant Shuey to Warsaw, Poland, and Tallinn, Estonia," 19 Oct 93.
- 12 Briefing (U), Albanian Country Desk Officer, USEUCOM/J5-J, 20 Jan 1994.
- 13 Intv (U), COL Richard L. Freeman, Chief, MLT Albania, by author, 15 Mar 94.
- 14 Intv (U), MAJ John A. Birznieks, MLT Latvia, by author, 5 Feb 94.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Intv (U), COL Owen W. Moon, Chief, MLT Latvia, by author, 5 Feb 94; Intv (U), Lt Col Russell A. Deming, Latvia Country Desk Officer, USEUCOM/J5-J, by author, 7 Feb 94; Intv (U), Mr. Gundars Zalkins, Advisor to the President of Latvia, and COL Wayne C. Koppa, Chief, MLT Latvia, by Capt Marybeth Ulrich, USAFA, 15 Jun 94.
- 18 See note above; Weekly Summaries prepared by Latvian MLT and submitted to USEUCOM/J5-J.
- 19 Concept Paper (U), Chief Int Initiatives, National Guard Bureau, "US National Guard Support of the US European Command Military-to-Military Contact Program," 4 Feb 94.
- 20 Intv, 1Lt William R. Cronen-Jerg, by author, 25 Feb 94.
- 21 Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECJ5-J to Joint Staff/J5-PMA, "Quarterly Input to Joint Staff Two-Year Plan for Military Contacts with Central and Eastern Europe," 091315Z Jun 93.
- 22 Memo (U), COL Robert V. Barziloski, Chief, MLT Lithuania, to Brig Gen Lennon, Dep Dir for JCTP, "Joint Contact Team Program Impact on Lithuania," 16 Feb 94.
- 23 Ibid; Intv (U), Lieutenant Colonel Antanan Paulikas, Dep Dir of Lithuania's Civil Defense, by author, 24 Mar 94; Intv (U), Major Aleksandr Temnolonskij and Major Oleg Nalotov, Iron Wolf Brigade S-3 Office, by author.
- 24 Memo (U) for Director, Military-to-Military Program, COL James A. Burger, USEUCOM Legal Advisor, "Military Justice TCT to Lithuania," w/atch report by LTC Trant; Memo (U), COL Robert V. Barziloski, Chief, MLT Lithuania, to Brig Gen Lennon, "Joint Contact Team Program on Lithuania," 16 Feb 94.
- 25 Intv (U) Brig Gen Lennon, by author, 31 Mar 94.
- 26 Ltr (U), John R. Davis, US Ambassador to Romania, to LTC Glen E. Lich, Acting Chief, MLT Romania, 13 Apr 93; Rpt (U), MLT Romania, "Consolidated Country Work Plan Event List," 5 Nov 93.
- 27 Intv (U), Maj Lester K. Haney and Capt Timothy R. Noonan, MLT Romania, by author, 21 Mar 94.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Rpt (U), Romanian Ministry of Defense, "Conclusions and Main Contributions of Romanian Armed Forces Participation in MIL-to-MIL Contact Program," (ca 14 Feb 94).
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 *Duma*, 13 Aug 1993.
- 32 Intv (U), Brig Gen Lennon, by author, 31 Mar 94.
- 33 Intv (U), Col Gary G. Chamberlin, Chief, MLT Bulgaria, by author, 17 Feb 1994.

- 34 Memo (U), Col Chamberlin, Chief, MLT Bulgaria, to Colonel Hansbrough, USDAO, Sofia, and Ambassador Montgomery, US Ambassador to Bulgaria, "Request for Approval of Proposed MLT Work Plan," (Nov 93), w/3 atchs: "Mil-to-Mil Events July-October 1993," "Work Plan Synopsis: Annual Events (Nov 93-Nov 94)," and "Work Plan Synopsis: Quarterly Events (Nov 93-Jan 94)."
- 35 Intv (U), Col Chamberlin, Chief, MLT Bulgaria, by author, 17 Feb 94.
- 36 Msg (U), USDAO Prague to Pres NDU, "Capstone 1993 general/flag officer course European field studies program," 311156Z Dec 92; Memo (U), LTC Mark Kogle, "Czech Desk Officer, USEUCOM/J5-J, to Lt Shuey, USEUCOM/J5-J, "Historical Background Monograph," 30 Nov 93.
- 37 Ibid; Work Plan Phase II (U), MLT Czech Republic, 1 Oct 93; Intv (U), Col Skrypczuk, Chief, MLT Czech Republic, by author, 19 Apr 94.
- 38 Work Plan Phase II (U), MLT Czech Republic, 1 Oct 1993.
- 39 Ibid; Work Plan Phase III (U), MLT Czech Republic, 30 Nov 93.
- 40 Work Plan Phase II (U); Memo (U), Col Skrypczuk, Chief, MLT Czech Republic, for USEUCOM/J5-J, "Recap of Czech Republic MLT Activities, 14-20 Mar 94," 20 Mar 94.
- 41 Ltr (U), Col Skrypczuk, Chief, MLT Czech Republic, to the Ambassador, "Chaplaincy Services Support to the Czech Republic," 3 Mar 94; Intv (U), Lt Col Joseph Supa, USEUCOM/J5-J, by author, 22 Mar 94; Intv (U), Lt Col Supa, by author, Apr 94.
- 42 Briefing (U), LtCol John F. Scheiner, Slovak Desk Officer, USEUCOM/J5-J, "Slovakia, Country Brief," 26 Jan 94; Historical Chronology (U), Slovak Desk, USEUCOM/J5-J, "Military Liaison Team-Slovakia," (Feb 94).
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Intv (U), CAPT Lizann Longstreet, Chief, MLT Slovakia, by author, 3 Feb 94.
- 45 Chronology (U), MLT Slovenia, "Military Liaison Team Deployment," (Nov 93).
- 46 Intv (U), MAJ Lewis E. Wald, Jr., MLT Slovenia, by author, 15 Mar 94; Intv (U), COL Richard L. Freeman, Chief, MLT Slovenia, by author, 15 Mar 94.
- 47 Plan (U), Slovenia Country Work Plan, Tab 2 (Jan 94).
- 48 Briefing (U), MAJ Debra A. Johnson, Belarus Desk Officer, USEUCOM/J5-J, "Belarus Country Briefing," (20 Jan 94).
- 49 Report (U), USEUCOM/J5-J, "Summary Report of Events Selected by Country and Dates, Belarus," (Mar 94).
- 50 Memo (U), CDR Gary R. Pollitt, Staff Chaplain for JCTP, to USEUCOM, Dir, Plans and Policy, "Report of Chaplain Participation in the Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP)," 14 Feb 94.
- 51 Memo (U), Col Stalder, Mil-to-Mil Ops to Country Desk Officers and Component MLT Shops, 16 Nov 94, w/atrch: Draft EUCOM Directive 56-8, "Military-to-Military Contacts with Central/Eastern Europe."
- 52 Information on support activities was extracted from the Joint Contact Team Weekly Reports.

APPENDIX I

THE GEORGE C. MARSHALL CENTER

Laying the Foundation

On 5 June 1993, United States European Command inaugurated the George C. Marshall Center, located in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany. The date was especially appropriate as it marked the anniversary of Secretary of State George C. Marshall's 1947 speech at Harvard University in which he announced what became known as the Marshall Plan for the rebuilding of Western Europe. Present for the ceremonies at Garmisch were ministers of defense and chiefs of staff from most of the member countries of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), the Secretary of Defense from the United States, and many US ambassadors to the member countries. The new Marshall Center marked another step in America's effort to democratize the military institutions of its former enemies in Central and Eastern Europe. Much of the work leading to the 5 June opening was done under the auspices of the Joint Contact Team Program.

The Marshall Center was to be an international college for security studies attended by military officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel or above, civilian officials of comparable grade from ministries of defense and foreign affairs, and parliamentary officials entrusted with oversight of their respective national military organizations. All members of the NACC could nominate students, but the courses were particularly aimed at individuals from new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. In an academic program of seminars, readings, and lectures, participants would consider the basic problems confronting defense strategists and policy makers and how these problems could be addressed in ways consistent with democratic governance, civilian control, and market economics.¹

The concept of the Marshall Center evolved from discussions initiated by Chris Donnelly, the special advisor for Central and Eastern European Affairs to NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner. On 25 July 1991, Mr. Donnelly met with Army Chief of Staff General Carl E. Vuono to win his support for a proposal to expand the charter of the United States Army Russian Institute (USARI). Donnelly urged that the Institute's activities be expanded to include orientation courses for former Warsaw Pact officers en route to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) School at nearby Oberammergau and that an Eastern European Research Center be established. Such a research center would support conferences and symposiums on East European security issues for the United States, NATO, and other countries.²

The US Army Russian Institute, located at Sheridan Barracks in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, was a unique organization founded in 1947. It administered the overseas portion of the foreign area officer training for Russian and Eastern European specialists and included the Foreign Language Training Center which specialized in teaching the languages spoken in Central and Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union.³

Donnelly prepared his proposal in response to the political changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The coup attempt in Moscow in August 1991 and the

rush of events which followed lent new urgency to expand NATO and US contacts with former members of the Warsaw Pact. The North Atlantic Council (NAC) meeting in Rome in November 1991 called for a framework of interlocking institutions tying together the countries of Europe and the United States. The NAC proposed establishing the North Atlantic Cooperation Council at ministerial level and the Defense Ministers Group at the military committee level. The Council could then focus on those security issues in areas where NATO allies could offer experience and expertise such as defense planning, democratic concepts of civil-military relations, civil-military coordination of air traffic control, and conversion of defense industries for civilian use. The allies pledged to provide adequate resources to support these activities.

Even before the Rome meeting, USEUCOM and the US Army were reviewing plans for the Garmisch facilities. Faced with a declining budget and reduced manpower authorizations, USAREUR was planning to close its Garmisch installations at the end of fiscal year 1992. On the other hand, USEUCOM believed the Institute offered some unique facilities and was the best location for expanding contacts with former members of the Warsaw Pact. The existing facilities and their proximity to NATO's SHAPE School were two important facts supporting the USEUCOM's argument to retain the facilities at Garmisch.

At Headquarters USEUCOM, General John R. Galvin, USCINCEUR, assigned responsibility for program planning to the Soviet/Eastern Europe Cell in the Directorate of Plans and Policy, European/NATO Division. Within the cell, Lieutenant Colonel Steven Ross assigned the Garmisch project to Lieutenant Colonel Frederick Hammersen and by the end of June 1992, the cell had evolved into the Contact Team Program Office with Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen its full-time planner for Garmisch.⁴

Working with planners in OSD and the Joint Staff, Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen prepared a proposal that called for the USARI to provide a forum for defense contacts, defense education to military and civilian personnel, research on regional security issues, conferences and seminars for exchange of information, and support for NATO activities in these areas. General Galvin approved the concept on 13 November 1991. At the same time, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz asked USCINCEUR to propose a means to expand the mission of the USARI to help fulfill the American goal of expanding defense and security relations with former Warsaw Pact members. General Galvin responded on 2 December, promising to assemble a formal proposal.⁵

Before Galvin's staff could complete the proposal, they had to resolve the problem of location and obtain the support of USAREUR. Working with planners from USAREUR, the planners examined alternate locations, including US Army facilities in Augsburg, Germany, and facilities at Echterdingen Army Airfield near Stuttgart, Germany. General Galvin felt Garmisch offered the best location for establishing a self-contained center away from a major German urban center or a large American military headquarters. Sheridan Kaserne offered classrooms and housing facilities several hundred meters away across the Loisach River; Artillery Kaserne and the Breitenau Housing Area offered support facilities and family housing for the permanent staff. Commander in Chief US Army Europe General Crosbie E. Saint agreed to support USEUCOM's proposal for the USARI and also agreed to assist in preparing the engineering and cost estimates.⁶

General Galvin sent the proposal for the European Center for Security Studies to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin L. Powell, on 28 February 1992. The concept was to consolidate the USARI, the US Army's Foreign Language Training Center-Europe (FLTC-E), and the Treaty Verification Division and train foreign area officer specialists for the Army, a function previously carried out by the USARI and the FLTC-E in Munich. The proposal envisioned the Center expanding to meet the needs of the other services and allied personnel. While USEUCOM expected the need for officers trained in Russian to remain about the same, they also expected the need for those trained in the languages of Central and Eastern Europe to expand. The European Center would provide specialized support so the SHAPE School could fulfill its liaison role with the emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe.⁷

Furthermore, the European Center would consist of three all-American branches—the Foreign Area Officer Training Center, the Foreign Language Training Center, a Director of Support—and a co-located German-American Research and Conference Center. The latter would provide the primary venue for defense-related contacts with the emerging democracies. The proposal for bilateral operation of the European Center recognized the fact that German cooperation was needed for the United States to carry out training of third country military in Germany. Also, among NATO allies, Germany was the most supportive of the effort to expand contacts with former Warsaw Pact members.⁸

The estimated total start-up cost for the European Center was \$12,937,000, of which a major element was modernizing student housing, the dining facility, and the Conference Center. Estimated recurring cost was about \$10 million per year.⁹ General Powell endorsed the USEUCOM proposal to Mr. Wolfowitz, and in doing so, underscored the need for funding and manpower, as neither USEUCOM nor USAREUR had the necessary resources. Powell also reminded the Under Secretary that German cooperation was essential.¹⁰

Mr. Wolfowitz indicated the degree of interest the European Center proposal had generated and that Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney would broach the subject of host nation support and participation with the German Minister of Defense. The Under Secretary expected a positive response. In addition, he directed his staff to work with the US Army and the other services to resolve all outstanding issues, including funding and manpower, in a mutually satisfactory manner. He hinted he had a proposal for the United States, through the Department of Defense, to act as the executive agent in an eventual international cost-sharing arrangement. Finally, he anticipated that the new institution would be inaugurated on 1 October 1992.¹¹

Although Mr. Wolfowitz' target date of 1 October 1992 proved to be overly optimistic, the promised support was forthcoming. In June 1992, General Galvin discussed the European Center proposal with General Neuman, the Inspector General of the German Armed Forces, and received a favorable response. The American embassy formally raised the issue with the German government during August. On 28 October 1992, a member of Mr. Wolfowitz' staff, Mr. Walter Christman, and Lieutenant Colonel Hammersen briefed German representatives of the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs.¹²

The Germans responded warmly to the American proposal, agreeing to provide the director of the Research and Conference Center as well as additional faculty and staff. They also announced the move of the 1st Mountain Division's headquarters from Kraft von Dellmensingen Kaserne in Garmisch to Munich, for late in 1993. Once completed, the facilities of Kraft von Dellmensingen Kaserne, located adjacent to American Artillery Kaserne and the Breitenau Housing Area, could be made available to the European Center. Valued in excess of \$75 million, the German facilities offered a new dining facility, additional housing, and buildings for office space and classrooms.¹³

In reviewing the USEUCOM proposal, the Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy made a number of changes. The staff modified the organization to emphasize the international outreach mission. The foreign language and foreign area officer training were consolidated into a single department, and the Research and Conference Center was placed under the European Center. The staff added two new departments—Executive Management Institute and Strategic Studies Institute. The Executive Management Institute would emphasize short classes on leadership and management topics such as resources, personnel, and financial planning and be targeted for senior military and civilian leadership. The Strategic Studies Institute would offer longer duration seminars on strategic and political studies, and its target audience would be the next generation of leaders.¹⁴

While reviewing General Gavin's proposal, Mr. Christman suggested the European Center be named the George C. Marshall Center to honor the United States Secretary of State whose plan aided the democracies of Western Europe that were devastated by World War II. The suggestion won immediate support in all quarters.¹⁵

On 25 November 1992, Secretary of Defense Cheney signed Department of Defense Directive 5200.34 authorizing the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. The director would report directly to USCINCEUR and receive policy guidance from the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and the Secretary of the Army would provide administrative, logistical, medical programming, and budget support through USAREUR.¹⁶

Two weeks later, on 10 December 1992, the OSD Comptroller approved Program Budget Decision (PBD) Number 021, providing funding and personnel to operate the Marshall Center beginning in fiscal year 1993. For 1993, the budget of \$15.8 million included repair and renovation of facilities in Garmisch as well as center operations. The PBD included funding for the center through fiscal year 1999 and authorized 65 civilian and 12 military positions. Together with the 23 military and 39 civilian positions transferred from the USARI, 139 personnel were authorized.¹⁷

With a budget assured, USAREUR initiated the renovations at the Marshall Center. The work was expected to be completed by July 1994. Until then, operations were limited. It held its inaugural conference, *Perspectives on European Security*, 3-5 June 1993 and on the last day, 5 June 1993, celebrated its official opening. At the same time, USEUCOM transferred responsibility for the Marshall Center from the Contact Team Program Office to the command's Chief of Staff.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Brochure (U), George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, College of Strategic Studies and Defense Economics, (Jan 94).
- 2 Memo (U), BG David C. Meade, Dir of Strategy, Plans and Policy, Dept of the Army, to Chief of Staff, Army, "Reasons to Keep USARI in Garmisch," (Sep 91).
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 SSS (U), LTC Hammersen, USEUCOM/ECJ5-J, "Utilization Plan for NATO School (SHAPE) and US Army Russian Institute in Future Military-to-Military Activities with Central/Eastern Europe (including the former Soviet Union)," 17 Oct 91.
- 5 Background Paper (U), LTC Hammersen, USEUCOM/J5-J, "George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies," 12 Apr 93; Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECCS to SECDEF, "The Future in Europe of the US Army Russian Institute (USARI)," 021400Z Dec 91; Intv (U), LTC Hammersen, Marshall Center, by author, 11 Feb 94.
- 6 Background Paper (U), LTC Hammersen, USEUCOM/J5-J, "George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies," 12 Apr 93; Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECCS to CINCUSAREUR/AEAGX, "USAREUR Support in Developing the Proposal for the Center for European Security Studies," 070800Z Jan 92; Msg (U), USCINCEUR/ECDC to CINCUSAREUR/AEACC, "Future Center for European Security Studies," 090740Z Jan 92.
- 7 Ltr (U), GEN John R. Galvin, USCINCEUR, to GEN Colin Powell, 28 Feb 92, w/atch "Proposal for European Center for Security Studies."
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Memorandum (U), GEN Colin Powell, CJCS, to Under SecDef for Policy, "European Center for Security Studies," 17 Mar 92.
- 11 Msg (U), SecDef/USDP to USCINCEUR and USNMR, "European Center for Security Studies," 240010Z May 92.
- 12 Background Paper (U), LTC Hammersen, 12 Apr 93; Briefing slides and text (U) Mr. Christman and LTC Hammersen to US-German Discussions, "George C. Marshall Center, European Center for Security Studies," 28 Oct 92.
- 13 Background Paper (U), LTC Hammersen, 12 Apr 93; Briefing (U), Marshall Center, "George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies," (27 Jan 94).
- 14 Briefing (U), USEUCOM/J5-J, "George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies," 3 Mar 93.
- 15 Intv (U), LTC Hammersen, Marshall Center, by author, 11 Feb 94.
- 16 Memo (U) Under SecDef for Policy to SecDef, "George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies," (Nov 92); Directive (U), Dept of Defense No. 5200.34, "George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies," 25 Nov 92.
- 17 Background Paper (U), LTC Hammersen, 12 Apr 93; PBD 021 (U), 10 Dec 92.

APPENDIX II

PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THE JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM

As of 31 March 1994

Aldrich, David M., Maj, USAF	Feb-Jul 93	Albania, MLT
Alloway, Lee C., Col, USAF	30 Jun 93-	Assistant Deputy Director, JCTP
Ambrozaitis, Gabriel J., CW1, USAR	23 Aug-27 Sep 93 10 Dec 93-	Assistant Personnel Officer Lithuania, MLT
Anderson, Gary L., Col, USAF	22 Aug 93-Feb 94	Slovakia, MLT Chief
Andrews, Ildiko E., Lt Col, USAF	1 Jul 93-	Hungary, Desk Officer
Babick, Robert P., Jr., SSgt, USAF	18 Apr-4 Sep 93	Czech Republic, MLT
Baric, Walter, MSG, USA	23 Oct 93-	Slovakia, MLT
Barnas, Thaddeus J., Maj, USAF	3 Nov 92-Jul 93 Jul 93-14 Mar 94	Czech Republic, Desk Officer Bulgaria, Desk Officer
Barziloski, Robert, COL, PAARNG	19 Apr 93-	Lithuania, MLT Chief
Beinhart, Ernest G., III, Col, USMC	Jul 92-Feb 93	Chief, Operations Division
Birznieks, John A., MAJ, USAR	22 Apr 93-	Latvia, MLT
Blahut, Leslie C., SFC, USA	14 Feb 94-	Poland, MLT
Block, Marsha R., SFC, USAR	1 Oct 93-	Budget Analyst
Bochtler, Edwin R., SPC, USA	18 Jul-	Bulgaria, MLT
Boros, Louis L., Col, USMC	27 Mar 93-	Hungary, MLT Chief
Bracht, Marlene F., SFC, USA	31 Jul 92-20 Jan 93	Hungary, MLT
Brady, Robert G., MAJ, USA	2 Mar-31 May 93	Albania, Desk Officer
Brasington, William P., CDR, USN	7 Jan 94-	Bulgaria, MLT
Brenner, Reuben P., ETC, USN	12 Feb 94-	Romania, MLT

Brooks, Jeannene V., Maj, USAF	12 Nov 93-	Czech Republic, MLT
Burleigh, Thomas W., CW3, USA	25 Apr-18 Oct 93	Latvia, MLT
Capas, Edmund R., MAJ, USAR	11 Aug 93-	Lithuania, MLT
Carlisle, Mark G., MSgt, USAF	9 Jan 94-	Czech Republic, MLT
Carrigg, James R., Capt, USAF	Apr-Jun 93	Civil Engineering Support— Marshall Ctr
Chamberlin, Gary G., Col, USAF	18 Jul 93-21 Mar 94	Bulgaria, MLT Chief
Chaplaupka, Melvin G., CAPT, USNR	4 Jan-7 Mar 94	Romania, MLT Chief
Cheadle, Bruce A., MAJ, USA	14 May 93-25 May 94	Romania, MLT
Chenard, Christian R., MSG, USAR	2 Aug 93-28 Mar 94	Operations NCOIC
Clark, Carl D., SFC, USA	19 Jan 94-	Czech Republic, MLT
Colee, Clifton H. PNC, USN	8 Mar-2 Sep 93	Estonia, MLT
Concheff, Jon W., CW3, USA	15 Oct 93-1 Jan 94 1 Jan-24 Jan 94	Slovenia, Desk Officer SOF Advisor
Conway, Michael, SGT, USAR	10 Apr-26 Aug 93	Secretary to Deputy Director
Cornell, Timothy J., Maj, USMC	14 Jul 93-5 Mar 94	Bulgaria, MLT
Cossaboom, Robert T., civ	10 Jan 94-	Historian
Crist, Charles E., COL, USAR	15 Jan 94-	Albania, MLT Chief
Cronenberg, William H., 1LT, USAR	1 Oct 93-	Estonia, MLT
Dart, Beverly B., LCDR, USN	15 Jul-23 Dec 93	Albania, MLT
Dearing, Kevin, SGT, USA	15 Mar-15 Sep 93	Poland, MLT
Deets, Jesse, MAJ, PAARNG	19 Jul-29 Sep 93	Lithuania, MLT
Deming, Russell A., Lt Col, USAF	10 May 93-11 Mar 94 14 Mar 94-	Latvia, Desk Officer Lithuania, Desk Officer
Dieal, William J., Jr., COL, USAR	3 Jul 93-15 Feb 94	Czech Republic, MLT Chief
Dietrick, William M., MAJ, USA	1 Aug-Oct 93	Romania, Desk Officer
Duda, John, Maj, USMC	23 Apr-31 Aug 93	Lithuania, MLT

Dykes, Richard D., LTC, USAR (AGR)	15 Nov 93-	Slovenia, Desk Officer
Ellsworth, Steven K., COL, USAR	7 Mar 94-	Slovenia, MLT Chief
Farkas, Frank, COL, USA	21 Dec 92-18 Jul 93	Hungary, MLT Chief
Ferguson, John M., SFC, USA	17 Oct 93-	Slovenia, MLT
Fish, Jonathan A., LCDR, USN	16 Nov 92-	Equip Management Operations Officer
Fodor, Peter A., MSgt, USAF	16 Jul 93-Jan 94	Hungary, MLT
Foster, John N., MAJ, USA	14 May-5 Nov 93	Estonia, MLT
Foursha, Sammy L., CAPT, USNR	11 Jun-20 Dec 93, 18-29 Jan 94	Romania, MLT Chief
Framcke, Herbert, Jr., CW2, USA	24 Jan 1994-	SOF Advisor
Frank, Paul C., ETC, USN	26 Apr-4 Oct 93	Romania, MLT
Freeman, Richard L., COL, USA	22 Mar 93-21 Jan 94 1 Feb-1 Apr 94	Albania, MLT Chief Slovenia, MLT Chief
Furth, Craig R., LTC, USA	27 Jun-26 Aug 93	Romania, MLT
Futch, David L., CPT, USA	23 Oct 93-18 Apr 94	Albania, Desk Officer
Gambolati, Ronald L., COL, USAR	1 Feb 94-	Belarus, FT Chief
Gamboliti, Ronald L., COL, USA	25 Oct 93-Jan 94	Ukraine, FT Chief
Garey, John D., Capt, USAF	29 Oct 93-	Czech Republic, MLT
Gavelis, Rimas R., SFC, USAR	23 Apr-31 Aug 93	Lithuania, MLT
Giero, Richard A., SFC, USA	11 Sep 93-8 Mar 94	Poland, MLT
Goddard, Jeffrey D., SFC, USA	8 Jan 94-	Latvia, MLT
Gola, Richard A., SFC, USA	15 Mar-26 Aug 93	Albania, MLT
Grabarz, Michael A., SFC, USA	7 Sep 93-	Poland, MLT
Grice, Angela C., SGT, USA	23 Apr-Oct 93	Poland, MLT
Gripman, William S., LCDR, USNR	1 Nov 93-	Estonia, Desk Officer
Hallisey, David, LT, USN	13 Dec 93-	Albania, MLT

Hammersen, Frederick F. A., LTC, USA	Jul 92-30 Jun 93	Marshall Center Development Cell
Hamrick, Stephen L., HT1, USN	8 Mar-2 Sep 93	Lithuania, MLT
Haney, Lester K., Maj, USAF	25 Jun 93-11 Jun 94	Romania, MLT
Hardy, Paul, MSG, USA	11 Jan-9 Jul 93	Hungary, MLT
Harris, Norman G., LCDR, USN	13 Apr-15 Jun 93	Romania, MLT
Hazelton, Coretta M., LCDR, USN	24 May 93-	Poland, Desk Officer
Helms, Charles M., Capt, USAF	May 93-	Executive Officer to Deputy Director
Hinds, Patrick, CPT, PAARNG	19 Apr-4 Sep 93	Lithuania, MLT
Hobbs, David R., CPT, USAR	3 Sep 93-28 Mar 94	Budget Analyst
Hoog, Steven, Maj, USAF	Dec 92-Jul 93	Slovakia, Desk Officer
Hornburg, Kirk D., LT, USN	23 Aug 93-	Latvia, MLT and Desk Officer
Huchel, Richard J., Lt Col, USMC	14 Mar 94-	Bulgaria, Desk Officer
Hudacek, John K., SFC, USA	13 Aug 93-	Latvia, MLT
Hutchings, Robert N., Jr., Maj, USAF	11 Nov 93-	Slovenia, MLT
Johnson, Debra A., MAJ, USA	Oct 93- Jan-Oct 93	Belarus, Desk Officer FSU, Desk Officer
Johnson, James R., WO1, USA	17 Oct 93-	Latvia, MLT
Jonkoff, Viktor I., Maj, USAF	31 Jul-24 Dec 92	Hungary, MLT
Kelemen, Sandor M., CW4, USA	12 Feb-30 Jun 93	Hungary, MLT
Kent, Jeffrey A., SFC, USA	22 Jan 94-	Albania, MLT
Keyeck, Anthony J., Jr., Col, MDARNG	Unknown	Estonia, MLT Chief
Kivi, Arno E., CPT, USA	17 Oct 93-	Estonia, MLT
Klipich, Richard D., Jr., BMC, USN	10 Jan 94-	Estonia, MLT
Kogle, Mark L., LTC, USA	18 Jun 93-	Czech Republic, Desk Officer
Koppa, Wayne C., COL, MIARNG	14 Feb 94-	Latvia, MLT Chief

Lantzky, Inguar-Erich, LTC, NYARNG	22 Apr-26 Sep 93	Estonia, MLT
Lee, Richard T., Col, USAF	6 Mar 94-	Bulgaria, MLT Chief
Lennon, Thomas J., Brig Gen, USAF	8 Sep 92-	Deputy Director, JCTP
Lich, Glen E., LTC, USAR	10 Oct 93-25 Feb 94 21 Mar-5 Jul 93	Slovenia, MLT Chief Romania, MLT Chief
Linden, Kurt E., MAJ, USA	25 Jan 93-	Resource Manager
Livermore, Carl D., Capt, USAF	11 Nov 93-4 Feb 94	Belarus, FT
Longstreet, Lizann, CAPT, USNR	8 Nov 93-	Slovakia, TCT and MLT Chief
Lucas, Jeffrey W., HMC, USN	11 Aug 93-	Lithuania, MLT
Lund, Ralph S., LTC, USAR (AGR)	15 Sep 93-	Guard Affairs and Personnel Officer
Maroney, Timothy, LTC, CTARNG	1 Mar-Aug 93	Baltics, Desk Officer
Marquart, Mairi A., CPT, USAR	24 May 93-30 Mar 94	Education, Training and Admin Officer
Mate, Steven J., TSgt, USAF	9 Jan 94-	Hungary, MLT
Mathison, Mark C., CW2, USA	13 Feb 94-	Poland, MLT
May, Marie A., MAJ, USA	14 Dec 92-12 Feb 93	Finance Officer
May, Marilyn, Maj, USAF	Sep 92-Feb 93	Albania, Desk Officer
McDonald, Marva E., Jr., CW2, USA	15 Aug 93-8 Feb 94	Bulgaria, MLT
McMurry, Thomas A., LCDR, USN	4 Apr 94-	Romania, Desk Officer
Melanson, Bernard D., Maj, USAF	30 Nov 93-	Albania, MLT
Melsha, Joel E., Maj, USAF	17 May-30 Sep 93	Czech Republic, MLT
Miller, Cheryl L., civ	22 Mar 93-	Admin support
Moon, Owen W., COL, MIARNG	13 May 93-14 Feb 94	Latvia, MLT Chief
Moore, Michael H., Capt, USAF	11 Nov 93-	Slovakia, MLT
Mukaj, Tomor, SGT, NYARNG	25 Jun-29 Sep 93	Albania, MLT
Newberg, Michael E., SFC, USA	13 Aug 93-	Hungary, MLT

Newton, Vanessa C., civ	22 Feb 94-	Administrative support
Njegovan, Nick, SFC, USA	13 Aug-4 Dec 93	Belarus, FT
Noonan, Timothy R., Capt, USMC	30 Mar 93-	Romania, MLT
Olson, Frederic M., Maj, USMC	Feb 93-14 Mar 94	Lithuania, Desk Officer
Olson, Richard L., COL, USA	24 Mar 93-	Chief, Central/Eastern Europe Division
Paulauskas, Stanley, LTC, USAR	24 Apr-18 Aug 93	Lithuania, MLT
Paulus, John S., III, SSG, USA	13 Nov 93-	Belarus, FT
Pertuit, Patrick P., Maj, USAF	8 Jul-12 Dec 93	Albania, MLT
Peterson, Maurice E., COL, USA	2 Jul 92-30 Aug 93	Romania, Desk Officer
Ploompuu, Andres H., CPT, USAR	14 Aug 93-	Estonia, MLT
Pollitt, Gary R., CDR, USN	24 Mar 93-	Chaplain
Preston, Russell E., SFC, USA	15 May-15 Aug 93 16 Aug-10 Nov 93	Czech Republic, MLT Slovakia, MLT
Proctor, Michael S., SSgt, USAF	11 Aug 93-31 Jan 94	Czech Republic, MLT
Rasch, Ronald L., LTC, USAR	9 Jul 93-28 Feb 94	Poland, MLT
Reilly, Thomas R., CDR, USCG	1 Feb-30 Apr 93	USCG Advisor
Rhymes, Donnie, SFC, USA	27 Oct 92-	Communications Officer
Riester, Carl W., MAJ, USA	12 May-27 Jun 93	Hungary, Desk Officer
Riley-Cunningham, Barbara, Maj, USAFR	17 Sep-17 Dec 93	Lithuania, MLT
Rimoczi, Zsolt G., Capt, USAF	29 Sep 92-	Hungary, MLT
Roades, Charles W., Jr., 1 st Lt, USAF	21 Feb 94-	Belarus, FT
Ross, Steven J., Col, USAF	Jul-7 Sep 92 8 Sep 92-27 Jun 93	Chief, JCTP Assistant Deputy Director
Rountree, Claude M., LTC, USA	Jul 92-May 93	Poland, Desk Officer
Ruggley, Larry D., MAJ, USA	30 Mar 93-15 Feb 94	Personnel Officer
Saciloto, Alessandro, civ	Sep 92-unk	Budget and Supply

Sagehorn, Steven M., LT, USN	16 Jul 93-15 Dec 93	Albania, MLT
Sanford, Ben, CPT, USA	13 Feb 94-	Lithuania, MLT
Saramago, Julian C., CPT, USA	22 Aug 93-	Slovakia, MLT
Scheiner, John F., LtCol, USMC	26 Jul 93-	Slovakia, Desk Officer
Schrupp, David, Lt Col, USAF	Jul 92-Apr 93	Scheduler and Briefer
Selph, Shelly S., CPT, USA	13 May-10 Nov 93	Albania, Desk Officer
Sharp, Walker D., AWC, USN	9 Sep 93-5 Mar 94	Romania, MLT
Sherman, Tony, civ	10 Jan 94-	Budget Analyst
Shuey, Karin S., LT, USN	1 Feb-15 Dec 93	Estonia, Desk Officer
Skrypczuk, Oleh, Col, USAF	4 Feb 93-13 Feb 94 13 Feb 94-	Poland, MLT Chief Czech Republic, MLT Chief
Snyder, Keith J., Lt Col, USAF	9 Nov 92-30 Jun 93 1 Jul 93-	Hungary, Desk Officer Briefer
Sokol, Joseph A., MAJ, USA	1 Feb 93-	Transportation Officer
Soroka, Thomas S., Maj, USMC	9 Feb-5 Aug 93, 12 Jan 94-	Poland, MLT
Southerland, James, CAPT, USN	8 Mar 94-	Romania, MLT Chief
Stalder, Keith J., Col, USMC	13 Feb 93-	Chief, Operations Division
Stankovich, Peter, COL, USA	31 Aug 93-	Chief, Baltics/Former Soviet Union Division
Stanton, Joanne E., Capt, USAF	13 Nov 92-10 May 93	Hungary, MLT
Starr, Gary G., CDR, USN	Feb-Jul 93 Jul 92-4 Mar 94	Bulgaria, Desk Officer NATO Liaison
Stebner, Darald R., COL, ARNG (AGR)	12 May 93-	Estonia, MLT Chief
Stowe, Charles R. B., CAPT, USNR	6 Jan 94-	Poland, MLT Chief
Sulcs, Verners, CW2, MIARNG	19 Apr 93-Feb 94	Latvia, MLT
Sullivan, Pauline, SSgt, USMC	20 May 93-	Administration
Summerlin, Marcie, civ	8 Sep 92-	Secretary

Supa, Joseph, Lt Col, USAF	22 Jul 93-	Chaplain
Szocs, Erno, MSgt, USAF	1 Aug-30 Sep 92	Hungary, MLT
Tiderman, Michael C., LTC, USA	12 Oct 93-	FSU/Ukraine, Desk Officer
Tindell, Joseph W., LCDR, USN	12 Jan-19 May 93	Albania, MLT
Turman, Dianna M., CDR, USNR	Oct 93-	Assistant Scheduler
Tweedy, David A., SSG, USA	14 Jun 93-10 Jan 94 11 Jan 94-	Ukraine, FT Lithuania, MLT
Tyson, Randolph L., SFC, USA	13 Aug 93-4 Mar 94	Czech Republic, MLT
Urtel, Barry, YN1, USN	17 Sep 92-May 93	Aide to Brig Gen Lennon
Vasquez, Michael E., SGT, USA	22 Aug 93-	Slovakia, MLT
Venner, Mark E., Lt Col, USAF	29 Aug 93-10 Feb 94	Belarus, FT
Voss, F. James, Capt, USMC	3 Aug 93-27 Jan 94	Lithuania, MLT
Wald, Lewis E., Jr., MAJ, USAR	15 Oct 93-2 Apr 94	Slovenia, MLT
Warnick, Rodger N., Lt Col, USAFR	May-Aug 93	Air Force Reserve Advisor
Willingham, Frank M., Col, USAF	Jul 92-30 Jun 93	Marshall Center Development Cell
Wilson, Marcus B., RM1, USN	11 Aug 93-5 Feb 94	Estonia, MLT
Wilson, Ronald A., SSG, USA	11 Nov 93-14 Mar 94	Albania, MLT
Woodley, Carmon L., Maj, USAFR	7 Jun-30 Sep 93 18 Oct 93-8 Apr 94	EOD and Weapons Safety Advisor Romania, Desk Officer
Wright, Denise, civ	27 Mar 93-23 Jan 94	Administrative support
Xhaferi, Drini D., SFC, USA	13 Aug 93-10 Feb 94	Albania, MLT
Yeager, William, PR1, USN	28 Jan 94-	Lithuania, MLT
Zak, Robert S., Maj, USMC	14 Jul 93-8 Jan 94	Poland, MLT
Zak, Richard, LTC, USA	22 Jan-22 Jul 93	Poland, MLT
Zamojda, B. Tony, LTC, USA	29 Dec 93-	Reserve Affairs Officer

APPENDIX III

JOINT CONTACT TEAM PROGRAM EVENTS

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
Albania						
16	Assessment Coast Guard TCT	02/24/93	02/27/93	DPS	ECJ5-J	
9	Organization and Doctrine TCT	03/08/93	03/12/93	DPC	USAFE/MLT	
18	Military Law TCT	03/15/93	03/19/93	LFL	ECLA	
8	Civil Engineering TCT	03/22/93	03/26/93	DMI	NAVEUR	
28	Port Safety and Security	03/25/93	03/28/93	DPS	ECJ5-J	USCG
7	Ship Visit	03/31/93	04/02/93	GE	NAVEUR	
22	Chaplain's Assessment TCT	04/19/93	04/23/93	PES	ECCH	ECJ5-J
27	Staff Organization	04/19/93	04/23/93	LFD	ECJ1-MP	
41	Library Org and Management	04/26/93	04/29/93	TRF	USAFE	
36	EUCOM Staff FAM Tour	05/05/93	05/10/93	GE	ECJ5-J	
39	Annual Medical/Surgical Conf	05/09/93	05/13/93	DMH	ECMD	
52	NATO IMS Org and Doctrine TCT	05/10/93	05/15/93	DPD	USAREUR	
12	Officer Mgt and Devel TCT	05/17/93	05/21/93	PEM	USAREUR	
29	Waterways Management TCT	05/17/93	05/21/93	DPS	ECJ4-SA	USCG
23	Military Medicine TCT	05/19/93	05/23/93	DMH	USAMCE	ECMD
10	FAM Tour AF Cdr to USAFE	05/27/93	05/29/93	DMI	USAFE	
46	US-Albanian Mil Law Exchange	06/01/93	06/06/93	LF	ECLA	NAV LEGA
43	Engineer FAM Tour	06/07/93	06/11/93	DMI	NAVEUR	
53	Modification FAM Tour	06/09/93	06/18/93	GE	DAO ALBANIA	
40	US Coast Guard FAM Tour	06/13/93	06/19/93	DPS	ECJ4-SA	USCG
11	Logistics Management TCT	06/14/93	06/18/93	DML	USAREUR	
21	Ocean Engineering TCT	06/14/93	06/18/93	DMI	NAVEUR	
45	Civil Engineering Conf	06/21/93	06/25/93	DMI	ECJ4	
47	NCO Training TCT	06/21/93	06/23/93	TRO	USAREUR	
32	Hydrographic Cooperation Prog	06/22/93	06/25/93	DMT	NAVEUR	
13	TCT on MP Management	06/28/93	07/01/93	LFP	USAREUR	
60	Chaplain TCT	06/30/93	07/02/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
31	Humanitarian Assistance TCT	07/12/93	07/16/93	HU	USACAPOC	
19	Div Organization TCT	07/19/93	07/23/93	DPC	USAREUR	3ID
73	Communications TCT	07/21/93	07/23/93	C2	EUCOM J6	
69	Maritime Safety TCT	08/02/93	08/06/93	DPS	USCG	
76	Hydrocooperation Program II TCT	08/09/93	08/20/93	DMT		
63	CH53 Display and Human Relief	08/16/93	08/16/93	HU	NAVEUR	
14	Military Intelligence Mgt TCT	08/23/93	08/27/93	DPX	ECJ2	
49	Training the Force TCT	08/23/93	08/27/93	EDT	USAREUR	SETAF
75	Medical Logistics FAM	08/23/93	08/30/93	DMH	USAMMCE	
78	Medical Conf Tour	08/27/93	09/05/93	DMH	USA	
67	Military Historian TCT	08/30/93	09/03/93	DMC	USAFE	
50	Training the Force FAM Tour	09/06/93	09/12/93	TRU	USAREUR	SETAF
25	Air Field Assessment TCT	09/13/93	09/17/93	DMI	USAFE	
72	Info Management TCT	09/13/93	09/17/93	C2	USAFE	
97	Officer Accession and NCO Prof Devel Conf	09/17/93	09/24/93	TRO	USAFE	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
55	Defense Planning TCT	09/20/93	09/24/93	DMD	USAREUR	
94	Legal Conference FAM	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
51	BDE/BN Operations FAM Tour	09/24/93	09/30/93	DPO	USAREUR	3ID
92	TOPS IN BLUE	10/08/93	10/10/93	GE	USAFE	
33	Officer Educ and Tng TCT	10/23/93	10/30/93	TRG	USAREUR	TRADOC
96	Intl Seapower Symposium FAM	11/05/93	11/10/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
61	Resource Mgt TCT	11/08/93	11/12/93	DMB	USAREUR	
70	Firefighting FAM Tour	11/15/93	11/19/93	DPO	USAFE	
81	Electrical Engineering TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	DMI	USAREUR	
71	Air Space Mgt TCT	12/05/93	12/08/93	AMC	FAA	
100	Military Historian FAM	12/06/93	12/10/93	DMC	USAFE	
90	NCO Academy FAM to Grafenwoehr	12/08/93	12/11/93	TRO	USAREUR	
82	Engineering II FAM	12/13/93	12/17/93	DMI	USAREUR	
125	Maj Gen Link Visit	12/15/93	12/16/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
128	Diving Symposium	01/16/94			NAVEUR	
89	Signal Communication FAM	01/17/94			ECJ6	
126	Bilateral Working Group	01/17/94			ECJ5-J	
85	Operations FAM	01/24/94			USAREUR	
101	Field Sanitation/ Prevention Med TCT	01/24/94			SOCEUR	10th SFG
106	Medical Logistics II TCT	01/24/94			USAREUR	USAMMCE
123	International Logistics TCT	01/31/94			ECJ4-LP	
105	Environmental Protection TCT	02/01/94			ECJ4-LIE	NAVEUR
107	Role of Mil in a Democracy TCT	02/05/94			ECJ4-LH	353D CA
133	Maritime Law II TCT	02/07/94			ECJ4-EDC	
145	2d Qtr Scheduling Conference	02/15/94			ECJ5-J	
132	Inspector Gen Org and Ops TCT	02/21/94			ECIG	
144	Brig Gen Lennon Visit	02/21/94			ECJ5-J	
93	C-130 and Humanitarian Relief II	02/22/94			NAVEUR	
110	Aviation Safety, and Maintenance TCT	02/22/94			NAVEUR	
130	NAVEUR HQ FAM Tour (UK)	02/23/94			NAVEUR	
74	Judge Advocate Gen FAM Tour (US)	02/28/94			ECJ5-J	ECPA
88	Engineering III FAM Tour (UK)	02/28/94			USAFE	
127	Sr Enlisted Advisor/ 1st Sergeant TCT	03/07/94			USAFE	
142	Mil Uniform Devel FAM Tour (US)	03/12/94			OSD ACQUIS	
83	Installation Master Planning TCT	03/21/94			USAREUR	
87	Logistics FAM Tour	03/21/94			USAREUR	

Belarus

1	Brig Gen Lennon Visit and Ft Insertion	10/05/93	10/05/93	GE	ECJ5	
3	Military Training	11/03/93	11/04/93	DPD	ECJ5	ECJ5
4	Physical Fitness TCT	12/06/93	12/10/93	TRU	USAREUR	ECJ5
5	Eye Tumors and Related Topics TCT	12/13/93	12/31/93	DMH	ECMD	ECJ5

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
14	Air Defense Site Ops TCT	01/31/94			USAFE	
8	Mil Air Traffic Control FAM	02/14/94			USAFE	ECJ5
34	Ground Forces Comm FAM	02/22/94			ECJ5	
13	Destruction of Armor Equip TCT	02/28/94			ECJ5	DLA
9	Personnel Mgt in the US Army TCT	03/28/94			USAREUR	USAREUR

Bulgaria

13	Port Visit/Medical TCT	07/26/93	07/30/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
18	Medical FAM Tour	08/16/93	08/20/93	DMH	ECMD	
21	Comd Surgeon CONUS FAM Tour	08/27/93	09/03/93	DMH	ECMD	
37	English Language Instructor Conf	08/31/93	09/09/93	TRG	ECJ5-J	
23	Public Affairs TCT	09/01/93	09/03/93	LFI	ECPA	
43	15 th Annual Minuteman Comp	09/10/93	09/12/93	GE		
12	Comm FAM Visit to GE	09/13/93	09/18/93	C2	ECJ6	
25	Officer and NCO Devel Conf	09/19/93	09/24/93	TRO	ECJ5-J	
44	Military Law Conf	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL		
22	TOPS IN BLUE Concert	10/07/93			ECPA	
79	Geodetic Exchange TCT	10/11/93			ECJ4	
40	Brig Gen Lennon Update Visit	10/20/93	10/21/93	DPD	ECJ5	
26	Marine Corps Presentation Team	11/16/93	11/20/93	DPO	FMFEUR	
19	Military FAM Tour	11/28/93			ECJ5	
45	Air Space Mgt TCT	12/08/93	12/10/93	AMC	SAF/IA	
102	Naval Planning Conf	01/10/94			NAVEUR	
39	Bulgaria BWGp	01/18/94			OSD	
17	Chaplaincy TCT	01/30/94			ECCH	
67	Unit Exchange— Parachutist (Face) TCT	01/30/94			SOCEUR	
104	Chaplains Conf— Stockholm, Sweden	01/30/94			ECCH	
103	Nuclear Accident Civil Defense TCT	02/06/94			ODUSD/EP	
107	Qtrly Mil-to-Mil Sched/ TM Chief Conf	02/13/94			ECJ5-J	
52	Educ on Rights of Ind Servicemember TCT	02/14/94			USAREUR	
64	Org of Mil Legal System TCT	02/14/94			USAREUR	
62	Resource Progr and Allocating TCT	02/15/94			USAFE	
68	PPBS TCT	02/15/94			USAFE	
24	Airspace Mgt CONUS FAM Tour	02/20/94			SAF/IA	
11	Maritime Envir Protection TCT	02/21/94			NAVEUR	
31	Engineering Country Appendix	02/21/94			ECJ4	USAREUR
16	Port Visit—Varna	02/23/94			NAVEUR	
97	Face FAM Tour	02/27/94			SOCEUR	
108	Class A Agent Close-Out	03/01/94			ECJ5-J	
109	Gen Officer Visit to USAFA	03/14/94			ECJ5-J	
42	Tenn Guard Partnership FAM	03/20/94			USAREUR	
53	Sr Level Mil in Democ Society FAM	03/21/94			OSD/PA	USIA
72	Mil Member Support Prog TCT	03/21/94			USAFE	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
Czech Republic						
151	Dep Dir JCTP GO Visit	02/25/93	02/26/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
152	USEUCOM Surgeon Gen FAM	03/16/93	03/18/93	DMH	ECMD	
153	Cheb Shooting Competition TCT	04/23/93	04/25/93	GE	USAREUR	USAFE
154	Special Forces Restore Hope TCT	06/05/93	06/11/93		10 SFG	
155	C4 DV FAM to CONUS	06/06/93	06/15/93	C2	ECJ5-J	
156	USEUCOM Engr Conf FAM	06/21/93	06/25/93	DMI	ECJ5-J	
157	Peacekeeping Prague Conf GO Visit	06/30/93	07/02/93	CMO	ECJ5-J	
1	MLT Insertion	07/12/93	07/12/93	GE	ECJ5-J	
158	Chaplain Visit TCT	07/13/93	07/13/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
159	US Forces Organization TCT	08/31/93	09/02/93	DPS	USAREUR	
160	English Language Instr Conf FAM	08/31/93	09/08/93	TRG	ECJ5-J	
161	USEUCOM Surgeon Gen Med CONUS FAM	09/01/93	09/03/93	DMH	ECMD	
162	US Army Parachute Team TCT	09/02/93	09/09/93	DPO	ECJ5-J	
163	15th Intl Minuteman Garmish FAM	09/10/93	09/12/93	GE	USAREUR	
164	US Air Force Academy FAM	09/11/93	09/24/93	SRR	USAFA	
165	Airlift Wing R-M FAM	09/13/93	09/18/93	DPO	USAFE	
166	BWG in CZ Rep	09/17/93	09/18/93	DPD	DUSD	AMEMB
167	Off Accession and NCO Devel Maxwell AFB FAM	09/19/93	09/24/93	TRO	USAF Air Univ	
168	Force Structure Methodology TCT	09/20/93	09/24/93	DP	USAREUR	USAFE
169	Desert Storm TCT	09/20/93	09/24/93	DPO	USAREUR	
170	Legal Conf Garmisch FAM	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
171	TOPS IN BLUE TCT	09/21/93	09/21/93	GE	ECJ5-J	USAF
172	Cheb Shooting Competition TCT	10/28/93	10/30/93	DPO	USAREUR	USAFE
30	7th ATC Tng TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	EXC	USAREUR	
31	Chemical Defense Unit TCT III	12/06/93	12/10/93	DPO	USAREUR	
81	Scheduling Conf for 2/3 Qtr FY94	12/07/93			ECJ5-J	
22	C4 Assessment TCT	12/13/93	12/17/93	C2	ECJ6	
37	Medical Services TCT	12/13/93	12/17/93	CMH	USAREUR	
38	Security Forces TCT	12/13/93	12/17/93	DPO	USAFE	
43	Log Management TCT	01/03/94			USAFE	
14	Mathies NCO Academy FAM	01/17/94			USAFE	
26	CZ Chem Co to 95 th Chem Co FAM	01/18/94			USAREUR	
35	Log Sys Structure/Org TCT	01/24/94			USAREUR/ AF	USAFE
47	Personnel Mgt and Career Devel TCT	01/24/94			USAREUR/ AF	USAFE
87	Rank/Duty Position Compatibility TCT	01/24/94			USAREUR	
138	NATO Comm/Info Sys FAM	01/24/94			ECJ6	
114	Physical Fitness Tng Prog	01/29/94			ECJ5-J5	
48	Community Relations TCT	01/30/94			ECPA	
128	Chaplaincy Stockholm Conf FAM	01/31/94			ECJ5-J	
21	Air Space Management TCT	02/07/94			SAF	
75	Security Police Info/Analysis FAM	02/14/94			USAFE	
83	BG Garrett, CG 32 ADC, GO TCT	02/14/94			USAREUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
33	Gen Kuba, GO FAM	02/15/94			USAREUR	
136	ECJ5-J Scheduling Conf	02/16/94			ECJ5-J	
140	ECJ5-J Team Chief Mtg FAM	02/18/94			ECJ5-J	
125	Chaplaincy TCT	02/20/94			ECJ5-J	
36	Logistics Info System FAM	02/21/94			USAREUR	USAFE
42	C3 Reliability and Sec FAM	02/21/94			ECJ6	
49	Command and Control Sys FAM	02/21/94			ECJ6	
141	Legal Conf CONUS FAM	02/27/94			ECLA	
72	Air Traffic Control FAM	03/07/94			USAFE/ USAR	USAREUR
60	Gen Matejka GO Grafenwoehr FAM	03/10/94			USAREUR	
143	NDU Resource Mgt TCT	03/10/94			NDU	
176	Colson Air Space Mgt Con't TCT	03/15/94			SAF	
139	Brig Gen Lennon GO Visit	03/16/94			ECJ5-J	
174	Texas Partnership Intro TCT	03/16/94			ECJ5-J	
45	Reserve Affairs TCT	03/21/94			USAREUR	USAFE
85	Air Defense at Corps and Div TCT	03/21/94			USAREUR	

Estonia

1	Port Visit (BALTOPS)	06/21/93			NAVEUR	
28	P-3/Navy Diver Static Display	06/25/93			NAVEUR	
2	Border Operations	06/28/93			USAREUR	
3	Legislation Process for Support of Natl Security	06/28/93			ECLA	
4	Threat Assessment Process	07/06/93			ECJ2	
6	Personnel Mgt TCT	07/06/93			USAFE	
17	Ops and Training Mgt	07/06/93			USAREUR	
7	Education and Training	07/12/93			Other	
18	Command, Control, and Communication	07/13/93			USAREUR	
5	FAM Tour on Base Admin (Rota, Spain)	07/18/93			NAVEUR	
8	Military Law TCT	07/19/93			ECLA	
19	Employ Spt of Guard/Reserve	07/19/93			USAREUR	
9	USCG Missions TCT	07/26/93			Other	
20	Information Mgt	07/26/93			USAREUR	
10	Morale and Welfare for Personnel	08/02/93			USAFE	
12	Waterways Mgt TCT	08/02/93			Other	
13	Logistics TCT	08/02/93			Other	
14	Port Safety/Security TCT	08/16/93			Other	
15	FAM Tour Logistics	08/23/93			Other	
22	Personnel Mgt TCT Follow-Up	09/06/93			Other	
23	Marine Pollution TCT	09/06/93			USCG	
29	Personnel Mgt TCT Follow-Up	09/06/93			USAFE	
24	Chaplain TCT Follow-Up	09/13/93			ECCH	
25	Mil in Democ Soc TCT	09/13/93			SOCEUR	
26	Public Affairs	09/22/93			ECPA	
83	Sea Power Symposium	11/01/93	11/12/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
106	Army DATT Visit	11/08/93				

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
82	Maryland NG Indoc Visit	11/15/93	11/19/93	DPR	USAREUR	MDNG
84	NCO Professional Devel	11/15/93	11/19/93	TRO		
27	Military Medical TCT	11/27/93			ECMD	
32	Small Boat Ops and Nav	12/06/93	12/10/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
36	Communications Follow-On Visit	12/06/93	12/08/93	C2	ECJ6	
78	Battalion Aid Station	12/06/93	12/10/93	DMH	ECMD	
98	Baltic Inst Conf—Brig Gen Lennon	12/16/93			ECJ5	
86	Diving Symposium	01/16/94			NAVEUR	
96	Brigade CPX FAM	01/16/94			USAREUR	MDNG
31	Med Evac and Ops Planning	01/17/94			ECMD	
44	Rules and Regs for the Estonian Defense Force	01/17/94			ECLA	
45	Intl Law and Ground Protocols	01/24/94			ECLA	
108	Small Boat Operations and Nav II	01/31/94			SOCEUR	NSWU-2
113	Army Reserve Visit	02/06/94			ECJ5	
114	National Guard Visit	02/06/94			ECJ5	
89	SP/MP TCT	02/07/94			USAFE	
109	Firing Range Safety	02/09/94			USAREUR	
51	Maryland FAM Tour	02/14/94			USAREUR	MDNG
52	Nuclear Emergency Planning	02/19/94			USAREUR	MDNG
118	EUCOM Historian Visit	02/24/94			ECJ5	
85	Comm FAM to Stuttgart	02/27/94			ECJ6	
48	Company Level Staff Org	02/28/94			USAREUR	
54	PAO FAM to Stuttgart	02/28/94			ECPA	
87	Navy FAM to UK	03/08/94			NAVEUR	
112	CIMICS Data Gathering Visit	03/12/94			ECJ4	
60	Counter Drug Operations TCT	03/14/94			USAREUR	MDNG
111	Coast Guard FAM	03/16/94			ECJ4	USCG
123	U/W Salvage Assessment TCT	03/17/94			NAVEUR	
33	USMA FAM Tour	03/20/94			USAREUR	
104	Rules and Regs for the EDF II TCT	03/20/94			NAVEUR	
39	Logistics Sys Mgt TCT	03/28/94			USAREUR	

Hungary

75	CJCS Visit to Hungary	07/06/92	07/11/93	GE	EUCOM	
100	CJCS Visit to Hungary	07/06/92			EUCOM	
101	COMSOCEUR Visit to Hungary	07/13/92	07/15/93	GE	SOCEUR	
77	HHDF Visit to 7 ATC, GE	09/01/92	09/03/92	EXC	USAREUR	
78	Gen Priol to EUCOM	09/21/92	09/25/92	C2	EUCOM	
92	ECMD Visit to Hungary	09/21/92	09/23/92	DMH	EUCOM	
93	7 MEDCOM Visit to Hungary	09/28/92	10/01/92	DMH	USAREUR	
79	Brig Gen Lennon Visit to Hungary	09/30/92	10/01/92	GE	EUCOM	
94	HHDF Officers to Ramstein GE	10/05/92	10/10/92	DPO	USAFE	
81	HHDF to Spangdahlem	10/07/92	10/10/92	DPO	USAFE	
64	Resource Mgt TCT	10/19/92	10/23/92	DMB	USAREUR	
80	DCINC Visit to Hungary	10/19/92	10/20/92	GE	EUCOM	
65	Education and Science TCT	10/26/92	10/29/92	TRE	USAREUR	
67	Acquisition/Contracts TCT	11/08/92	11/11/92	DMB	USAREUR	
66	Personnel Mgt TCT	11/09/92	11/13/92	PEM	USAREUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
68	Logistics TCT	11/30/92	12/04/92	DML	USAREUR	
82	Congressional Liaison Visit	12/10/92	12/13/92	LFA	EUCOM	
69	Organizational Mgt TCT	12/14/92	12/18/92	DPS	USAREUR	
83	HHDF Visit 32 AADCOM	12/14/92	12/18/92	AMD	USAREUR	
84	Helo Unit Exchange to 4 BDE GE	12/14/92	12/18/92	DPO	USAREUR	
85	7 MEDCOM Visit to Hungary	12/14/92	12/19/92	DMH	USAREUR	
86	FAA Visit to Hungary	12/15/92	12/16/92	AMC	OSAF	
87	Brig Gen Lennon Visit to Hungary	01/15/93	1/15/93	GE	EUCOM	
161	ALS/NCO/SNCO Sch FAM to US	01/17/93	01/27/93	TRO	USAF	
197	Peacekeeping Ops TCT (Hungary)	01/17/93	01/21/93	CMO	ECSSO	
72	Aviation and Air Defense TCT	01/19/93	01/23/93	AMD	USAFE	
88	Desert Storm Road Show	01/24/93	01/30/93	GE	USAREUR	
70	Resource Mgt TCT Follow-Up	01/26/93	01/29/93	DMB	USAREUR	
71	Medical Assessment Team	01/26/93	01/27/93	DMH	ECMD	
89	Chief of Chaplains Conf in Budapest	02/01/93	02/05/93	PES	EUCOM	
91	Finance Trip to MLT	02/04/93			EUCOM	
90	Mental Health Conf, GE	02/07/93	02/11/93	DMH	USAREUR	
73	Training Mgt TCT	02/08/93	02/12/93	TRE	USAREUR	
1	GEN Shalikashvili Visit	02/14/93	02/16/93	GE	SHAPE	
55	Engineering Pre-Assessment TCT	02/17/93	02/19/93	DMI	EUCOM	
3	POMCUS FAM Tour to GE	02/22/93	02/26/93	DML	USAREUR	
4	Military Justice TCT	02/22/93	02/26/93	LFL	EUCOM	ECJ5-J
5	TCT Orientation	02/23/93			EUCOM	
6	Physical Readiness TCT	03/01/93	03/05/93	TRU	USAREUR	
7	Helo Unit Exchange to Hungary	03/01/93	03/04/93	DPO	USAREUR	
8	Brig Gen Landry to Hungary	03/03/93	03/05/93	C2	USAREUR	
49	FAM Tour—Project Soldier (CONUS)	03/06/93	03/14/93	DMN	USAREUR	
10	Leadership Orientation TCT	03/08/93	03/12/93	TRO	USAREUR	
11	MG Fugh to Hungary	03/08/93	03/15/93	LFL	USAREUR	
12	BWG in Budapest	03/09/93	03/11/93	GE	Other	
9	MEDCOM Pre-Conf Visit	03/23/93	03/27/93	DMH	USAREUR	
13	TCT Orientation	03/23/93			EUCOM	
2	Engineering Assessment TCT	03/29/93	04/01/93	DMI	ECJ5	ECJ4
105	Brig Gen Lennon Visit to Hungary	04/01/93	04/02/93	GE	EUCOM	
16	Computers and Simulations TCT	04/05/93	04/09/93	CIO	USAREUR	
19	TCT Orientation	04/13/93			EUCOM	
21	Resource Mgt TCT Follow-Up #2	04/13/93	04/16/93	DMB	USAREUR	
25	Org Mgt TCT Follow-Up #1	04/13/93	04/16/93	DM	USAREUR	
23	Allied Health Med Conf in GE	04/18/93	04/22/93	DMH	USAREUR	
15	Maintenance Unit Exchange—Spangdahlem	04/19/93	04/23/93	DML	USAFE	
24	Communications TCT	04/19/93	04/23/93	C2	EUCOM	
109	Brig Gen Lennon Visit to Hungary	04/23/93	04/23/93	GE	EUCOM	
27	Contracting FAM Tour to GE	04/26/93	04/30/93	DMB	USAREUR	
20	Field Artillery Unit Exchange to GE	04/27/93	04/30/93	DPO	USAREUR	
31	Air Defense FAM to Fort Bliss TX	05/01/93	05/08/93	AMD	USAREUR	
18	Gen Biro to HQ USAREUR	05/03/93	05/06/93	GE	USAREUR	
102	Mil Justice FAM Tour to Ramstein	05/03/93	05/05/93	LFL	ECLA	
36	TCT Orientation	05/04/93			EUCOM	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
28	Observer at REFORGER	05/05/93	05/11/93	EXC	EUCOM	
111	Info Security TCT	05/06/93	05/09/93	C2	EUCOM	
32	Surgical Conf in GE	05/09/93	05/13/93	DMH	USAREUR	
17	EUCOM/PA Follow-Up TCT	05/10/93	05/14/93	LFI	EUCOM	
22	Gen Davis to Hungary	05/11/93	05/13/93	GE	USAREUR	
62	Mech Inf Unit Exchange to GE	05/11/93	05/14/93	DPO	USAREUR	
37	HHDF/3ID Staff Exch to Hungary	05/17/93	05/20/93	DPO	USAREUR	
56	Force Devel FAM Tour to GE	05/17/93	05/21/93	DPC	USAREUR	
110	Force Mod/Mobilization FAM Tour #1	05/18/93	05/21/93	DME	USAREUR	
34	Firefighting/Aircrew Rescue FAM Tour	05/24/93	05/28/93	DPO	USAFE	
112	Needs Assessment Visit to Hungary	05/24/93			EUCOM	
60	Armor Unit Exchange to GE	05/25/93	05/28/93	DPO	USAREUR	
48	Dr Sved Visit EUCOM	06/01/93	06/03/93	DMH	ECMD	
251	Gen Priol to Comm Conf (US)	06/05/93	06/15/93	CI2	ECJ6	
252	Mech Inf Unit Exchange (Hungary)	06/08/93	06/11/93	DPO	USAREUR	
253	LTG Schroeder, DCINC (USAFEUR) (Hungary)	06/09/93	06/10/93	GE	USAREUR	
277	Psychiatrist Visit to 7 MEDCOM	06/13/93	06/17/93	DMH	USAREUR	
255	Food Services Visit (Hungary)	06/16/93	06/21/93	DML	USAREUR	
256	Band Lead to Debrechen Music Fest	06/17/93	06/24/93	GE	USAREUR	
257	EUCOM Engr Conf	06/21/93	06/24/93	DMI	ECJ4	
258	Armor Unit Exchange (Hungary)	06/28/93	07/01/93	DPO	USAREUR	
259	Mil Changeover Ceremony (Hungary)	06/29/93	06/30/93	GE	ECJ5-J	
260	Logistics Reciprocal Visit (Hungary)	07/12/93	07/16/93	DML	USAREUR	
261	Humanitarian Asst TCT	07/17/93	07/23/93	HU	ECJ5-J	
346	Quarterly Scheduling Conf	08/11/93			ECJ5-J	
14	HHDF/3ID Staff Reciprocal Exch to GE	08/22/93	08/27/93	DPO	USAREUR	EUCOM
132	USEUCOM Com Surgeon US Med Tour	08/27/93	09/05/93	DMH	ECMD	
41	Airfield Maint FAM Tour to GE	08/30/93	09/04/93	DMI	USAFE	
176	English Lang Teacher Conf	08/31/93	09/09/93	TRG	ECJ5-J	
186	SAF/IA Orientation FAM	09/04/93	09/08/93	DPS	SAF/IA	
121	52 FW Unit Exchange (Hungary)	09/07/93	09/10/93	DPO	USAFE	
182	Nuremberg Hosp FAM	09/08/93	09/09/93	DMH	USAREUR	7 MEDC
123	Intl Minuteman Competition	09/10/93	09/13/93	GE	USAREUR	
183	Explosive Ord Disposal Conf	09/11/93	09/17/93	DPO	ECJ5-J	
42	Helicopter Maint FAM to GE	09/13/93	09/17/93	DPO	USAREUR	
201	OSD Mil-Mil Orient (Hungary)	09/14/93	09/15/93	DMD	ECJ5-J	
202	State Dept Mil Indoc (Hungary)	09/15/93			ECJ5-J	
47	Acute Care Medical Conf	09/19/93	09/23/93	DMH	USAREUR	
133	BWG in Hungary	09/19/93	09/21/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
131	Military Law Conf	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
203	State Dept Mil Orient (Hungary)	09/21/93			ECJ5-J	
156	Ops/Planning Meeting (SUE)	09/22/93	09/24/93	DPO	USAREUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
127	Hist of USMC Doctr Devel TCT	09/27/93	09/30/93	SRC	FMFEUR-DES	
140	C4 Assessments Planning to GE	09/27/93	09/30/93	C2	ECJ6	
125	52 FW Civ Engr Reciprocal Exch to Hungary	10/04/93	10/08/93	DPO	USAFE	
130	GO Visit to Hungary	10/09/93	10/12/93	GE	USAF	
136	TOPS IN BLUE	10/10/93	10/13/93	GE	PAO	
122	52 FW Log Unit Exch (Hungary)	10/12/93	10/15/93	DML	USAFE	
129	Chaplain Visit to Hungary	10/12/93	10/15/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
160	USAFE Band to Hungary	10/21/93	10/29/93	GE	USAFE	
128	GO Visit to Hungary	11/02/93	11/04/93	DPD	USAREUR	
262	MLT Fin Reconcil	11/09/93			ECJ5-J	
179	USMC Tng and Educ FAM to East Coast	11/14/93	11/20/93	TRO	FMFEUR	
230	Family Support TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	PES	USAFE	
281	OSD Visit (Democ and Hum Rights)	12/02/93	12/03/93	GE	OSD	
144	Standards and Quality Control TCT	12/06/93	12/12/93	DMN	SAF/AFMC	
196	Crisis Mgt/War Game Assess	12/07/93	12/10/93	CME	J8	
232	Flight/Wpn/Ground Safety Plan TCT	12/08/93	12/11/93	DPO	USAFE	
345	Quarterly Scheduling Conference	12/08/93			ECJ5-J	
145	Armor/Inf Plans Off Exch (1 BDE)	12/12/93	12/18/93	DPO	USAREUR	
282	Senate Arms Approv Committee	12/12/93	12/14/92	LFA	ECJ5-J	
229	Log Staff Off Exchange (DISCOM)	01/06/94			USAREUR	
190	Life-Cycle Cost Est Sem (Hungary)	01/10/94			USAREUR	ARMETCO
219	Art Plans Off Exchange (DIV ARTY5-41FA)	01/12/94			USAREUR	
225	Arm Cav/Arm Plans Off Exchange (3/4 CAV)	01/12/94			USAREUR	
269	MLT Program Rev (Hungary)	01/12/94			ECJ5-J	
266	Chaplain TCT	01/19/94			ECJ5-J	
141	HHDF Comm to Brussels	01/24/94			EUCOM	
158	CC/Unit Inspect Sys TCT	01/24/94			USAREUR	USAFE
166	Mil Meteorology FAM to GE	01/24/94			USAFE	
263	Army Educ/Tng TCT	01/25/94			USAREUR	
220	Art Plans Off Exchange (DIVARTY2-14FA)	01/26/94			USAREUR	
221	Art Plans Off Exchange (DIVARTY3-1FA)	01/26/94			USAREUR	
280	GO Visit to Hungary	01/27/94			ECJ5-J	
211	Arm Plans Off Exchange (3 BDE/TF1-37)	01/28/94			USAREUR	
151	Small Unit Exchange (OBSRV-1 BDE/TF2-15)	01/29/94			USAREUR	
234	Small Unit Exchange (OBSRV-1 BDE/TF2-64)	01/29/94			USAREUR	
199	Intl Chapl Conf in Sweden	01/31/94			EUCOM/ ECCH	
147	Art Ops Off Exchange (DIVARTYHQ)	02/01/94			USAREUR	
226	Small Unit Exchange (OBSRV-3/4CAVSQDHQ)	02/01/94			USAREUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
286	Band Conductor Exchange (GE)	02/04/94			BANDFUND	
124	AAFES Supply/DECA FAM to GE	02/07/94			USAFE	
177	Unit Mgt FAM (Batt/Sq)	02/13/94			USAREUR	USAFE
344	Sched Conf and MLT Chief Mtg	02/14/94			ECJ5-J	
348	USAFE Band Coord TCT	02/14/94			BANDFUND	
349	Med-Surg Conf Plan (HU)	02/14/94			USAREUR	
137	Airspace/Air Traffic Control/ Air Def FA	02/19/94			USAF	
178	Comm Exchange to Hungary	02/28/94			EUCOM	
210	Plns Off Exch (1 BDEHQ) #FAM	03/01/94			USAREUR	
352	J5J Historian TCT	03/01/94			ECJ5-J	
265	MP/SP TCT	03/08/94			USAREUR	USAFE
246	Supply/Spt Syst and Mgt FAM (GE)	03/16/94			USAFE	
288	Peacekeeping Skills TCT	03/21/94			SOCEUR	
289	Legal FAM	03/21/94			USAREUR	
283	USAFE Band TCT (HU)	03/23/94			BANDFUND	
189	Natl Secreq Sem TCT (HU)	03/27/94			JS/J-8	

Latvia

1	General Officer Visit	05/24/93	05/25/93	GO	J5J	
2	Port Call—USCG	06/12/93	06/14/93	GE	USCG	
3	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Assessment	06/14/93	06/25/93	DPO		
4	Desk Officer Orientation	06/18/93				
5	USS Doyle Port Call	06/18/93	06/21/93	GE		
6	Ambassador Reception	06/20/93				
7	Legal Assessment	06/21/93	06/23/93	LAW	ECLA	
8	Medical Assessment	06/28/93	06/30/93	MED	ECMD	
9	Medical/First Aid	07/02/93	07/13/93	MED	MING	
10	Legal #2	07/04/93	07/21/93	LAW	USAFE	
11	Coast Guard Assessment	07/26/93	08/13/93	DPS	USCG	
12	National Guard Training	08/06/93	08/13/93	TRU	MING	
13	Medical	08/06/93	08/13/93	DMH	MING	
14	General Officer Visit—TAG—MI	08/10/93	08/13/93	TRR	MING	
15	Desk Officer Visit	08/10/93			J5J	
21	Mod Reception	08/12/93				
17	Explosive Ordnance Disposal #2	08/14/93	08/23/93	ENC	USAFE	
19	Air Force Assessment	08/16/93	08/19/93	DPO		
20	FAM Tour Mich/Wash	08/27/93	09/10/93	DPR		
22	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Conference	09/13/93	09/17/93	DPO		
25	State Dept Visit	09/14/93	09/15/93	GE		
24	Political Activities of Mil Officer	09/15/93	09/17/93	LF		
38	Latvian National Guard Exercise	09/17/93	09/30/93	EXC		
18	Minuteman Fellows	09/18/93	09/30/93	DPO		
28	Nuclear Planning Conf	09/19/93	09/23/93	DPE		
27	Legal Conference	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	WW	
34	TOPS IN BLUE	10/01/93	10/03/93	GE		
29	Public Affairs Assessment	10/17/93	10/20/93	LFI	W	
64	Secretary of State Visit	10/25/93	10/26/93			

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
35	Airspace Management	11/01/93	11/03/93	AMC	USAFE	
36	General Officer Visit	11/04/93	11/05/93	DPD		
40	LAT NG Comm Tng—Ogres	11/04/93	11/04/93	C2I		
41	Dinner/Recep—CHOD, AMB, CNG	11/04/93				
42	Legislative Affairs	11/08/93	11/15/93	LFA		
52	AF Logistics	11/10/93	11/13/93	DML		
45	Wreath Laying—Jelgava	11/11/93	11/11/93	GE	MLT	
33	Personnel Management	11/15/93	11/22/93	PEM		
50	NATO Level Visit	11/18/93				
43	Chaplain Assessment	11/20/93	11/24/93	PES		
46	NCOA FAM Tour	11/29/93	12/03/93	TRO	USAFE	
58	DOD Visit—Patrick AFB FL	12/03/93	12/04/93	OSD	ECJ5-J	
47	Role of Mil Aide	12/05/93	12/07/93	GE		
48	Air Force Safety	12/06/93	12/08/93	DPO	USAFE	
59	Congressional Staff Visit— D'Amato/Dubee	12/08/93	12/10/93	LFA	ECJ5-J	
66	BALTOPS Plan Conf	12/09/93	12/10/93	EXC	MLT	
51	Contracting FAM Tour	12/11/93	12/19/93	DMB	MING	
65	Baltic Research Ctr Conf	12/14/93	12/19/93	SR	MLT	
67	Baltic Security Conf	12/15/93	12/16/93	SR	MLT	
49	Legislative Affairs FAM—MI	01/03/94			MING	
39	Medical FAM Tour—MI	01/08/94			MING	
53	Personnel Mgt FAM Tour	01/08/94			MING	
63	Staff Funct Company/Platoon Lvl	01/10/94			SF	
95	General Officer Visit	01/12/94				
54	IG TCT	01/15/94			MING	
56	Planning Cell—Joint Troop Contact FAM	01/15/94			MING	
62	Component Rep Visit	01/19/94			ECJ5-J	
96	OSD/DOS/GO Visit	01/23/94				
57	AF Logistics FAM Tour	01/24/94			USAFE	
60	Office Administration TCT	01/24/94			USAFE	
55	Mil Responsibilities to Civ (Police)	01/29/94			MING	
61	Airspace Mgt FAM Tour— Spangdahlem AB GE	01/31/94			USAFE	
73	Cold Weather Tng Orientation FAM Tour	02/01/94			SF	
102	Force Structure	02/01/94				
68	Unit Supply Procedures	02/06/94			NG	
97	Public Affairs—MING	02/06/94				
128	Coast Guard FAM	02/06/94				
69	Leadership Seminar	02/13/94			ECJ5-J	
72	Training Methodology	02/13/94			SF	
98	Quarterly Scheduling Conference w/Lat MLT	02/16/94				
71	Role of Mil Eng in Disaster Relief	02/22/94			ECJ4	
32	EDA/DRMO System FAM	03/07/94			USAREUR	
100	Navy Leadership TCT	03/07/94			ECJ5-J	
101	Intl Logistics Seminar Planning	03/07/94			ECJ5-J	
70	Medical FAM GE	03/09/94			ECMD	
90	Salvage/Diving TCT	03/13/94			NAVEUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
76	Navy Maintenance Systems	03/21/94			NAVEUR	
79	Public Affairs FAM Tour	03/21/94			ECPA	
75	Contracting TCT	03/27/94			USAREUR	MING
81	Maintenance TCT	03/27/94			USAREUR	MING

Lithuania

1	FAM Tour Penn Guard/Reserve	06/02/93	06/12/93	MISC	USAREUR/ NG	
36	Chaplain Program Overview MWR TCT 1	06/10/93	06/15/93	PES	OTHER	
13	Military Law/Justice Overview TCT 1	07/12/93	07/16/93	LAW	ECLA	
55	Radiological Civil Def Plan TCT 1	07/18/93	07/25/93	DPE	OTHER	
59	Radiological Energy Planning TCT 2	07/19/93			OTHER	
60	Radiological Med Planning TCT 3	07/19/93			OTHER	
63	Barrier 93 Exer, Klapipeda, Exer 1	07/28/93	07/29/93	EXC		
62	FAM Flood Mid-States St Louis MO FAM 1	08/03/93	08/09/93	DPE	NGB	
2	Resource Mgt Overview/ Assess TCT 1	08/09/93	08/13/93		NAVEUR	
12	Logistics Mgt/Overview TCT 1	08/09/93	08/13/93		NAVEUR	
64	DMB	08/22/93	08/25/93		ECMD	
37	DMI	08/23/93	08/27/93	PES	USAFE	
67	DMH	09/09/93	09/14/93	DMB	PA GUARD	
68	FAM Explosive Ordnance Disposal Conf, Eglin AFB FL	09/11/93	09/17/93	DPO	EUCOM	
69	FAM Conference, Emergency Plan Comm FAM-1	09/19/93	09/23/93	DPE	USAREUR-NG	
11	Continuing Education TCT 1	09/20/93	09/24/93	TRG	USAFE	
58	PME NCO Education TCT 2	09/20/93	09/24/93	TRO	USAFE	
70	Military Legal Conference	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
84	Environment, Soil, and Water TCT	09/20/93	09/24/93	ENC	ECJ4	
66	TOPS IN BLUE TCT-1	09/25/93	09/26/93	GE	ECPA	
56	Staff Organ (Mod/Gen Stf) Overview TCT 1	09/27/93	09/30/93	DPR	UUSAREUR-NG	
57	Staff Organ (DIV/BDE/BN/CO) Overview TCT 1	09/27/93			USAREUR-NG	
61	Natl Security Strat Overview/ Assess TCT 1	10/03/93	10/08/93	SR	USMC	
45	Public Affairs Prog Overview TCT 1	10/12/93	10/17/93	LFI	ECPA	
39	Military Law/Justice System TCT 3	10/15/93	10/29/93	LFL	ECLA	
42	Ocean/Charts TCT 2	10/18/93			NAVEUR	
81	Communication HF/VHF TCT 2	10/18/93			USCG	
92	Finance TCT (FY 93 Close Out)	10/25/93			ECJ5-J	
88	Military Law/Contract Law TCT	10/28/93	11/12/93	LFL	USAREUR-NG	
74	Selective Service TCT	11/01/93	11/06/93	LFR	USAREUR-NG	
90	Contract Law	11/01/93	11/12/93	LFL	USAREUR-NG	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
89	General Officer Visit	11/02/93	11/03/93	DPD		
76	Airspace Management TCT 1	11/03/93	11/06/93	AMC	USAFE	
91	Intl Seapower Symposium	11/07/93	11/10/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
71	NCO FAM Leadership NCO Acad	11/15/93			USAFE	
93	NATO Work Level Visit	11/20/93			SHAPE	
43	Disaster Preparedness Mil Civ Coop	11/29/93	12/03/93	DPE	CI Affairs	
47	Military Civil Coop TCT	11/29/93			ECJ4	
83	Shipboard Med/Prevent Med TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
86	Warehouse/General Supply TCT	12/05/93			NAVEUR	
5	Pers/Manpower Overview TCT 1	12/06/93			USAFE	
85	BN Aide Station TCT (USAFEUR)	12/12/93			ECMD	
79	Environmental Engineering TCT	12/13/93			EUCOM-J-4	
73	Unit Personnel Awards/Heraldry	01/10/94			USAREUR	
94	First Aid for Soldiers (SF)	01/17/94			EUCOM	
99	Physical Fitness Prog	01/23/94			FMFEUR	
101	Field Logistics Org (BN, CO, BDE)	01/24/94			EUCOM	
122	Supply Contracting TCT	01/24/94			NAVEUR	
51	Reserve Forces Utilization/ Employ TCT 5	01/31/94			USAREUR	
98	Security/Mil Police (MP) TCT	01/31/94			USAFE	
114	Cold Weather Orientation FAM	02/01/94			SF	
50	Airspace/ATC/FAM to Spangdahlem GE	02/07/94			USAFE	
103	Historian TCT	02/07/94			USAFE	
118	Military Police for the Army TCT	02/07/94			USAREUR	
128	National Guard Reserve Affairs Visit	02/08/94			USAREUR-NG	
126	Leasing Quarters in Lithuania	02/10/94			ECLA	ECLA
121	Environmental Engineering FAM	02/14/94			ECJ5-J	
82	FAM Tour, Coast Guard Facilities, USA	02/20/94			USCG	
100	Military School Org Mgt TCT	02/21/94			FMFEUR	
108	NCO Role and Educ Sys in US Army	02/21/94			MLT	
125	International Logistics Seminar	02/27/94			ECJ5-J	ECJ4
49	Force/Strength Mgt/ Manpower TCT 2	02/28/94			USAREUR-NG	
77	AF General Needs Assessment	02/28/94			USAFE	
140	DRMO/EDA Orientation Visit FAM	03/07/94			ECJ5-J	
102	Ops in Winter Envir (INF, BDE, BN, CO) TCT	03/14/94			EUCOM	
124	Chaplaincy Visit TCT	03/21/94			NAVEUR	
153	Hist of the Joint Contact Prog TCT	03/24/94			ECJ5-J	

Poland

32	Civil Affairs TCT	01/01/91			ECJ5-J	
38	Physical Security FAM Tour	01/01/91			USAFE	
72	SME (AIRDEF) Coord Visit	01/01/91			USAFE	
74	Information Security FAM Tour	01/01/91			OSD	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
83	Defense Budget Tng TCT	01/01/91			JS	
85	Pentagon Org/Ops TCT	01/01/91			JS	
86	Polish Peacekeeping Presentation	01/01/91			USEUCOM	
89	HQ EUCOM FAM Tour	01/01/91			USAREUR	
108	US National Guard, Kick-Off	01/01/91			USAREUR	
114	Special Forces TCT	01/01/91			10-SFG	
134	10th SFG(A) to Poland (FACE)	01/01/91			SOCEUR	
137	Air Defense Follow-On TCT	01/01/91			USAFE	
139	SAR FAM Tour	01/01/91			USAF	
148	Military Uniform FAM	01/01/91			EUCOM	
175	US Navy/Coast Guard FAM	01/01/91			NAVEUR	
192	Military History Conf	01/01/91				
195	Navy Fuel Exch/Ship Supply	01/01/91			NAVEUR	
198	Global Positioning Systems "I" TCT	01/01/91			ECJ6-DS	
201	EUCOM Med Surgeons Conf	01/01/91			ECMD	
203	Oceanography/Meteorology TCT	01/01/91			NAVEUR	
204	Diving and Salvage TCT	01/01/91			NAVEUR	
210	Mil-Mil Historian Visit	01/01/91			ECJ5-J	
63	Nellis AFB NV FAM Tour	02/01/91			USAFE	
64	Logistic Facilities (USAF) FAM Tour	02/01/91			USAFE	
67	Navy Organizations TCT	02/01/91			NAVEUR	
71	Navy Med FAM Tour	02/01/91			NAVEUR	
76	Naval Aviation FAM	02/01/91			NAVEUR	
80	ATC FAA FAM Tour	02/01/91			USAFE	
84	Firefighting Reciprocal Visit	02/01/91			USAFE	
87	FAM Tour to Training Ctrs GE	02/01/91			USAREUR	
88	Coast Guard TCT	02/01/91			USCG	
99	Environmental FAM	02/01/91			ECJ4	
109	Civil Affairs TCT	02/01/91			ECJ5-J	
118	Threat Assessment/ Strategic Options TCT	02/01/91			JCS	
119	Defense Education TCT	02/01/91			JCS	
120	Defense Budget Building TCT	02/01/91				
121	Def Budget Legislation Process TCT	02/01/91				
122	Financial Mgt--Unit Level TCT	02/01/91				
124	Armor/Mech Div Cmdr Exchange to Poland	02/01/91			AREUR	
128	US Army Reserve Europe (ARCOM) FAM	02/01/91			AREUR	
141	Tng Area Mgt GO Exchange	02/01/91			USAREUR	
145	Language Cross Training	02/01/91				
151	Sr Svc School Acad Instructor Exch	02/01/91			JS	
155	AF Firefighting Ops Recip Visit--Poland	02/01/91			USAFE	
169	CAC FMSO GO Visit to Poland	02/01/91			FMSO	
173	Intl Kayak Paddle in US	02/01/91			10-SFG	
174	Mountain Ops Training TCT	02/01/91			SFG(10)	
106	Medical Mil-Mil CTC/Poland	09/16/92			EUCOM	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
48	EE Junior Officer FAM Visit	10/05/92	10/10/92	EDT		
46	Polish Mod Visit with SECDEF Cheney	11/10/92	11/16/92	DPD	OTHER	
50	GO Visit: Mil-To-Mil Update	11/24/92	12/05/92	GE	ECJ5	
49	Desert Storm Brief (TCT)	11/29/92		EDT	USAREUR	
182	Pilot Training Assessment Visit	12/16/92			ECSO	
65	Defense Budget TCT	12/31/92			JCS	
180	Air Defense Assessment Visit	01/05/93			USAFE	
181	Mil Assessment Team	01/06/93			EUCOM	
1	Polish Officer Visit to 7th ATC	03/10/93	03/26/93		USAREUR	
184	MLT/RAND Conf Visit	03/17/93			ECJ5	
2	Air Defense TCT	03/22/93	03/26/93	ADEF	USAFE	
3	Crisis Mgt Gaming Training TCT	03/22/93	03/26/93	GAME	USEUCOM	
5	Organization Tng TCT	03/30/93			USAREUR	
104	Col Olson Indoctrination Visit	04/21/93			EUCOM	
45	Firefighting FAM Tour to GE	04/26/93	04/30/93	FIRE	USAFE	
4	Information Security Tng TCT	05/03/93	05/07/93	INFO	OSD	
6	Range Survey/Flight Safety	05/10/93	05/14/93	RANG	USAFE	
7	Training Area Exchange to Poland	05/17/93	05/21/93	TNG	USAREUR	
8	EUCOM FAM Tour Exchange	05/17/93	05/18/93	MOD	USEUCOM	
9	FAM Tour Air Defense	05/17/93	05/18/93	AD	USAFE	
10	Chaplains Conference	05/24/93	05/26/93	CHAP	USEUCOM	
101	Personnel/Logistics Coord Conf	05/24/93			USAREUR	
103	Peacekeeping Visit	05/31/93			EUCOM	
183	Pers Mgt for Execs, Resource Staff	06/01/93			ECJ5	
11	Comm FAM Tour to CONUS	06/05/93	06/15/93	COMM	USEUCOM	
12	TCT Orientation	06/06/93			USEUCOM	
13	Leader and Soldier Tng TCT	06/07/93	06/11/93	TRU	USAREUR	
16	BALTOPS/SAR FAM Tour	06/14/93	06/18/93	EX	NAVEUR/DAO	
102	Engineering Conf	06/21/93			EUCOM	
21	Logistics TCT	06/28/93	07/01/93	LOG	USAREUR	
19	Unit Training Management TCT	06/29/93	07/03/93	TNG	USAREUR	
15	3d AF NCO Academy FAM Tour	07/05/93	07/09/93	NCO	USAFE	
20	USAFA Cadets Visit to Poland	07/05/93	07/09/93	AIR	USAFE	
22	BDE/BN Tng Mgt TCT	07/12/93	07/16/93	TNG	USAREUR	
166	Needs Assessment Conference	07/14/93			ECJ5-J	
17	Defense Planning (Corps) TCT	07/19/93	07/23/93	DEF	USAREUR	
53	Chaplain TCT	07/29/93	07/30/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
54	Quarterly Mil-to-Mil Visit	07/29/93	07/30/93	GE	ECJ5-J	
28	Logistics Depot FAM Tour	08/09/93	08/13/93	DMI	USAREUR	
27	BN/CO Training Mgt FAM Tour	08/23/93	08/27/93	TRU	USAREUR	
78	EUCOM Command Surgeon Gen Med FAM Tour	08/27/93	09/09/93	DMH	ECMD	
23	Defense Planning (Theater) TCT	09/01/93			JCS	
29	Legal Advisor Visit to Poland	09/01/93	09/03/93	LFL	USEUCOM	
36	Transportation Mgt TCT	09/01/93			USAREUR	
51	Personnel FAM Tour	09/01/93			USAFE	
100	Teachers of English Conference	09/01/93	09/09/93	TRG	EUCOM	
24	Civil Engineering TCT	09/07/93	09/11/93	DMI	USAFE	
39	Medical FAM Tour	09/07/93	09/11/93	DMH	USNAVEUR	
66	Explosive Ord Disposal Conf	09/07/93	09/17/93	DPO	ECJ5-J	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
18	GO Comd Surgeon Visit to Poland	09/10/93	09/11/93	DMH	USEUCOM	
41	Intl Minuteman Competition	09/10/93	09/13/93	GE	USAREUR	
14	Personnel Mgt TCT	09/13/93	09/17/93	PEM	USAREUR	
47	Airborne Training TCT	09/13/93	09/24/93	DPO	ECJ5-J	
168	CSAF Visit to Poland	09/13/93			ECJ5	
107	Bilateral Working Group	09/14/93			OSD	
110	GO Visit/Chief, Army Reserve Command	09/14/93	09/16/93	DPR	ECJ5-J	
112	Officer Accession Conference	09/19/93	09/24/93	TRO	ECJ5-J	
79	USEUCOM Lawyer Conference	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
52	Crisis Management/ModellinTCT	09/21/93			JCS	
105	TOPS IN BLUE/Poland 93	09/24/93	09/25/93	GE	EUCOM	
111	Polish Desk Off (State Dept) Visit	09/24/93			ECJ5-J	
30	Military Police TCT	09/27/93	10/01/93	LFP	USAREUR	
77	Command Historian Pre-TCT	09/27/93			ECJ1	
125	Dep Dir Visit to MLT	10/13/93	10/14/93	DPD	EUCOM	
170	Dep Cmdr, CAC, FMSO Visit	10/18/93	10/21/93	TRG	EUCOM	
33	BN/CO Training Mgt TCT	11/02/93	11/06/93	TRU	USAREUR	USAREUR
97	Chaplaincy TCT	11/09/93	11/12/93	PES	EUCOM	
123	Surgeons Conf (AMSUS)	11/14/93	11/19/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
131	Class A Fund Verification	11/16/93			EUCOM	
132	Gen Lennon, State Visit to Poland	11/16/93	11/17/93	DPD	EUCOM	
68	NAVEUR FAM Tour	11/22/93	11/24/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
37	Physical Security TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	DPO	USAFE	
70	C4 Assessment TCT	11/29/93	12/03/93	C2	EUCOM	
34	Law Enforcement FAM Tour	12/06/93	12/10/93	LFP	USAREUR	
177	Theater Scheduling Conf	12/07/93			EUCOM	
176	Legislative Process (Poland) Visit	12/10/93	12/12/93	LFA	EUCOM	
56	Armor BN Exchange to Poland	12/13/93	12/17/93	DPO	USAREUR	
156	Mil-to-Civ Transitioning Prog TCT	12/19/93	12/22/93	PEW	USAREUR	
164	Industrial Preparedness Plan TCT	01/05/94			EUCOM	
188	Mil Indoc Class	01/09/94			EUCOM	
126	Tng Area Mgt Gen Off to Poland	01/10/94			USAREUR	
129	Air Defense Artillery BN Exc to GE	01/10/94			USAREUR	
149	Pol-Mil Game Planning Visit	01/11/94			EUCOM	
147	Mil Oil/Lubricants FAM	01/17/94			EUCOM	
58	Aviation BN Exchange to Poland	01/24/94			USAREUR	
92	Field Artillery BN Exchange to GE	01/24/94			USAREUR	
127	Tng Area Mgt Gen Off to USAREUR	01/24/94			USAREUR	
186	NATO Comm FAM (Brussels)	01/24/94			EUCOM	
187	Deputy Director Bi-Monthly MLT Visit	01/26/94			EUCOM	
81	NA/NATO Chief of Chaplains Conf (FAM)	01/31/94			USEUCOM	
98	Environmental Protection TCT	01/31/94			EUCOM	
116	USAF Firefighting Recip Visit to Poland	01/31/94			USAFE	
144	Army Reserve Europe (ARCOM) FAM	02/04/94			USAREUR	
143	Navy/Coast Guard Survey Visit	02/07/94			NAVEUR	
171	Army Aviation Logistics Fac FAM	02/07/94			USAREUR	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
167	Army Trans Mgt FAM Tour	02/13/94			USAREUR	
55	Infantry BN Exchange to Poland	02/14/94			USAREUR	
190	Scheduling Conf/Team Ch Mtg	02/16/94			ECJ5-J	
135	CONUS FAA/Air Def FAM Tour	02/19/94			ECJ5-J	
150	Pol-Mil Crisis Mgt Game TCT	02/20/94			EUCOM	
57	Field Artillery Exchange to Poland	02/21/94			USAREUR	
153	Public Affairs TCT	02/28/94			EUCOM	
191	USEUCOM Command Chaplain Visit	03/01/94			ECJ5-J	
90	Infantry BN Exch to USAREUR	03/07/94			USAREUR	
91	Armor BN Exchange to USAREUR	03/07/94			USAFEUR	
73	AF SAR Ops FAM	03/09/94			USAFE	
136	AWACS Systems FAM Tour	03/13/94			USAFE	
200	Naval Aviation Logistic TCT	03/21/94			NAVEUR	
130	Cmdr 3 AF, 48 FW Visit to Poland	03/23/94			USAFE	
95	Combat Engr BN Exchange to GE	03/28/94			USAREUR	
172	Army Aviation Logistics Fac TCT	03/28/94			USAREUR	

Romania

69	HQ USEUCOM Counter Drug TCT	10/20/92			DEA	J-1,2,3
1	Aviation Medicine FAM Tour	03/29/93	04/03/93	MED	86 TFW	USAFE
15	Role of NCO and NCO Academy FAM Tour	04/13/93	04/16/93	EDT	USAREUR	
10	Col O'Connell to Iams	04/17/93	04/22/93	EDT		
5	Prof Henry C. Bartlett to NDC	04/19/93	04/23/93	EDT	NWC	
11	Professor Holman to Speak at Iams	04/19/93	04/24/94	EDT		
18	LOG/CE FAM Tour to Ramstein	05/03/93	05/08/93	LOG	86 TFW	USAFE
19	NDU Visit to Romania	05/03/93	05/06/93	EDT	USDAO	
21	Medical/Surgical Conference in GE	05/10/93	05/10/93	MED	ECMD	
26	Equal Opportunity FAM Tour	05/12/93	05/14/93	EO	USAREUR	
23	Orient for Romanian Counterparts	05/16/93	05/22/93	MISC	ECJ5-J	MLT
22	Ophthalmology Conf, Germany	05/17/93	05/21/93	MED	FFTMEDAC	ECMD
24	Resource Mgt TCT	05/17/93			ECCM	
12	Professor Hay to Iams	05/22/93				
29	Mildenhall Air Show	05/27/93			USAFE	
30	USAFE Chief of Staff Visit	06/01/93	06/09/93	DPD	USAFE	
6	Colonel Hailes Presentation to NDC	06/07/93	06/12/93	SRR	AWC	
7	Dr Stein, Air Univ, Presentation to NDC	06/07/93	06/18/93	AVN	AU	
32	Aviation Maintenance TCT	06/07/93			USAFE	
34	Aviation Maintenance and Safety FAM Tour	06/14/93				
35	Visit of Gen Maj Cernat to SOCEUR	06/14/93			SOCEUR	ECJ5-J
40	Garmisch TCT Orientation FAM Tour	06/14/94			EUCOM	
13	Unknown Speaker AWC to Iams	06/19/93				

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
8	Col Benton-Dr Guertner to speak at NDC	06/20/93	06/24/93	SRR	AU and AWC	
9	Prof Daniel and Col O'Connell to NDC	06/20/93	06/24/93	SRR		
71	Civil Defense I TCT	06/20/93	06/26/93	DPE	USAREUR	
25	Facility Engineering FAM Tour	06/21/93	06/25/93	ENG	USAREUR	
37	Ship Embarkation Training	06/21/93			NAVEUR	
163	AF Maintenance TCT	06/21/93	06/25/93	MAIN	USAFE	
2	Port Visit to Constanta II	06/22/93	06/25/93	GE	NAVEUR	6th Fleet
36	Port Visit/Passage Exercise	06/22/93			NAVEUR	
38	Logistics Management TCT	06/28/93			USAREUR	
159	4th of July Band TCT	07/01/93	07/07/93	BAND	USAFEUR	
99	Role of Chaplaincy	07/05/93	07/16/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
46	Public Affairs TCT	07/13/93	07/16/93	EDT	ECPA	
41	Military Justice TCT	07/19/93			ECLA	
154	Quality of Life Commander's TCT	07/19/93	07/23/93	LAW	ECLA	
84	Nuclear Accident Control I TCT	07/26/93	07/31/93	DPE	ECJ5-J	
101	Military History and Museums	07/26/93	07/30/93	DMC	USAREUR	
58	Naval Medicine	07/27/93	08/01/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
80	Organization and Training--INF	08/02/93			USAREUR	
62	Personnel Mgt in USAF	08/09/93	08/13/93	PEM	USAFE	
64	National Guard and Reserves	08/09/93	08/13/93	DPR	USAREUR	
180	Quarterly Sched Conf	08/11/93			ECJ5	
131	FAM Tour--Chaplaincy (Wash DC)	08/13/93	08/21/93	PES	ECJ5-J	
59	Navy Day Activities	08/14/93			NAVEUR	
119	Ops in Mountainous and Forested Terrain	08/15/93	08/21/93	EDT	USAREUR	3-325 ABN
72	Stockpile to Supply Room	08/22/93	08/28/93	DML	ECJ4	
103	Personnel Mgt in the USA TCT	08/23/93	08/27/93	PEM	USAREUR	
137	Comd Surgeon US Orientation FAM Tour	08/26/93	09/05/93	DMH	ECMD	
20	FAM Tour of AF NCO Academy	08/30/93	09/03/93	EDT	USAFE	
162	General Officer Visit--Sister Wing TCT	08/30/93	09/03/93	UEX	USAFE	
150	English as a Foreign Language FAM Tour	08/31/93	09/10/93	TRG	ECJ5	
82	Army Readiness Tng Equip FAM Tour	09/07/93			USAREUR	
90	Tng of Specialized Cat of Navy Pers	09/07/93	09/11/93	TNG	NAVEUR	
149	Explosive Ord Disposal FAM Tour	09/11/93	09/18/93	DPO	ECJ5	
92	Role of a Frigate I FAM Tour	09/12/93	09/17/93	DPO	NAVEUR	
66	Eye Tumors	09/13/93	09/17/93	DMH	ECMD	
86	Military Air Traffic Controllers	09/13/93	09/17/93	AMC	USAFE	
158	Org, Maint, and Tng in Mech Infantry BN	09/13/93	09/17/93	EDT	USAREUR	
28	Medical Assessment TCT	09/14/93	09/15/93	DMH	ECMD	
85	Army Training (ADA)	09/14/93			USAREUR	
87	Army Air Defense TCT	09/14/93	09/18/93	AMD	USAREUR	
136	C4 Assessment Coord Conf TCT	09/14/93	09/16/93	C2	ECJ6	MLT-ROM

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
39	Visit to US Gen Maj Popa, Acquisition	09/19/93			JCS J5PMA	ECJ5-J
155	Field Hospitals FAM Tour	09/19/93	09/25/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
100	Explosive Ordnance Disposal	09/20/93	09/26/93	DPO	ECJ5	
133	Legal Conference	09/20/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECLA	
130	USMC Operations Seminar--TCT	09/21/93	09/27/93	DPC	FMFEUR	
112	Fam Tour--Civil Defense II	09/22/93	09/24/93	DPE	USAREUR	
160	Army Readiness Equip Tng FAM Tour	09/22/93	09/24/93	TRF	USAREUR	
78	Leadership Training (Armor)	09/26/93			USAREUR	
135	Artillery Unit Exchange Visit	09/26/93	09/30/93	DPO	USAREUR	
132	Ophthalmology Conf	09/28/93	10/02/93	DMH	ECMD	
151	TOPS IN BLUE TCT	10/04/93	10/06/93	GE	AF BAND	
54	Physical Training TCT	10/18/93	10/22/93	TRU	USAREUR	
156	Leadership Tng at Armor Inst TCT	10/18/93			USAREUR	
94	Pilot Readiness Standards TCT	11/01/93	11/05/93	TRG	USAFE	
81	Military Music	11/05/93	11/10/93	GE	FMFEUR	USAFE
95	USMC Gen Officer Visit TCT	11/05/93	11/07/93	DPD	ECJ3	
91	Training of Marine Pers FAM Tour	11/14/93	11/21/93	TRO	FMFEUR	
117	Air Defense Site Ops TCT	11/15/93	11/19/93	AMD	USAFE	
138	Role and Mission of Mil Police TCT	11/15/93	11/19/93	LFP	USAREUR	
148	Brig Gen Lennon Visit	11/17/93	11/18/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
129	Navy Personnel Mgt FAM Tour	11/21/93	11/24/93	PEM	NAVEUR	
140	Natl Def Univ FAM Tour	12/05/93	12/11/93	TRE	NDU	EUCOM
141	Navy Hosp FAM Tour--Sigonella	12/06/93	12/10/93	DMH	NAVEUR	ECMD
144	Financial Mgt TCT	12/06/93	12/10/93	DMB	USAFE	USAREUR
171	Mil Med Hosps FAM Tour	12/06/93	12/12/93	DMH	NAVEUR	
145	Quarterly Scheduling Conf	12/07/93			ECJ5	
68	Public Affairs--FAM Tour	12/08/93	12/17/93	LFI	ECPA	ECJ5
170	Alabama National Guard FAM Tour	01/01/94			USAREUR	AL NG
147	Chaplaincy TCT II	01/04/94			ECJ5	
139	English Language Assessment TCT	01/08/94			J5-J	
67	Kophsurgery TCT	01/10/94			ECMD	
176	6th Fleet Port Visit Planning TCT	01/13/93			NAVEUR	
146	Navy Diving Symposium FAM Tour	01/16/94			NAVEUR	
173	BWG Visit	01/20/94			MLT	
177	Chief of Chaplain Conf	01/31/94			ECCH	
182	EUCOM Finance Staff Asst Visit	02/02/94			ECJ5	
76	US Mil Entrance Requirements FAM Tour	02/06/94			USAFE	
98	Oceanography and Meteorology TCT	02/06/94			NAVEUR	
169	Mountain Troops Winter FAM Tour	02/06/94			SOCEUR	USAREUR
33	Command, Control, Communications, and Computer FAM Tour	02/07/94			ECJ6	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
63	Nuclear Accident Control II TCT	02/12/94			EPD	ECMD and J4
142	Navy Fleet Logistics FAM Tour	02/14/94			NAVEUR	
174	Quarterly Sched Conf	02/15/94			EUCOM	
56	Ship Maint/Overhaul FAM Tour	02/22/94			NAVEUR	
128	Navy Surface and Subsur FAM Tour	02/22/94			NAVEUR	
178	Command Surgeon (GO Visit)	02/22/94			ECJ5-J	
209	EUCOM CE Safety Inspection TCT	02/22/94			EUCOM	
97	Air Force Logistics TCT	02/23/94			USAFE	
181	Military Chaplaincy III TCT	02/25/94			ECJ5	
45	Navy Aviation Med TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
52	Navy A/C Squadron Maint TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
55	Navy A/C Tng Procedures TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
89	Air Force C2 Systems TCT	02/28/94			USAFE	
113	Supply Operations FAM Tour	02/28/94			USAREUR	
166	From TA-50 to Toothpaste FAM	02/28/94			USAREUR	
187	Navy Aircraft Safety TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
193	Navy A/C Squadron Admin TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
194	Navy Patrol Squadron Ops TCT	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
229	Aircraft Visit: P-3	02/28/94			NAVEUR	
44	Search and Rescue TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
96	Destroyer Ops and Mission TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
134	SJA Mission FAM Tour	03/01/94			ECJ5-J	
175	Ship Visit II TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
189	Shipboard Maint Organ TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
190	Navy Shipboard Safety TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
191	Shipboard Medicine TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
192	Shipboard Organ TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
195	Lamps Aircraft TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
196	Shipboard Tng Procedures TCT	03/01/94			NAVEUR	
202	Natl Def Univ Lecture TCT	03/05/94			ECJ5-J	NDU
157	Artillery Exchange FAM Tour	03/07/94			USAREUR	
200	Dutch Multilateral Expert Visit	03/14/94			ECJ5	NATO
201	Army War College Lecture (TCT)	03/14/94			USAREUR	NDU
184	Brig Gen Lennon Visit	03/21/94			ECJ5	
188	EUCOM Historian Visit TCT	03/21/94			ECJ5-J	
207	Financial Mgt II FAM Tour	03/28/94			USAFE	

Slovenia

11	TCT Joint Binational Staff Tng	11/30/93	12/01/93	GE	MLT	EUCOM
2	TCT Military Faculty Devel	12/02/93	12/18/93	TRE	USAREUR	NGB
1	FAM Quarterly Scheduling Conf	12/07/93			ECJ5-J	
4	TCT Production of Tng Films and Videos	12/13/93	12/17/93	TRF	USAREUR	WISE
5	TCT Infantry Officer Tactics	12/13/93	12/17/93	DPO	USAREUR	SETAF
3	FAM Colorado Natl Guard Visit	12/15/93	12/19/93	DPR	NGB	TAG CO
9	TCT GO Visit to Slovenia	12/16/93	12/17/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
6	FAM Infantry, Armor/AT, Field Artillery	01/01/94			HQDA	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
10	TCT C4 Assessment	01/04/94			EUCOM	ECJ6
8	TCT Component Representatives	01/15/94			EUCOM	MLT
12	FAM Strategic Studies Center	01/19/94			USAREUR	DA and USAWC
7	FAM Air Def Artillery and Air Traffic Contr	01/24/94			HQDA/SAF	
17	FAM NATO Comm and Info System	01/24/94			ECJ6	ECJ5-J
13	FAM CO NG Academy	01/27/94			NGB	COARNG
14	TCT Joint Staff Devel II	01/31/94			MLT	
33	TCT Joint Staff Development	01/31/94			USAREUR	
30	TCT Senior Officer Educ and Tng	02/01/94			USAREUR	
31	TCT Natl and Regional Strategy	02/01/94			USAREUR	
16	TCT Role of Armed Forces in Demo	02/13/94			USAREUR	353 CA
50	FAM Scheduling Conference	02/15/94			ECJ5	
22	TCT Office of the Inspector General	03/07/94			USAREUR	
29	USAF NCO Academy Visit FAM	03/14/94			USAFE	
28	TCT Advanced Public Affairs	03/15/94			ECPA	
42	Basic and Advanced Infantry Tng	03/20/94			FMFEUR	
24	FAM Site Survey	03/21/94			SOCEUR	
51	TCT Military Faculty Devel: Disc	03/21/94			ECJ5	
23	TCT Correspondence Study	03/28/94			USAREUR	

Slovakia

9	General Officer Comm FAM	06/10/93	06/15/93	C2	ECJ5-J	
67	Mil Engineering Conf FAM	06/21/93			ECJ5-J	
6	General Officer Visit	07/27/93	07/27/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
11	MLT Forward Insertion	08/16/93	08/16/93		ECJ5-J	
15	MLT Training	08/20/93			ECJ5-J	
25	English Teachers' Conf	08/31/93	08/31/93	TRG	ECJ5-J	
21	MLT Insertion	09/01/93			ECJ5-J	
30	Off Accession/NCO Devel Conf	09/19/93	09/24/93	TRO	USAFE	
55	Bilaterals	09/20/93	09/21/93	DPD	ECJ5-J	
32	Legal Conf	09/24/93	09/24/93	LFL	ECJ5-J	
37	TOPS IN BLUE	10/13/93	10/13/93	GE	USAFE	
56	GO (Gen McPeak, CSAF) Visit	10/15/93			USAFE	
50	Legislative Affairs TCT	11/01/93	11/05/93	LFA	ECJ5-J	
51	Legal Affairs	11/10/93	11/10/93	LFL	ECJ5-J	
3	DV Belohorska FAM	11/22/93			ECJ5-J	
81	Mil Educ TCT	12/05/93	12/10/93	TRE	USAREUR	
60	Quarterly Scheduling Conf, Dec 93	12/06/93			ECJ5-J	
4	Polomka Visit	12/07/93			ECJ5-J	
35	Security Pol/Mil Police Assess TCT	01/10/94			USAFE	
29	Resolving Tng Range Disputes TCT	01/24/94			ECJ5-J	
24	Legal Court Martial (ECJ5-J) FAM	01/25/94			ECJ5-J	
12	Be All You Can Be, Physical Fitness TCT	01/31/94			USAREUR	
2	Airspace Mgt Colson FAA TCT	02/02/94			FAA	

#	Title	Dates		Focus	OPR	OSR
		Begin	End			
78	GO Visit Lennon/Olson TCT	02/02/94			ECJ5-J	
5	Personnel Mgt in the USA TCT	02/07/94			USAREUR	
52	Force Modernization TCT	02/07/94			USAREUR	
45	Extreme Cold Weather Ops FAM	02/13/94			SOCEUR	
38	Airfield Maintenance TCT	02/14/94			USAFE	
47	SOCEUR General Officer Visit TCT	02/20/94			SOCEUR	
54	Public Affairs TCT	02/20/94			ECJ5-J	
28	Pilot Readiness/Flt Clinic TCT	03/01/94			USAFE	
79	Indiana National Guard Initial TCT	03/12/94			ECJ5-J	
31	Joint USA/USAF Mil Pol/Sec Pol TCT	03/13/94			USAREUR	
26	Country Desk Officer/Finance TCT	03/14/94			ECJ5-J	
57	Military Festival in Nitra TCT	03/18/94			USAREUR	
72	Environ Protection in US Mil TCT	03/21/94			USAFE	
36	USAF Simulators TCT	03/28/94			USAFE	
44	Veterinary TCT	03/28/94			USAREUR	
33	Airspace Mgt/ATC TCT	03/29/94			USAFE	

Multi-Country

1	Airspace Management Conf	01/01/93			ECJ5	
3	Chaplains Conference	01/01/93			ECCH	
2	Engineers Conf #1	03/01/93			ECJ4	
23	Medical Conference #1	05/01/93			ECJD	
22	Engineers Conf #2	06/01/93			ECJ4	
10	Reserve Component	07/01/93			ECJ5	
21	English Language Tng	08/15/93			ECJ5	
7	Command Surgeon FAM	08/23/93			ECMD	
4	TOPS IN BLUE	09/13/93			ECJ5	
5	Explosive Ord Disposal Conf	09/13/93			ECJ5	
6	Emergency Planning	09/13/93			ECJ5	
9	Officer Accessions, NCO PME	09/13/93			ECJ5	
8	Legal Conference	09/20/93			ECLA	
11	US Chaplains Conf	09/20/93			ECJ5	
15	Latvia Leadership Conf in Stuttgart GE	02/14/94			ECJ5-J	ECJ5
18	TM Chief Conf in Stuttgart GE	02/14/94			ECJ5-J	
17	National Guard/USAR Spt for Mil-Mil Relationship	03/01/94			NGB	USAR

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

10 SFG	10 th Special Forces Group
1LT	First Lieutenant (USA)
1 st Lt	First Lieutenant (USAF)
7 MEDC	7 th Medical Command (USAREUR)
86 TFW	86 Tactical Fighter Wing
AADCOM	Army Air Defense Command
A/C	Aircraft
ACJCS	Assistant Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
ACQUIS	Acquisition
ADA	Air Defense Artillery
ADC	Air Defense Command (USA)
ADEF	Air Defense
AEACC	Commander, US Army Europe
AEAGX	Chief of Staff, US Army Europe
AGR	Active Guard and Reserve (USA)
ALS	Airman Leadership School
AMB	Air Mission Brief (USA) and Ambassador
AMC	Army Materiel Command (USA), Air Mobility Command (AMC)
AMD	Aerospace Medical Division (USAF)
AMEMB	American Embassy
ARCOM	Army Reserve Command
AREUR	Army Europe (US)
ARMETCO	Army Materiel Command (USA)
ARNG	Army National Guard
AT	Antiterrorism
ATC	Air Training Command (USAF), Army Training Command
AU	Air University (USAF)
AWC	Anti Submarine Warfare Chief (CPO)
BALTOPS	Baltic Operations (NATO Exercise)
BANDFUND	Band Funds, US European Command
BDE	Brigade
BG	Brigadier General (USA)
BMC	Boatswain Mate Chief (CPO)
BN	Battalion
BN/CO	Battalion Commanding Officer
Brig Gen	Brigadier General (USAF)
BWG	Bilateral Working Group
C4	Command, Control, Communications, and Computers
CAC	Combat Arms Command (USA)
CAPT	Captain (USN)
CDR	Commander (USN)
CH53	Transport Helicopter

CHOD	Chief of Defense
CI	Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (NATO Focus Code)
CI2	Command and Control in the Armed Forces (NATO Focus Code)
CII	Information Systems (NATO Focus Code)
CIO	Central Imagery Office
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CIT	Computerization (NATO Focus Code)
civ	Civilian
CJCS	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
CME	Crisis Management Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
CMH	Center for Military History (USA)
CMO	Civil-Military Operations, General Concept of Peacekeeping Operations (NATO Focus Code)
CNG	Commander, National Guard
CO	Commanding Officer (USA), Company
COARNG	Colorado Air National Guard
Col	Colonel (USAF and USMC)
COL	Colonel (USA)
COMSOCEUR	Commander, Special Operations Command, US European Command
CONUS	Continental United States
CPO	Chief Petty Officer (USN)
CPT	Captain (USA)
CRA	Continuing Resolution Authority
CSA	Chief of Staff of the Army
CSAF	Chief of Staff of the Air Force
CSCE	Council on Security and Cooperation
CTARNG	Connecticut Army National Guard
CTPO	Contact Team Program Office
CW1	Chief Warrant Officer 1 (USA)
CW2	Chief Warrant Officer 2 (USA)
CW3	Chief Warrant Officer 3 (USA)
CW4	Chief Warrant Officer 4 (USA)
DAO	Defense Attaché Office
DC	District of Columbia
DCINC	Deputy Commander in Chief
DCINCEUR	Deputy Commander in Chief of European Command
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
DECA	Defense Electronics and Communications Agency
DES	Depot System, Fleet Marine Forces, Europe
DJS	Director of the Joint Staff
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DM	Defense Management (NATO Focus Code)
DMB	Budgets and Finances (NATO Focus Code)
DMC	Military History (NATO Focus Code)
DMD	Planning and Management (NATO Focus Code)
DMH	Military Medicine (NATO Focus Code)
DMI	Infrastructure (NATO Focus Code)

DML	Logistics (NATO Focus Code)
DMN	Defense Industry (NATO Focus Code)
DMS	Standardization (NATO Focus Code)
DMT	Mapping/Surveys (NATO Focus Code)
DoD	Department of Defense
DOS	Department of State
DPC	Defense Planning Committee (NATO), Concept Forces Issues (NATO Focus Code)
DPD	Policy Issues (NATO Focus Code)
DPE	Civil Emergency Planning (NATO Focus Code)
DPO	Operational Matters (NATO Focus Code)
DPR	Reserve Forces (NATO Focus Code)
DPQ	Mobilization (NATO Focus Code)
DPS	Structure of Armed Forces (NATO Focus Code)
DPX	Military Intelligence (NATO Focus Code)
DUSD	Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
EC	European Command (US)
ECCE	Commander in Chief, US European Command
ECCH	Chaplain, US European Command
ECSS	Chief of Staff, US European Command
ECDC	Deputy Commander, US European Command
ECIG	Inspector General, US European Command
ECJ1	Directorate of Manpower, Personnel, and Administration, US European Command
ECJ4	Directorate of Logistics and Security Assistance, US European Command
ECJ5	Directorate of Plans and Policy, US European Command
ECJ5-J	Contact Team Program Office, US European Command
ECLA	Judge Advocate, US European Command
ECMD	Surgeon, US European Command
ECPA	Public Affairs, US European Command
ECSSO-J5	Director of Special Operations, US European Command
EDT	Education and Training (NATO Focus Code)
ENC	Clean-up of Nuclear Pollution (NATO Focus Code)
EO	Executive Officer
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
EPD	Environmental Protection and Disasters (NATO Focus Code)
ETC	Electronic Technician Chief (CPO)
EUCAP	EUCOM Coordination and Assistance Program
EUCOM	US European Command
EUCOM J6	Director of Command, Control, and Communications, US European Command
EX	Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
EXC	Conduct of Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
EXD	Design/Plan of Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
EXE	Evaluation of Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
EXJ	Joint Exercises (NATO Focus Code)
EXM	Computer Assisted Exercises (NATO Focus Code)

FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAM tour	Familiarization Tour
FTMEDAC	Frankfurt Medical Activity, Germany, US Army Europe
FLT	Flight
FLTC-E	Foreign Language Training Center-Europe
FMFEUR	Fleet Marine Force Europe
FMSO	Foreign Military Sale Office
FSU	Fire and Safety Unit (USCG)
FT	Familiarization Tour
GE	Germany, General (NATO Focus Code)
GEA	General Support/Information (NATO Focus Code)
GEN	General (USA)
GO	General Officer
HHDF	Hungarian Home Defense Forces
HMC	Hospital Corpsman Chief (CPO)
HQ	Headquarters
HQDA	Headquarters Department of the Army
HT1	Hull Technician First Class (PO1)
HU	Hungary, Humanitarian Issues (NATO Focus Code)
HUM	Civil/Military Cooperation (NATO Focus Code)
HUS	Search and Rescue Operations (NATO Focus Code)
IG	Inspector General
IMET	International and Military Education and Training
IWG	Interagency Working Group
J-5	Directorate of Strategic Plans and Policy
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JCTP	Joint Contact Team Program
JNA	Yugoslav Federal Army
JS	Joint Staff
LAT NG	Latvia National Guard
LAW	Light Anti-tank Weapon
LCDR	Lieutenant Commander (USN)
LF	Legal Framework (NATO Focus Code)
LFA	Low Frequency Active
LFB	Democratic Control of Armed Forces (NATO Focus Code)
LFC	Civil/Military Relationships (NATO Focus Code)
LFD	Civilian ministry of defense organization in a democracy (NATO Focus Code)
LFI	Military Press and Information (NATO Focus Code)
LFL	Military Law (NATO Focus Code)
LFP	Military Police Organization (NATO Focus Code)
LFR	Military Personnel Categories (NATO Focus Code)
LOG	Logistics
LT	Lieutenant (USA)

Lt Col	Lieutenant Colonel (USAF)
LTC	Lieutenant Colonel (USA)
LtCol	Lieutenant Colonel (USMC)
Maj	Major (USAF and USMC)
MAJ	Major (USA)
Maj Gen	Major General (USAF)
MDARNG	Maryland Army National Guard
MDNG	Maryland National Guard
MED	Medical
MG	Major General (USA)
MIARNG	Michigan Army National Guard
MIL	Military
MING	Michigan National Guard
MISC	Miscellaneous
MLT	Military Liaison Team
MP	Military Police
MSG	Master Sergeant (USA)
MSgt	Master Sergeant (USAF)
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NAV LEGA	Navy Legal
NCO	Noncommissioned Officer
NCOIC	Noncommissioned Officer in Charge
NDC	National Defense College
NDU	National Defense University
NG	National Guard (ANG or ARNG)
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NSC	National Security Council
NSWU-2	Naval Special Warfare Unit-2 (USN)
NTSEC	National Security
NWC	National War College
NYARNG	New York Army National Guard
ODT	Overseas Deployment Training (USA)
ODUSD/EP	Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for European Policy
OPR	Office of Primary Responsibility
OSAF	Office of the Secretary of the Air Force
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
OSR	Office of Secondary Responsibility
PA	Public Affairs
PAARNG	Pennsylvania Army National Guard
PBD	Program Budget Decision
PE	Personnel Issues (NATO Focus Code)
PEM	Personnel Management (NATO Focus Code)
PES	Personnel Welfare (NATO Focus Code)

PEW	Other Personnel Issues (NATO Focus Code)
PMA	Politico-Military Affairs
PME	Primary Mission Equipment (USA) or Professional Military Education
PNC	Personnelman Chief (CPO)
PO1	Petty Officer 1 (USN)
PR1	Parachute Rigger First Class (PO1)
REFORGER	NATO Exercise
RM1	Radioman First Class (PO1)
SAF	Secretary of the Air Force
SAF/IA	Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs
SECDEF	Secretary of Defense
SETAF	Southern European Task Force (USA)
SF	Special Forces
SFC	Sergeant First Class (USA)
SGT	Sergeant (USA)
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
SKAT	<i>Savonoriskoji Krasto Apsaugos Tarnyba</i> (Lithuanian Home Guard)
SNCO	Senior Noncommissioned Officer
SOCEUR	Special Operations Command, Europe
SP	Security Police
SPC	Specialist (USA)
SR	Strategy (NATO Focus Code)
SRC	Strategic Reconnaissance Center
SRR	Systems Requirements Review
SSgt	Staff Sergeant (USAF)
SSGT	Staff Sergeant (USA)
TAG	The Adjutant General (USA)
TCT	Traveling Contact Team
TDY	Temporary Duty
TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command (USA)
TR	Training (NATO Focus Code)
TRA	Air Defense Training (NATO Focus Code)
TRE	Organizational Issues for Training (NATO Focus Code)
TRF	Training Material (NATO Focus Code)
TRG	Training in General (NATO Focus Code)
TRH	Training in National Schools (NATO Focus Code)
TRM	Training for Civilian Duties (NATO Focus Code)
TRO	Officer/NCO Training (NATO Focus Code)
TRR	Reserve Forces Training (NATO Focus Code)
TRU	Troop/Unit Training (NATO Focus Code)
UEX	Unit Exchange
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States Army
USACAPOC	United States Army Civil Affairs Point of Contact
USAF	United States Air Force

USAFA	United States Air Force Academy
USAFE	United States Air Forces in Europe
USAFR	United States Air Force Reserve
USAMMCE	US Army Medical Material Center—Europe
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USAREUR	United States Army Europe
USARI	United States Army Russian Institute
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USCGR	United States Coast Guard Reserve
USCINCEUR	Commander in Chief, United States European Command
USDAO	US Defense Attaché Office
USDP	Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
USEUCOM	United States European Command
USIA	United States Information Agency
USMC	United States Marine Corps
USMCR	United States Marine Corps Reserve
USN	United States Navy
USNAVEUR	United States Naval Forces, United States European Command
USNMR	United States National Military Representative
USNR	United States Naval Reserve
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WISE	Visual Information Service, Europe
YN1	Yeoman First Class (PO1)

INDEX

- Air defense: 8, 25-26, 28-29, 47-48, 51
Air traffic control: 8, 43, 47-48, 51, 58
Akhromyev, Marshal Sergi (U.S.S.R.): 4
Alabama National Guard: 20
Albania: 6, 14-17, 20, 29-31, 51, 53, 71-72
Aldrich, Maj. David M., USAF: 30
Alloway, Col. Lee C., USAF: 53-54
Ambassadors
 to Albania: 30
 to Belarus: 19
 to Bulgaria: 40-41
 and country work plans: 20-21, 25-26, 28, 30-31, 40-41, 43
 to Czech Republic: 42-43
 to Estonia: 17
 to Hungary: 4, 16, 25-27
 and in-country teams: 11, 25-28
 input into planning: 8
 to Latvia: 17, 32
 to Lithuania: 17
 to Poland: 16, 28
 to Slovenia: 17-18
 to Ukraine: 19
Anderson, Col. Gary L., USAF: 45-46
Andrejcek, Imrich: 44
Arizona National Guard: 20
Armenia: 3
Arms control, promotion of: 5
Arms sales to third world countries: 5
Army Air Defense Command (AADCOM), 32d: 20
Army Reserve Commands (ARCOMs): 19-20
Army Reserve officers: 31, 34-35
Austria: 2
- Babick, SSgt. Robert P., USAF: 42
Barziloski, COL Robert V., PAARNG: 35-36
Base administration: 35
Basora, Adrian A.: 42-43
Baudys, Antonin: 42-44
Belarus: 15, 18-20, 48-49, 72-73
Belohorska, Irene: 45
Berisha, Sali: 30
Bilateral Working Groups: 6, 11
 Hungary: 25-26
 Poland: 16, 29
 Slovak Republic: 45
 Ukraine: 19
Biro, Maj. Gen. Janusz (Hungary): 25
Birznieks, MAJ John A., USAR: 31
Bochtler, SPC Edwin R., USA: 40
Boros, Col. Louis, USMC: 27
Bratislava, Slovak Republic: 17, 44, 53
Bubesi, Col. Akil: 30
Bucharest, Romania: 38
- Budapest, Hungary: 2, 4, 6, 13, 16, 20, 25-26, 53
Budgets: 14-15, 18, 52
Bulgaria: 6, 14-17, 20, 40-41, 51, 53, 73
Burleigh, CW3 Thomas W., USA: 31
Bush, George H. W.: 3, 9
Byelorussia: 3
- California National Guard: 20
Central Intelligence Agency: 4
Chamberlin, Col. Gary G., USAF: 40-41
Charles University: 44
Cheadle, MAJ Bruce A., USA: 38
Chelberg, Lt. Gen. Robert D., USAF: 7-8, 12, 16-17
Cheney, Richard B.: 6, 25, 59-60
Chiotea, Lt. Col. Marin (Romania): 38
Christman, Walter: 59-60
CINC Initiative Fund: 14
Citizen-soldier, role-modeling of the: 19, 25, 32-35
Civil defense: 8, 39, 47
Civil engineering: 30, 35, 40-41, 43, 51
Civilian leadership, development of: 30, 43
Clinton, William J.: 15
Clinton administration: 18
Colee, PNC Clifton H., USA: 33-34
Colorado National Guard: 20
Commonwealth of Independent States: 9
Communications: 8, 11, 26, 35, 40-41, 43, 51
Computers: 43
Conaway, Lt. Gen. John B.: 17, 19, 34
Concheff, CW3 Jon W., USA: 47
Contact Team Program Office: 11, 12, 53-54
 and country work plans: 20-21, 50-51
 and George C. Marshall Center: 58, 60
 staffing of: 12-13
 and support for liaison teams: 52-53
Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty
 Implementation Act: 18
Cornell, Maj. Timothy J., USMC: 40
Cost estimates: 14-15
Council on Security and
Cooperation in Europe (CSCE): 10
Country desk officers: 11, 51, 53
Country work plans
 Albania: 30
 approval of: 16, 20-21
 Bulgaria: 40-41
 Czech Republic: 42-43
 development of: 50-51, 53
 Estonia: 34-35
 Hungary: 16, 25-26
 Latvia: 32-33
 Lithuania: 36-37
 Poland: 28
 Romania: 38-39

Slovak Republic: 45-46
 Slovenia: 47-48
 Cronenberg, 1LT William, USAR: 34
 Crowe, Admiral William J., Jr., USN: 4
 Czarnecki, Col. Waldemar (Poland): 28
 Czech Republic: 6, 15-17, 20, 41-44, 51, 74-76
 Czechoslovakia: 2, 4-8, 10, 16, 41-42, 44

Davey, MG John M., USA: 7, 12, 16
 Deak, Lt. Gen. Janos (Hungary): 27
 Deets, MAJ Jesse, PAARNG: 35
 Defense Intelligence Agency: 4
 Defense Language Institute: 31
 Defense reorganization: 6
 Defense Security Assistance Agency: 9, 15
 Deming, Lt. Col. Russell A., USAF: 35
 Democracies, military role in: 5, 8-10, 19-20, 25, 30-31, 34-35, 38-39, 42-43, 47, 51, 54, 57-58
 Deal, COL William J., Jr., USAR: 42
 Dimitrov, Lt. Col. Dimitre G. (Bulgaria): 40-41
 Disaster relief: 29, 36-37, 47
 Dobrota, Sgt. 1st Class Gabriel (Romania): 38
 Donnelly, Chris: 57-58
 Duda, Maj. John, USMC: 35

Einseln, Brig. Gen. Aleksander (Estonia): 34
 Environmental protection: 36, 43, 47
 Equipment

- excess USEUCOM used by JCTP: 52-53
- maintenance training: 26, 39
- requests by program countries for excess: 25-26, 52

 Estonia: 2-3, 6, 8, 14-17, 19-20, 33-35, 51
 EUCOM Coordination and Assistance Program (EUCAP): 8, 10-11
 European Center for Security Studies: 59
 Explosive ordnance disposal: 32

Facilitating teams

- for Belarus: 18-19, 48-49
- for Ukraine: 18-19, 48-49

 Familiarization tours: 20-21, 51

- by Albanians: 30
- by Belarussians: 49
- by Czechs: 42-43
- by Estonians: 35
- by Hungarians: 26
- by Latvians: 32-33
- by Lithuanians: 37
- by Poles: 29
- by Romanians: 39
- by Slovaks: 46
- by Slovenes: 48

 Farkas, COL Frank, USA: 25, 27
 Ferguson, SFC John M., USA: 37
 Fleet Marine Force Europe (FMFEUR): 7, 21

Floods: 37
 Force planning: 26, 51
 Foreign Language Training Center: 57
 Fort Benning, Ga.: 4
 Fort Devens, Mass.: 37
 Foster, MAJ John N., USA: 34
 Foursha, CAPT Sammy L., USNR: 38
 France: 4
 Frank, ETC Paul C., USN: 38
 Freeman, COL Richard L., USA: 30-31
 Fur, Lajos: 25

Galvin, General John R.: 7-10, 16, 58-60
 Gambolati, COL Ronald L., USAR: 48
 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany: 57-58, 60
 Gavelis, SFC Rimas R., USAR: 35
 General or flag officer exchanges: 4, 7
 George C. Marshall Center: 57-60
 Georgia: 2, 3
 German Democratic Republic: 2, 4
 Germany, Federal Republic of: 2, 4, 59-60
 Global Cooperative Initiative: 15
 Gola, SFC Richard A., USA: 30
 Gorbachev, Mikhail S.: 1-3
 Grafenwoehr, Germany: 43
 Grice, SGT Angela C., USA: 31
 Gripman, LCDR William, USNR: 34
 Grudyzinski, Przemyslaw: 28
 Gulf War: 26, 50

Hammersen, LTC Frederick P. A., USA: 7-8, 12, 58-59
 Hamrick, HT1 Stephen L., USN: 35
 Harris, LCDR Norman G., USN: 38
 Hinds, CPT Patrick, PAARNG: 35
 Host countries

- costs to: 8, 48
- and country work plans: 20-21
- and English-language qualified personnel: 14, 25, 30-31, 34, 45, 47-49, 52
- and office space: 14, 25, 30-32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 47
- personnel assigned to liaison teams: 14

 Human rights, respect for: 9, 50-51
 Humanitarian assistance, development of forces for: 29-30, 47
 Hungarian-American Bilateral Working Group: 25-26
 Hungarian Home Defense Forces: 25-27
 Hungary: 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-16, 19-20, 25-27, 51, 76-80
 Hutchings, Maj. Robert N., Jr., USAF: 47

Ignalina power plant: 37
 Illinois National Guard: 20
 In-country teams: 8, 10-11.
 See also Military liaison teams.

Indiana National Guard: 20
Indicianskis, 1st Lt. Arturas (Lithuania): 20, 36
Infantry division, 3d: 26
Information security: 28
Interagency Working Group on United States-East
European defense
and military relations: 4-7, 9, 11
approval of expanding JCTP to Baltic states:
16-17
approval of specific events: 9-10, 20-21
approval of staff exchanges: 7-8
and Czech Republic: 42
goals: 5, 9, 11
and military liaison teams: 13, 16-18,
20-21, 42, 44
and Slovak Republic: 44
and Slovenia: 47
International Military Education and Training
program: 48
Italy: 4

Jansa, Janez: 47-48
Johnson, MAJ Debra A., USA: 48
Joint Chiefs of Staff
and approval of country work plans: 16
and funding for JCTP: 14-15
and IWG: 6
and military contacts with Russia: 18
and military-to-military contacts: 4, 9-10, 12
Joint Contact Team Program: 7, 57
and Baltic states: 16-17
charter: 9-10
Contact Team Program Office.
See Contact Team Program Office.
deputy director: 12, 15-16
expenditures: 15
funding for: 45, 52-53
military liaison teams.
See Military liaison teams.
and National Guardsmen: 34
policy guidance for: 10-11
program extensions: 27, 29
and reservists: 34
traveling contact teams.
See Traveling contact teams.
use of funds: 18, 20-21
Joint Staff Directorate of Strategic Plans and
Policy: 8-10, 16
Jonkoff, Maj. Viktor, USAF: 25

Kazakhstan: 2-3, 20
Kiev, Ukraine: 18-19
Kivi, CPT Arno, USA: 34
Klipich, BMC Richard D., Jr., USN: 34
Kogle, LTC Mark L., USA: 42
Koppa, COL Wayne C., MIARNG: 31

Language requirements: 59
and liaison teams: 13-14, 30-31, 34-35
and National Guard units: 19, 34
and specialist contacts: 44, 52
Language training: 48, 57, 59
Lantzky, LTC Inguar-Erich, NYARNG: 33-34
Latvia: 2-3, 6, 8, 14-17, 19-20, 31-33, 51, 80-81
Lennon, Brig. Gen. Thomas J., USAF: 12, 15-19,
34, 40, 42, 44-45, 47-50, 53-54
Libby, I. Lewis "Scooter": 17, 38
Lich, LTC Glen E., USAR: 38
Lithuania: 2-3, 6, 8, 14-17, 19-20, 35-37, 51-52,
82-83
Livermore, Capt. Carl D., USAF: 48
Ljubljana, Slovenia: 18, 47, 53
Logistics: 8, 11, 26, 28, 34-37, 39-41, 43, 47, 51
Longstreet, CAPT Lizann, USNR: 45-46
Lorincz, Col. Gen. Kalman (Hungary): 25

Marine pollution: 35
Maritime operations: 51
Market economics, promotion of: 5, 9
Marksmanship teams: 4
Marshall, George C.: 57
Maryland National Guard: 19-20, 34-35
Matyus, Maj. Zoltan (Hungary): 25
McCarthy, General James P.: 7-8, 12, 15-16
McDonald, CW2 Marva E., Jr., USA: 40
Medical Command, 7th: 26
Melsha, Maj. Joel E., USAF: 42
Michigan Army National Guard: 19-20, 31-33
Military and security police: 8
Military chaplains: 5-6, 8, 11, 34-35, 39, 43-44,
50-51, 54
Military contracting: 26, 33
Military education and training: 8, 11, 28, 30,
32-35, 37, 39-41, 43, 47-48, 51, 54
Military finance: 11, 26, 29
Military historians: 4-5, 38, 52
Military justice and law: 5, 8, 11, 26, 30, 32-37,
39, 43, 45-47, 51
Military liaison teams: 11, 53-54
Albania: 17, 30-31
Belarus: 48-49
composition of: 11, 13, 34-35
and country work plans: 20-21
Czech Republic: 17
Estonia: 17, 33-35
housing for: 30, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 47
Hungary: 11, 13, 16, 25-27
and language requirements: 13-14, 30-31,
34-35
Latvia: 17, 31-33
Lithuania: 17, 35-37
office space for. See Office space.
Poland: 16, 27-29
Romania: 17
Slovak Republic: 17, 45

Slovenia: 17-18, 47-48
support for: 11, 38, 44, 52-53
training of: 11
transparency of: 50
Military medicine: 8, 11, 26, 32, 36-37, 39-41,
43, 49, 51
Military police: 43
Military reorganizations: 25-28, 30, 37, 39, 42-43,
51, 54
Military surgeons: 5, 6, 38
Military-to-military contacts.
See also Military liaison teams.
approval of: 8-10, 18, 42
funding of: 18
guidelines for: 5, 10
JCS role in: 6-9, 11
objectives of: 9
planning for: 5-6, 8-12
role of USEUCOM in: 7-8, 10, 12, 48
Warsaw Pact-U.S.: 3-5
Miller, William G.: 19
Minsk, Belarus: 18-19, 48-49
Moldova: 3, 15, 18
Moon, COL Owen W., MIARNG: 31-32
Mukaj, SGT Tomor, NYARNG: 30

National Guard Bureau: 16-17, 19-20, 31-34
National Security Council: 4
Naval infantry: 39
Nekvasil, Gen. Maj. Jiri (Czech Republic): 42
New York Army National Guard: 19-20, 30, 34
Njegovan, SFC Nick, USA: 48
Noncommissioned officers
development of: 27, 29-30, 33, 36-37, 48,
51, 54
on liaison teams: 13
use of: 50
Noonan, Capt. Timothy R., USMC: 38
North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC):
10, 16, 57-58
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO):
4, 10, 28, 30, 37, 42-43, 53-54, 57-59
Novotny, Frantisek: 43-44
Nuclear weapons: 5, 9
Nunn-Lugar law: 18, 48

Office of the Assistant Secretary of State for
European and Canadian Affairs: 9
Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD): 4, 9, 16
Office space
provided by embassies: 31
provided by host countries: 14, 25, 30-32, 34,
36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 47
Officer and enlisted relationships: 26, 36-37, 50
Ohio National Guard: 19-20
Olaru, Lt. Col. Iordache (Romania): 38
Olson, Maj. Frederic M., USMC: 35

Palmer, Robie M. H.: 4
Partnership for Peace program: 53-54
Patch Barracks, FRG: 12
Paulauskas, LTC Stanley, USAR: 35
Paulus, SSG John S., III, USA: 48
Peacekeeping forces, development of: 26, 30, 42-43
Pennsylvania National Guard: 19-20, 35, 37
Performance evaluation: 26-27
Personnel management: 8, 26-27, 34-35, 39-41,
43, 47, 51
Peterson, CAPT Gordon I., Jr., USN: 51
Physical fitness programs: 26-27, 29, 49
Ploompoo, CPT Andres H., USAR: 34
Poland: 4-8, 14-16, 20, 27-29, 51, 83-87
Pollitt, CDR Gary R., USN: 51
Port safety and security: 30, 34-35
Powell, General Colin L.: 8-12, 16, 26, 43-44, 59
Prague, Czechoslovakia: 6, 43-44, 53
Preston, SFC Russell E., USA: 42, 45
Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
for Plans: 6
Proctor, SSgt. Michael S., USAF: 42
Public affairs: 11, 26, 32, 34-35, 39, 40-41,
43, 51
Puerto Rican National Guard: 48

Reagan, Ronald W.: 3
Reserve organizations: 12, 16-17, 19-20
Resource management: 8, 11, 26, 43
Rich, Lt. Col. Glen E., USAF: 47
Riga, Latvia: 30-31
Rimoczi, Capt. Zsolt G., USAF: 25
Role model, US military presented as: 5
Romania: 2, 5-6, 15-17, 20, 38-39, 51, 87-90
Ross, Col. Steven J., USAF: 7, 12
Russia: 3, 15, 18

Saint, General Crosbie E., USA: 58
Saramago, CPT Julian C., USA: 45
Scheiner, Lt. Col. John F., USMC: 45
Schrupp, Lt. Col. David, USAF: 7-8, 12
Self-defense, development of militaries suited for:
5, 9-10, 25-26
Ship visits: 32
Shuey, LT Karin S., USN: 34
Silins, Ints: 32
Skrypczuk, Col. Oleh, USAF: 27-28
Slocombe, Walter B.: 17
Slovak-American Bilateral Working Group: 45
Slovak Republic: 6, 15-17, 20, 42, 44-46, 91-92
Slovenia: 17-18, 20, 46-48, 90-91
Sofia, Bulgaria: 40
South Carolina National Guard: 20
Special Forces Group, 10th: 13, 37
Special Forces Groups: 29
Staff exchanges: 7-8
Staff organization: 36-37

Starr, CDR Gary G., USN: 7-8, 12
 State Partnership Program: 19-20, 35, 43
 Stebner, COL Darald R., ARNG: 34
 Stofft, Brig. Gen. William A., USA: 4
 Stuttgart, Germany: 8, 18, 47
 Sulcs, CW2 Verners, MIARNG: 31
 Supa, Lt. Col. Joseph, USAF: 44, 51
 Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
 (SHAPE) School: 57-59
 Sutter, Eleanor B.: 44

Tallinn, Estonia: 33-34
 Tanase, Senior Lt. Teodor (Romania): 38
 Temnolonskij, Maj. Aleksandr: 37
 Tennessee National Guard: 20, 41
 Texas National Guard: 20, 43
 Thomas, Charles: 27
 Threat assessment: 34-35
 Tindell, LCDR Joseph W., USN: 30
 Tirana, Albania: 30, 53
 Training manuals: 37
 Transportation: 8, 11, 21
 Trant, LTC Charles: 37
 Traveling contact teams: 11, 25
 Albania: 30
 Belarus: 18, 49
 Bulgaria: 41
 composition of: 20-21, 26, 29
 Czech Republic: 42-43
 Estonia: 34-35
 Hungary: 16, 20, 26
 Latvia: 32-33
 Lithuania: 37, 52
 Poland: 29
 Romania: 39
 subject areas covered by: 51-52
 and support for liaison teams: 53
 training of: 11
 Ukraine: 18
 Tyson, SFC Randolph L., USA: 42

Ukraine: 2-3, 15, 18-20
 Under Secretary of Defense for Policy: 16
 Unified Command Plan: 16
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: 1-9, 12-13,
 18-19, 36, 48, 50, 57-58
 Unit exchanges: 15
 Unit-to-unit contacts: 43
 United Kingdom: 4
 United Nations
 and former republics of Yugoslavia: 17-18
 membership in: 36, 46
 US Air Force
 historians: 4
 language training by: 48
 TOPS IN BLUE: 51-52

United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE): 7, 21,
 26, 29
 US Army
 budget requests: 14
 Foreign Language Training Center-Europe: 59
 historians: 4
 United States Army Europe (USAREUR): 7, 21, 26,
 58, 60
 United States Army Russian Institute: 57-60
 US Central Command: 18
 United States Coast Guard: 30, 32, 34-35
 US Commander in Chief Europe (USCINCEUR): 10
 US defense policies, promotion of understanding
 of: 5, 9
 US Department of State: 4
 and language exams: 31
 and military-to-military contacts: 9
 and security policy goals: 10
 US Embassy Marine Guards: 39
 US European Command (USEUCOM): 5-6, 11
 assessment visits to recipient countries: 32
 budget requests: 14-15
 Director of Plans and Policy: 6-7, 9-12, 53-54
 Directorate of Logistics and Security
 Assistance: 12
 Directorate of Manpower, Personnel, and
 Administration: 12
 European/NATO Division: 7, 12
 and funding for JCTP: 14-15
 and George C. Marshall Center: 57-60
 Inspector General: 12
 and military contacts with former Soviet
 Union members: 18, 48-49
 planning for military-to-military contacts:
 7-12, 16-18
 responsibility for Baltic states: 16
 Soviet/East European cell: 7-8, 12-13, 58
 and traveling contact teams: 20
 US Marine Corps: 35
 United States Naval Forces Europe (USNAVEUR):
 7, 21, 32
 US Navy: 34-35
 US Pacific Command: 18
 United States-Polish Bilateral Working Group:
 16, 29
 United States-Soviet Union Interagency Working
 Group: 4, 18, 48
 Urban, Igor: 45
 Utah National Guard: 20
 Uzbekistan: 3

Vasho, Lt. Gen. Ilia (Albania): 30-31
 Vasquez, SGT Michael E., USA: 45
 Venner, Lt. Col. Mark E., USAF: 48
 Viccellio, Lt. Gen. Henry, Jr.: 17
 Vilnius, Lithuania: 20, 35-36
 Vuono, General Carl E.: 57

Wald, MAJ Lewis E. "Buddy," Jr., USAR: 47
Walesa, Lech: 28
Warrant officers on liaison teams: 13
Warsaw, Poland: 16, 53
Warsaw Pact: 1-3, 27-28, 57-59
Waterways management: 34-35
Weinberger, Caspar W.: 4
Wendt, Allan: 17-18, 46-47
Wilson, RM1 Marcus B., USN: 34
Woerner, Manfred: 57
Wolfowitz, Paul: 58-59
Wosniak, Brig. Gen. Stanislaw (Poland): 28

Yeltsin, Boris N.: 3
Yugoslavia: 2, 17, 29-30, 46-47

Zak, LTC Richard, USA: 27-28
Zeca, Maj. Gen. Constantin (Romania): 39
Zhulali, Safet: 30-31

Eastern Europe



728096 (R00416) 3-93

Source: Central Intelligence Agency