

The National Guard's State Partnerships: Security Cooperation and Force Multiplier

by

Lieutenant Colonel David B. Majury
New Jersey Army National Guard



United States Army War College
Class of 2013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) xx-03-2013		2. REPORT TYPE STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The National Guard's State Partnerships: Security Cooperation and Force Multiplier				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel David B. Majury New Jersey Army National Guard				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Louis H. Jordan, Jr. Strategic Studies Institute				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Approved for Public Release. Distribution is Unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Word Count: 5,977					
14. ABSTRACT The National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) is a twenty year old program that provides a training environment that enhances military-military and civil-military proficiency in Security and Stability operations while performing critical security cooperation activities for Combatant Commanders. This, coupled with the Army National Guard's Strategic Imperative of partnering with Combatant Commanders to provide relevant, ready forces capable of performing unified land operations worldwide is the framework for building partner capacity in support of the Combatant Commander's strategic objectives. Sharing ideas, building relationships, and seeking global security is becoming crucially more important as we move to globalization, global supply chains, and interdependency. Security Cooperation has clearly become a strategic imperative and, as such, has been addressed in virtually every key defense document from the National Security Strategy to the National Defense and Military Strategies and down to the CBT CDRs Strategies.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Building Partner Capacity, Multinational, Interagency					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 36	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UU	b. ABSTRACT UU	c. THIS PAGE UU			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**The National Guard's State Partnerships:
Security Cooperation and Force Multiplier**

by

Lieutenant Colonel David B. Majury
New Jersey Army National Guard

Colonel Louis H. Jordan, Jr.
Strategic Studies Institute
Project Adviser

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Abstract

Title: The National Guard's State Partnerships:
Security Cooperation and Force Multiplier

Report Date: March 2013

Page Count: 36

Word Count: 5,977

Key Terms: Building Partner Capacity, Multinational, Interagency

Classification: Unclassified

The National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) is a twenty year old program that provides a training environment that enhances military-military and civil-military proficiency in Security and Stability operations while performing critical security cooperation activities for Combatant Commanders. This, coupled with the Army National Guard's Strategic Imperative of partnering with Combatant Commanders to provide relevant, ready forces capable of performing unified land operations worldwide is the framework for building partner capacity in support of the Combatant Commander's strategic objectives. Sharing ideas, building relationships, and seeking global security is becoming crucially more important as we move to globalization, global supply chains, and interdependency. Security Cooperation has clearly become a strategic imperative and, as such, has been addressed in virtually every key defense document from the National Security Strategy to the National Defense and Military Strategies and down to the CBT CDRs Strategies.

The National Guard's State Partnerships: Security Cooperation and Force Multiplier

The State Partnership Program (SPP) is cost effective means to an end. As security cooperation moves to the forefront of our combatant commander's priorities, the U.S. must revisit their strategy and use of the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP). This highly effective program enhances security cooperation and supports deployments and U.S. Strategy. This research paper will explore the history of the program, discuss combatant commander's views on the program and make a case for its expansion. Additionally, this paper will identify ways to optimize the support provided by our State Partnership Program partners for future operations. How does this program benefit US interests? By imbedding SSP states' soldiers in units when they deploy do we enhance the program in supporting U.S. interests? Should the program be expanded to all Services of the military to better support our interests?

The National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) is a twenty year old program that provides a training environment that enhances military-military and civil-military proficiency in Security and Stability operations while performing critical security cooperation activities for Combatant Commanders. This, coupled with the Army National Guard's Strategic Imperative of partnering with Combatant Commanders to provide relevant, ready forces capable of performing unified land operations worldwide is the framework for building partner capacity in support of the Combatant Commander's strategic objectives.¹

Sharing ideas, building relationships, and seeking global security is becoming significantly more important as we move to globalization, global supply chains, and interdependency. Security Cooperation has clearly become a strategic imperative and,

as such, has been addressed in virtually every key defense document from the National Security Strategy to the National Defense and Military Strategies and on down the line to the Combatant Commander's Strategies. The State Partnership Program is rising to the challenge to support this imperative and should be expanded and have increased funding.

The greatest challenge to the U.S. Government's ability to conduct Security Cooperation Operations is the lack of integrated capability and capacity of civilian agencies and partner nations with which it is necessary for the military to partner with in order to achieve success. Interagency cooperation and the whole of government approach must continue to be sought from all vantage points. The U.S. Armed Forces can fill some of these gaps in civilian capacity in the short-term, but strategic success in Security Cooperation operations will only be possible with a robust architecture for unified civil-military action, and substantially more resources devoted to making civilian U.S. Departments and Agencies operational and expeditionary.² The State Partnership Program helps to build these relationships as States work with and through Ambassador's and Country teams to partner with a Nation. These partnerships serve several functions. First, the partnership is a force multiplier as partner capacity is built. Secondly, it is a learning experience in terms of cultural awareness to other regions of the world and is a great opportunity to exchange training techniques with other Nations. Lastly, it is a bridge to help strengthen the largest and most powerful Military force in the world in the United Nations. The strengthening of the United Nations (UN) lends itself to better security cooperation and a larger opportunity for burden sharing around the

globe. The state partnership program assists with the Theater Security Cooperation (TSC) program of each of the six geographic Combatant Commands.

Regional security cooperation strategies seek to enhance the capacity and will of partner nations to support security and stability operations missions, with the ultimate goal of preventing conflict in fragile regions.³ Kathleen Hicks, the principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy stated “that security cooperation is fiscally responsible and that building partnership capacity elsewhere in the world also remains important for sharing costs and responsibilities of global leadership”.⁴ There are more than 95 thousand UN uniformed personnel (Military and Police) coming from over 110 countries performing in 16 operations. They come from nations large and small, rich and poor. They bring different cultures and experience to the job, but they are united in their determination to foster peace.⁵ Of the 110 contributors, 41 participate in the SP program, contributing upwards of 34 thousand uniformed personnel.⁶ One of the reasons that so many partners contribute troops is because, in many cases, their partner state worked and trained with them in order for them to meet the standards to become a member of the UN. In other words, they are giving back in support of global security. The Department of Defense is taking additional steps to improve interagency capability and capacity for integrated whole-of-government stability operations by exchanging liaisons, providing military personnel to support planning and operations of other U.S. Government Agencies, and seeking enhanced synchronization of interagency activities such as security cooperation and foreign assistance.⁷

In General Dempsey’s, “Chairman’s Strategic Direction to the Joint Force” in February 2012 he directed to “expand the envelope of interagency and international

cooperation. Promote multilateral security approaches and architectures to deter and if necessary, defeat aggression”.⁸ The National Guard’s State Partnership Program can be a key enabler as State’s continue to develop relationships with the nearly 70 international partners.

Building partnership capacity elsewhere in the world also remains important for sharing the costs and responsibilities of global leadership. Across the globe we will seek to be the security partner of choice, pursuing new partnerships with a growing number of nations – including those in Africa and Latin America .– whose interests and viewpoints are merging into a common vision of freedom, stability, and prosperity. Whenever possible, we will develop innovative, low-cost, and small-footprint approaches to achieve our security objectives, relying on exercises, rotational presence, and advisory capabilities.⁹ The aforementioned is from the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance and is another example of how, in these fiscally constrained times, the U.S. Military and more importantly, the U.S. Government, must leverage all of its assets in order to keep a low cost, small footprint approach to security objectives. Again, the Partnership program is an affordable tool to meet these ends. Partner states send small contingents of soldiers over to their partner nations and train shoulder to shoulder on security and other relevant missions. In addition to sharing training experience, soldiers on both sides walk away with an increased cultural awareness that ultimately strengthens both sides’ abilities to support operations around the globe. In other words, it builds partner capacity which can lead to burden sharing in security cooperation throughout any region. And, if we are lucky, can reduce our footprint and stress on our military in the process. As General Craig McKinley, former Guard Bureau Chief stated,

the National Guard's SP program is the crown jewel of the Guard's international engagement.We believe it's easier to stop a war by being friends with someone than having to fight a war with people we don't understand.¹⁰

This paper will look at five of the six geographic combatant commands and how the state partnership program supports their strategic imperatives and will make a recommendation and argument for growth. Prior to that, it is important to take a look at the history of the state partnership program.

The State Partnership Program evolved in 1993 from the United States European Command's (USEUCOM) Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP), devised in 1992 by Generals Colin Powell and John Shalikashvili, and was initially launched in Europe as a political and military outreach initiative to the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.¹¹ The State Partnership Program is a Department of Defense security cooperation program run by the National Guard. It also serves as a mechanism for training National Guard personnel. Since the program began in 1992, it has expanded to the point where nearly every states National Guard participates, as do the National Guards of Guam, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.¹² The State Partnership Program is very similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) led Partners for Peace Program in that both programs look to build long-term relationships and improve security capacity during mil-mil engagements. Soon after the program was established, DoD made the decision to send a thirty member Military Liaison Team (MLT) led by Lieutenant General John B. Conaway former Chief of National Guard Bureau (NGB), to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. DoD

believed that the National Guard led delegation would appear to the region as non-threatening and helpful to the emerging democracies and their defense forces.¹³

Today, the program encompasses 67 partner affiliations with nearly 70 countries across the globe — over a third of the world’s recognized countries.¹⁴ All of these partners, although National Guard supported, works through the six geographic combatant commanders in order to support their strategic objectives. EUCOM, where the program was born has 22 participating nations, CENTCOM has 6, AFRICOM has 8, PACOM has 7, NORTHCOM 1, and SOUTHCOM has 22 partners.

In 1997, the fast growing SP Program, out of necessity, broadened its mission to: “Build genuine state partnerships which mobilize the entire social fabric of American support to democracy abroad. Capitalizing on the unique role of the NG citizen-soldiers, we will aggressively engage at home and abroad to promote stability by strengthening democracy and free market economies. We will assist in the construction of democratic institutions and the social infrastructures necessary to sustain a democratic tradition. Partners will create long-term personal relationships based on openness, confidence, and trust”.¹⁵ Shortly thereafter, the programs first doctrine was published identifying five National Security Cooperation Objectives. The Objectives were: to demonstrate military subordination to civilian authority, to demonstrate military support to civilian authorities, to assist in the development of democratic institutions, to foster open market economies to help bring stability, and to project and represent the United States’ humanitarian values¹⁶. The 2007 “National Guard State Partnership Program; Program Goals Fiscal Year 2008-2013”, NG J-5 stated that the national Guard will become a lead Department of Defense instrument in advancing international civil-

military cooperation to affect key defense and security issues of our time.¹⁷ To that end, four overarching goals were established. The goals are: 1) Build partnership capacity to Deter, Prevent & Prepare, 2) Build partnership Capacity to Respond & Recover, 3) Support Partners' Defense Reform & Professional Development, and 4) Enable and Facilitate Enduring Broad-Spectrum Security Relationships.¹⁸ Through the untiring efforts of so many, past and present, on the National Guard's J5/IA staff, the Partnership Program has been nested in the Nations Defense Strategy and perhaps more importantly, in the geographic combatant commander's strategy.

Today, The National Guard's dual Federal and State missions make SPP the ideal vehicle to demonstrate effective democratic institutions, promote democratic values, and share best practices to help partner countries achieve their goals. The unique civil-military nature of the National Guard allows the SPP to engage in a wide range of Security Cooperation activities, such as: Disaster Preparedness, Humanitarian Assistance, Defense Support to Civil Authorities, CBRNE, Cyber, Counterdrug, Border / Port Security, and Public / Private Partnerships to name a few.¹⁹ Through its cooperative efforts with other nations, the National Guard plays a critical role in helping to shape the international environment in support of the national security strategy. The National Guard's international initiatives directly support the United States national security and national military strategies by helping to foster democracy, encourage market economies, promote regional cooperation and stability, and provide opportunities for National Guard soldiers and airmen—as well as civilian members from their communities—to interact with and learn from other nations and cultures. For a minuscule portion (.00002%) of the total defense budget, these programs return

tremendous benefits for the United States, the National Guard, and our partner nations.²⁰

In 2007, then Chief of the National Guard Bureau, H. Steven Blum, retooled the State partnership Program Mission Statement to read: Enhance combatant commanders' ability to establish enduring civil-military relationships that improve long-term international security while building partnership capacity across all levels of society.²¹ The State Partnership Program currently accounts for 44% of all mil-mil engagements in U.S. European Command, 46% in U.S. Africa Command, and 38% in U.S. Southern Command. The program supports the security cooperation objectives of combatant commanders, as well as the country objectives of the chiefs of mission within their areas of responsibility. Forty countries that partner with the National Guard through the State Partnership Program currently provide a total of 31,309 troops and military experts to United Nations peacekeeping efforts.²² Nearly 20 National Guard states have deployed with their State Partnership Program partners to Iraq and Afghanistan. Perhaps most importantly, the State Partnership Program partner-country deployments reduce pressure on U.S. forces worldwide and hedge against the need for more direct and costly U.S. military involvement in future contingencies.²³ With that, this paper will look at 5 of the 6 geographic combatant commanders' and their AORs for opportunities for expansion of the program. NORTHCOM, with only one partner and limited opportunities, will not be looked at.

U.S. European Command (EUCOM) has the largest SP program participants with 22 of the 67 partnerships yet less than fifty percent of the region is involved. This is

a disturbing fact considering this is the region that the SPP program started in back in 1993. Twenty years of engagement yet only 22 partner nations listed below in figure 1.

USEUCOM
Alabama / Romania
California / Ukraine
Colorado / Slovenia
Georgia / Georgia
Illinois / Poland
Indiana / Slovakia
Iowa / Kosovo
Kansas / Armenia
Maine / Montenegro
Maryland / Estonia
Maryland / Bosnia
Michigan / Latvia
Minnesota / Croatia
New Jersey / Albania
North Carolina / Moldova
Ohio / Hungary
Ohio / Serbia
Oklahoma / Azerbaijan
Pennsylvania / Lithuania
Tennessee / Bulgaria
Texas, Nebraska / Czech Republic
Vermont / Macedonia

Figure 1:

Teaming EUCOM's Ready Forces with our long-time allies and newfound partners in the region provides cooperative solutions to a mutual security challenge. Continuing to build these enduring regional partnerships ensures we are "*Stronger Together*."

EUCOM is the vital link between U.S. interests and the European continent.²⁴ EUCOMs focus areas of ready forces, international cooperation, interagency integration, and helping people are all areas where the SP program can be a useful tool. There are still 29 of the 51 nations unaligned with a state partner. It is clear that the U.S. can't possibly partner with every nation but a goal of greater than fifty percent by region is a

reasonable expectation. EUCOM is also one of the most actively engaged commands in terms of multinational exercises. Austere Challenge, Georgia Deployment Program, Jackal Stone, Combined Endeavor, LOGEX, and Capable Logician are but a few operations that sees over 40 nations participating. Although many of these partner nations, twelve, contribute troops to UN operations, they total less than 500.²⁵ On the other hand, thousands of troops have contributed to the global war on terrorism in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Several nations have shown growing interest and participation in the state partnership Military Assistance Team (MAT), Police Assistance Team (PAT), and co-deployments programs. To date, seven partners have participated contributing about 1000 troops during roughly 20 missions. These troop contributions continue to reduce the requirement for U.S. soldiers on the ground and give the U.S. increased flexibility in protecting national interests. Building stronger alliances and enhancing partner capacity supports global security and the protection of the global commons.

US Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), with its 2012 addition of Colombia also has 22 of the 67 partnerships currently part of the State Partnership Program. Of the twenty-two shown in figure 2, 10 are troop contributing countries of the United Nations with just under 1700 troops and one, El Salvador is a troop contributor in Afghanistan with almost 3000 deployed since 2003.²⁶ With nearly sixty-five percent of the region engaged in partnerships the region has reaped some noteworthy benefits. The growth in partner nation capacity to conduct peacekeeping operations is a regional success story. The U.S. Department of Defense has partnered with the Department of State in support of the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), an ongoing seven-year

program to increase peacekeeping capabilities around the world. Drawing on the existing talents of countries with well-established peacekeeping capabilities, SOUTHCOM works with regional partners and conducts the annual PKO Americas exercise, which is designed to improve partner nations' capacity to plan and conduct Peacekeeping Operations.²⁷

USSOUTHCOM
Arkansas / Guatemala
Connecticut / Uruguay
Delaware / Trinidad-Tobago
District of Columbia / Jamaica
Florida / Venezuela
Florida / Guyana
Florida, Virgin Is. / Regional Security Sys. (E. Carib. Is)
Kentucky / Ecuador
Louisiana / Belize
Louisiana / Haiti
Massachusetts / Paraguay
Mississippi / Bolivia
Missouri / Panama
New Hampshire / El Salvador
New Mexico / Costa Rica
Puerto Rico / Honduras
Puerto Rico / Dominican Rep.
South Carolina / Columbia
South Dakota / Suriname
Texas / Chile
West Virginia / Peru
Wisconsin / Nicaragua

Figure 2:

Security, Illegal Migration and Illicit Trafficking continue to be the region's biggest concerns. As such, exercises are conducted regularly hi-lighted by the exercise "Tradewinds" which addresses transnational security threats in the Caribbean.²⁸

Our safety is endangered by a broad range of threats. But this peril can be eclipsed by the promise of a new prosperity and personal security and the protection of liberty and justice for all the people of our hemisphere. That's

the future that we can build together, but only if we move forward with a new sense of partnership.²⁹

Two of SOUTHCOM's three strategic objectives, fostering regional security and serving as an enduring partner of choice in support of a peaceful and prosperous region are the pillars of which their vision 2020 are built.³⁰ To this end, SOUTHCOM will continue to improve relations, build partnerships, and train with regional partners to ensure security. Although many success stories permeate throughout the region, there is significant room for growth amongst the State Partners. Many engagements revolve around counter-drug operations but disaster relief and humanitarian assistance are regular necessities for the region and are areas where the partnership program can flourish. Operations like New Horizon, Beyond New Horizon, and Fuerzas Aliadas Humanitarias are but a few where troops associated with the partner program can put their civilian acquired skills to work while building bonds and partner capacity.³¹ The nearly sixty-five percent participation rate shows that the region has strong ties with the U.S. and is like minded. With so many immigrants from the region, the U.S. needs to exploit the opportunities and continue to link states with similar nations.

The next 3 Combatant Commands have the largest room for expansion. AFRICOM, CENTCOM, and PACOM account for only 20 of the 67 partners or thirty percent. AFRICOM is a small budding State Partnership region with eight current members listed in figure 3. In September 2010, Senegal's President, Abdoulaye Wade, in a two day visit to Vermont, said "Each country can learn something from another - The National Guard will know Africa better, because to know a country is to know the people. You should have contact with the people."³² Senegal's Mil to Mil relationship with the Vermont National Guard has begun to change the look of the Senegalese

Military by introducing females and expanding the role of the Noncommissioned officer ranks.³³

USAFRICOM
California / Nigeria
New York / South Africa
North Carolina / Botswana
North Dakota / Ghana
Michigan / Liberia
Utah (So Carolina) / Morocco
Vermont / Senegal
Wyoming / Tunisia

Figure 3:

Ghana, another 1 of the 8 African nations that participates in the U.S. National Guard's State Partnership Program has the Ghanaian military conducting partnership, training and familiarization activities with the North Dakota National Guard. Since this program was inaugurated in 2004, the two nations' militaries have shared well over 70 events together.³⁴ Building Partner Capacity remains at the forefront of U.S. strategy as well as AFRICOM's strategy. In the article, "Going Farther by Going together: Building Partner Capacity in Africa," by Major General Charles Hooper AFRICOM's Director of Strategy, Plans and Programs (J5) he outlines the huge benefits of the partnership program and the room for expansion citing that only 8 of the 53 African Nations currently participate. He also notes that the U.S. Agency for International Development's Chief Economist Steven Radelet identified 17 African countries with over a decade of sustained economic growth and falling poverty rates along with another half-dozen African states showing signs of similar progress has additional potential.³⁵ Strengthening democracies and similarly minded leaders opens doors for more partnerships and security

cooperation. AFRICOMs senior leaders applaud the partnership program and state that it is one the best resources for the cost.³⁶ The opportunity to engage up to 23 more African nations, which is only half of the available nations, is a huge resource that can further enhance the regions security as well as support its continued economic development. With a population of one billion, the economic potential is enormous. Like most other regions, the AFRICOM region sees many immigrants in the U.S. Adding security partners not only supports harmony in the region but it also opens enormous trade opportunities. The U.S. must seize the opportunity to engage this natural resource rich region before China.

Maritime operation's is another area that can be considered for expansion. A 2010 program brought together an international team of maritime experts from 21 nations – 9 European, 10 African, and 1 South American -- to offer assistance in addressing maritime safety and security challenges such as unlawful, unregulated and illegal fishing, piracy and illicit trafficking. It is expected that more than 1,700 maritime experts will participate in dozens of workshops, seminars and professional exchanges.³⁷ If there were ever a case for expanding the partnership program to naval forces it would be because of exercises like this. Most partnerships currently deal with land forces with a few beginning to work with Air Guard forces. Africa's expansive coastline is home to a number of potential partners that would benefit greatly from a relationship with our Navy. Additionally, expanding the SP program to active or reserve forces can open up funding sources.

CENTCOM, similar to AFRICOM, has a small group of 6 State Partners shown in figure 4. This includes its most recent addition of Uzbekistan earlier in 2012 and a

pending relationship with Turkmenistan. Like other COCOMs, CENTCOM promotes the development of and the building of partnerships in their region. CENTCOM is working to build the capabilities of indigenous security forces as well as the mechanisms for regional cooperation. Their main effort provides training, equipment, and facilities for various Army, National Guard, and border security forces through Building Partnership Capacity programs.³⁸ Additionally, they also work with the national level organizations to facilitate dialogue on security and emergency response issues. For example, in February 2008 and again this past March, CENTCOM hosted Conferences for the Chiefs of Defense from the Central Asian States to discuss regional security issues. CENTCOM also co-hosted an annual Regional Cooperation Exercise, which is designed to improve regional coordination on issues such as counter-terrorism, security and humanitarian crisis response.³⁹

USCENTCOM
Arizona / Kazakhstan
Colorado / Jordan
Louisiana / Uzbekistan
Montana / Kyrgyzstan
(pending) / Turkmenistan
Virginia / Tajikistan

Figure 4:

Another major operation in the region is conducted in Jordan with 18 other nations to include a number of Arab and European allies. The three week exercise saw 12,000 multinational forces gather to practice their combat skills. Several U.S. military officials say while it's not the primary intention, the exercise is meant to be noticed by Syria and Iran especially. The message: even with the United States out of Iraq, and winding up the war in Afghanistan, there is a formidable U.S. presence in the region, and other

countries are capable of filling in the gaps.⁴⁰ General Dempsey's visit to the region placed emphasis on the need to build partner capacity so our partners can share the burden of securing the region. To date, 21 nations have deployed more than 16,000 troops to the U.S. Central Command's region of responsibility.⁴¹ Although that is impressive it sees less than one third of the regions coalition nations contributing troops and only 2 of the State Partners contributing, none of which are part of the 14 partner nations collaborating in military assistance team, co-deployment, or an Embed deployment leaving much room for growth in support of continued security cooperation efforts. These numbers lead to an enormous potential for growth and as the U.S. departs the region over the next two years or so it will prove vital for this unpredictable unbalanced region to have more partner capacity and support to ensure its long-term stability. The state partnership Military Assistance Team (MAT), Police Assistance Team (PAT), and co-deployments have proven an invaluable force multiplier. Fourteen state partners have participated contributing 1000 troops during nearly 60 missions.⁴² These 1000 troops reduces the requirement for U.S. soldiers on the ground and builds stronger alliances and enhances partner capacity and willingness to take on missions in support of global security and the protection of the global commons.

The U.S. Pacific Command, next to CENTCOM is becoming the focal command of the United States as the "pivot" to the pacific continues. Speaking to reporters at the Pentagon about moving ahead on the policy of rebalancing U.S. forces to the Pacific region, Adm. Samuel J. Locklear III, commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, assured the effort stresses cooperation and collaboration, not confrontation, the Defense Department reported on its website. "The rebalance draws on the strengths of the

entire U.S. government, including policy, diplomacy, trade, and, of course, security," Locklear said. He said the rebalance is not aimed at any one nation or region, but underscores the United States is and will remain a Pacific power. The rebalancing comes as the United States winds down its operation in Afghanistan and Iraq and at a time of China's growing military might and its assertive territorial claims in the South China Sea and the East China Sea.⁴³

During U.S. President Barack Obama's recent Asia trip, U.S. officials said the administration will move forward with the new policy, also referred to as the Asia-Pacific pivot. While in Thailand on the first leg of his trip, President Obama said the Asia-Pacific will shape so much of U.S. security and prosperity in this century and will be critical to creating jobs and opportunity for the American people. "And that's why I've made restoring American engagement in this region a top priority as president," Obama said.⁴⁴

The 36 nations that comprise the Asia-Pacific region are home to more than 50% of the world's population, 3 thousand different languages, several of the world's largest militaries, and 5 nations allied with the U.S. through mutual defense treaties. Two of the three largest economies are located in the Asia-Pacific along with 10 of the 14 smallest. The area of responsibility (AOR) includes the most populous nation in the world, the largest democracy, and the largest Muslim-majority nation. More than one third of Asia-Pacific nations are smaller, island nations that include the smallest republic in the world and the smallest nation in Asia.⁴⁵ Having said all of that, then why does an area of such wealth and importance see only 20 percent of the region with a state partnership. The list shown in figure 5 is relatively small considering the regions impact

on the rest of the world. Maintaining secured global commons is in everyone's best interest and one way to meet that end is to establish partnerships. As the old adage goes...There is strength in numbers.

USPACOM
Alaska / Mongolia
Hawaii / Guam / Philippines
Hawaii / Indonesia
Washington / Thailand
Oregon / Bangladesh
Oregon / Vietnam
Idaho / Cambodia

Figure 5:

The Asia – Pacific State Partnership Program just added their seventh member nation in Vietnam. This historic alignment with Oregon was finalized in Nov of this year.⁴⁶ In accordance with the President's priority of restoring American engagement in the region it is clear that there are many more partnership opportunities (26) as well as the possibility of increasing the involvement of the already engaged partners. Twenty of the 36 nations contribute troops to UN operations to the tune of 31000 soldiers and 6 of the 7 partner nations have contributed nearly half of that. It has become a proven fact that the more the U.S. engages with partners, the more those partners contribute to world-wide operations whether it is directly with the U.S. or indirectly with the UN. The relatively low cost state partnership program builds long term relationships that will pay dividends for years to come. As Sun Tzu stated, "For to win one hundred victories in one hundred battles is not the acme of skill. To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill".⁴⁷ As many politicians have discussed, this rebalance must come with a strong diplomatic arm so as not to cause China to become an isolationist or start

applying unnecessary pressure on our allies. The U.S. must also engage China often and directly, encourage their continued growth, and strengthen our trade ties. Globalization is coming and the more partnerships and better regional relations the U.S. has will help ensure future growth and prosperity. As long as China grows and becomes a responsible leader in the region the U.S. shouldn't fixate on them becoming the regions hegemony.

Exercises is another area where the U.S. and its partners have had marked success. Cobra Gold (Thailand), Balikatan (Philippines), Keen Sword / Keen Edge (Japan), Yama Sukura (Japan) and the Rim of the Pacific (six plus nations) need to continue while at the same time engaging other partners in exercise possibilities. The more nations that the U.S can engage with during exercises will help to grow the militaries understanding of others cultures both civil and military. Annually, Title 10 forces send hundreds of requests for troops / units to fill gaps in training exercises or other real world operations. These overseas training / deployment opportunities are hugely beneficial to guard unit's readiness. In light of this fact would it not be even more beneficial if, when the request for support is submitted it included the states partner? What better way to build relationships and partner capacity than training with Active, reserve, and ally forces. A better understanding leads to a stronger relationship and potential for expansion.

It is abundantly clear that partner nations share a similar resolve with the U.S. when it comes to global security and cooperation. The sheer number of troop contributions is a testament to the success of both the relationships with the U.S. and the UN. One of the Joint Professional Military Education special areas of emphasis is

Building Partnership Capacity. A preventive strategy to build the capacity of foreign partners to counter terrorism and promote regional stability.⁴⁸ States, working through the combatant commander and with their partner nation is an invaluable tool for the region. Strong regional partnerships enhance security and builds long-term partner capacity which leads to increased flexibility. Take for instance the Michigan / Latvia and the Michigan / Liberia relationships. Spanning across two geographic combatant commander's AORs, Michigan has been working with the Latvian military to teach them how to train others. Over the course of the next year or so the Latvian military will be handed the responsibility to partner with and train the Liberian Military. This is a true success story and one which can truly be grown. Getting partners to partner with partners is a win – win for the states involved, the combatant commander, the region involved, and most importantly, the United States of America.

The program is particularly valuable because of the National Guard's ability to provide continuity in its relationships with foreign counterparts, Dempsey said. National Guard elements are better-suited than the active components to develop and leverage career-long relationships because of the way that active component service members move around, he said. The continuity in these relationships contributes to a high level of trust.⁴⁹ In his opening remarks at the State Partnership Program's 20th Anniversary Symposium, GEN Craig R. McKinley said, "We must adopt a collaborative approach to security – collaboration not only between the United States and our partner countries, but also within separate segments of the United States government, our states, the private sector, and multi-national organizations".⁵⁰ Forty-one partners, contributing over

30 thousand soldiers is a demonstration to how our growing relationships contribute to regional and global security.

Failing States are a serious area of concern. Many analysts posit that there are upwards of 25 failing states globally and that any one of them could cause the next regional conflict. It is therefore in the United States' national interest to ensure that regional stability is maintained. One way of maintaining that national interest is to synergize security cooperation operations and training opportunities with partner nations and the interagency. According to the recently released Department of Defense Instruction, only up to 3 million dollars may be used to pay for the travel and per diem costs associated with the participation of U.S. and foreign civilian and non-defense agency personnel in conducting SPP activities.⁵¹ This is clearly an underfunded program if, in fact, it is DoD policy for Partnership activities and events are planned, coordinated, and executed to achieve the theater security cooperation program objectives of the geographic Combatant Commander taking into account the objectives of the relevant chief of mission (COM), as well as the national security objectives of the partner nation.⁵²

Through exercises, multinational and interagency collaboration, the U.S. can substantially increase the number of ready forces. National Guard forces exceed 350 thousand while our partner nations have in excess of 12 million active and reserve forces with which the U.S. must continue to build capacity and capability. This is a massive force that only sees \$12 million dollars of the 2010 DoD budget.⁵³ The U.S. should not only increase the funding for states to participate more frequently with their active duty and foreign partners but it should look for other opportunities to exploit.

Opportunities such as the operations, mentor, liaison teams (OMLT) in Afghanistan where guard teams deploy with their state partner with the state partner having the lead in training Afghan forces. The OMLT teams are only 12-15 personnel from the U.S. while partner states provide 25-30 personnel. As stated earlier, Title 10 has hundreds of opportunities annually. The DoD must capitalize on these untapped resources if they continue to look at downsizing its military force. This increase in training and capacity building will offer a significant increase in the combatant commander's agility and flexibility. Stronger and more adept partners that have increased capacity and capability will lead to a more secure region. Another consideration to look at is an expanded ARFORGEN model. As planners plug forces into the model they should take into consideration all of our partner countries and the capabilities they bring to the table. This approach would be no different than that of our allies like Great Britain, Canada, and Australia providing forces. We also embrace our partners and invite field grade and senior officers to our Intermediate Learning and Senior Service Schools so why then is it that we don't seek more opportunities to share the responsibility of securing the globe.

More so now than ever as the United States moves towards regionally aligned forces and continue to reduce their overseas footprint it is becoming crucially more important to leverage all relationships and to seek alternative cost effective or cost sharing methods to ensure global security and perhaps equally as important free access to the global commons. Title 10 United States Code Section 153, states that one of the functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to assess the capabilities, adequacy, and interoperability of regional allies of the United States and or other

friendly nations to support United States forces in combat operations and other operations for extended periods of time.⁵⁴ Additionally, the Army Budget states that no major conflict has ever been won without boots on the ground and that one of the essential roles of the Army is to “Shape the Environment” by building positive relationships and capabilities that enable nations to effectively protect and govern their citizenry.⁵⁵ Lastly, the overview of the 2013 defense budget clearly states that building partnership capacity elsewhere in the world also remains important for sharing the costs and responsibilities of global leadership. Across the globe, the U.S. seeks to be the partner of choice and looks to do it with low cost and small-footprint.⁵⁶ Everything discussed in the previous two paragraphs supports the need to share costs and responsibilities of global security. The U.S. must work globally to optimize resources with all of their current partners while continuing to seek new relationships. All of these arguments support the Defense Strategic Guidance issued by Secretary of Defense Panetta.

The United States faces profound challenges that require strong, agile, and capable military forces whose actions are harmonized with other elements of U.S. national power. Our global responsibilities are significant; we cannot afford to fail. The balance between available resources and our security needs has never been more delicate. Force and program decisions made by the Department of Defense will be made in accordance with the strategic approach described in this document, which is designed to ensure our Armed Forces can meet the demands of the U.S. National Security Strategy at acceptable risk.⁵⁷

Endnotes

- ¹ LTG William E. Ingram, Jr. "The Army National Guard; Strategic Imperatives: 10.
- ² Report to Congress on the Implementation of DoD Directive 3000.05, Military Support for Stability, security, Transition and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations, Secretary of Defense, 1 April 2007, p.i.
- ³ Ibid; p.28.
- ⁴ Jim Garamone, "Hicks Praises Guard's State Partnership Program," July 17, 2012, linked from *The Department of Defense Home page* at "News," <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=117156> (accessed November 14, 2012).
- ⁵ "Peace Keeping Issues," linked from The United Nations Home page at "Issues, Military," <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/military.shtml> (accessed November 14, 2012).
- ⁶ "United Nations Peace keeping," linked from The United Nations Home page at "Resources, Statistics, Troop and Police Contributors," http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2012/Nov12_1.pdf (accessed December 1, 2012).
- ⁷ Report to Congress on the Implementation of DoD Directive 3000.05. p 28.
- ⁸ Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), *Chairman's Strategic Direction to the Joint Force*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, 6 February 2012), 5.
- ⁹ Leon E. Panetta, Defense Strategic Guidance, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, 5 January 2012), 3.
- ¹⁰ Tech Sgt. John Orrell, Courtesy of National Guard Bureau, "McKinley Says State Partnership Program is National Guard Crown Jewel," March 28, 2011, linked from The National Guard Home page at "News," Nat<http://www.nationalguard.com/news/2011/mar/28/mckinley-says-state-partnership-program-is-national-guard-crown-jewel> (accessed November 14, 2012).
- ¹¹ Colonel Cathy M. Rodriguez, "The United States NG Security Cooperation and State Partnership Program (SPP)," briefing slides, Arlington, VA, HQ NG Bureau (NGB-J-5-IA), March 1, 2009.
- ¹² Lawrence Kapp and Nina M. Serafino, *The National Guard State Partnership Program: Background, Issues, and Options for Congress* (Washington, DC: U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, August 15, 2011), Summary.
- ¹³ John B. Conaway, Lt Gen, USAF (Retired), *Call Out the Guard!* (Kentucky: Turner Publishing, 1997), 220.
- ¹⁴ "10 Things about the National Guard State Partnership Program," July 30, 2012, linked from AFRICOM Home page at "Wordpress," <http://africom.wordpress.com/2012/07/30/10-things-about-the-national-guard-state-partnership-program/> (accessed November 16, 2012).

¹⁵ National Guard Security Cooperation and State Partnership Program Guide, Part I; SPP Doctrine & Development / Initial Procedures, (Arlington, VA: National Guard Bureau, 1 October 2008), 5-6.

¹⁶ “State Partnership Program History,” linked from The Virginia National Guard Home page at “State Partnership Program,” <http://vko.va.ngb.army.mil/VirginiaGuard/SPP/history.html> (accessed November 16, 2012).

¹⁷ J5 International Affairs Division (NGB-J5/IA), National Guard State Partnership Program; Program Goals Fiscal Year 2008-2013, (Arlington, VA: National Guard Bureau, 5 September 2007), 2.

¹⁸ Ibid., 3-4.

¹⁹ “National Guard State Partnership Program,” linked from EUCOM Home page at “Partnership Programs,” <http://www.eucom.mil/key-activities/partnership-programs/state-partnership-program> (accessed November 17, 2012).

²⁰ “State Partnership Program History,” linked from The Virginia National Guard Home page at “State Partnership Program,” <http://vko.va.ngb.army.mil/VirginiaGuard/SPP/history.html> (accessed November 16, 2012).

²¹ National Guard State Partnership Program; Program Goals Fiscal Year 2008-2013. 2.

²² “10 Things about the National Guard State Partnership Program,” July 30, 2012, linked from AFRICOM Home page at “Wordpress,” <http://africom.wordpress.com/2012/07/30/10-things-about-the-national-guard-state-partnership-program/> (accessed November 16, 2012).

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ “Key Focus Areas,” linked from EUCOM Home page at “Missions,” <http://www.eucom.mil/mission/focus-areas> (accessed November 17, 2012).

²⁵ “Monthly Summary of Contributions,” October 31, 2012, linked from The United Nations Home page at “Troop and Police Contributors,” http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2012/Nov12_1.pdf (accessed November 14, 2012).

²⁶ “Training and Exercises,” linked from SOUTHCOM Home page at “Missions,” <http://www.southcom.mil/ourmissions/Pages/Training%20and%20Exercises.aspx> (accessed November 16, 2012).

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ President Barack Obama, Summit of the Americas, Trinidad and Tobago (17 April 2012).

³⁰ General Douglas Fraser, United States Southern Command; Command Strategy 2020, (Doral, FL: July 2010), 3.

³¹ “Training and Exercises,” linked from SOUTHCOM Home page at “Missions,” <http://www.southcom.mil/ourmissions/Pages/Training%20and%20Exercises.aspx> (accessed November 16, 2012).

³² Staff Sergeant Jim Greenhill, “Senegal President Praises Guard Partnerships,” September 24, 2010, linked from AFRICOM Home at “News,” <http://www.africom.mil/getArticle.asp?art=5291&lang=0> (accessed November 16, 2012).

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ U.S. Africa Command Public Affairs, “Ghanaian Delegation Gets Inside Look at U.S. Africa Command Headquarters,” February 26, 2010, linked from AFRICOM Home at “News,” <http://www.africom.mil/getArticle.asp?art=4085&lang=1> (accessed November 16, 2012).

³⁵ Major General Charles Hooper, “Going Farther by Going Together: Building Partner Capacity in Africa,” November 16, 2012, linked from AFRICOM Home page at “Going Farther by Going Together,” <http://www.africom.mil> (accessed December 1, 2012).

³⁶ Staff Sergeant Jim Greenhill, “National Guard Boosts AFRICOM’s Partnership Capacity” linked from AFRICOM Home at “News,” <http://www.africom.mil/NEWSROOM/Article/7626/national-guard-boosts-africoms-partnership-capacity> (accessed January 5, 2013)

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ “Commander’s Posture Statement,” linked from CENTCOM Home page at “About CENTCOM,” <http://www.centcom.mil> (accessed November 16, 2012).

³⁹ “Coalition Countries-Kazakhstan,” linked from CENTCOM Home page at “About CENTCOM,” <http://www.centcom.mil/kazakhstan/> (accessed November 16, 2012).

⁴⁰ “Coalition Countries-Jordan,” linked from CENTCOM Home page at “About CENTCOM,” <http://www.centcom.mil/Jordan/> (accessed November 16, 2012).

⁴¹ “Coalition Countries,” linked from CENTCOM Home page at “About CENTCOM,” <http://www.centcom.mil/coalition-countries> (accessed November 16, 2012).

⁴² Michael W. Lashinsky, e-mail message to author, December 3, 2012.

⁴³ Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, “U.S. will Remain a Pacific Power,” December 6, 2012, linked from UPI Home page at “TopNews,” http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2012/12/06/Admiral-US-is-will-remain-Pacific-power/UPI-36781354856302/#ixzz2EUaAxi13 (accessed November 16, 2012).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ “USPACOM Facts,” linked from USPACOM Home page at “about USPACOM,” <http://www.pacom.mil/about-uspacom/facts.shtml> (accessed November 16, 2012).

⁴⁶ Mike Francis, "Oregon Guard will link with Vietnam in State Partnership Program," November 20, 2012, linked from Oregon Live Home page at "Oregon at War," http://blog.oregonlive.com/oregonatwar/2012/11/oregon_guard_will_link_with_vi.html (accessed December 1, 2012).

⁴⁷ Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, trans. Samuel Griffith (New York: Oxford University Press 1963), 77.

⁴⁸ Theater Strategy and Campaigning Core Curriculum Directive; (U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013, AY 2013), 165.

⁴⁹ Claudette Roulo, "Dempsey: Forming Partnerships Vital for Future Force," July 17, 2012, linked from *The Department of Defense Home page* at "News," <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=117155> (accessed November 14, 2012).

⁵⁰ GEN Craig R. McKinley; "Opening Remarks, SPP 20th Anniversary Symposium", (17 July 2012), 2.

⁵¹ Department of Defense Instruction; Number 5111.20, State Partnership Program, (December 14, 2012), 12.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵³ Tech Sgt. John Orrell, Courtesy of National Guard Bureau, "McKinley Says State Partnership Program is National Guard Crown Jewel," March 28, 2011, linked from The National Guard Home page at "News," <http://www.nationalguard.com/news/2011/mar/28/mckinley-says-state-partnership-program-is-national-guard-crown-jewel> (accessed November 14, 2012).

⁵⁴ Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, *Selected Readings in Defense Management*, AY13, Vol. I (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, January 2013), 23

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁵⁶ U.S. Department of Defense, *United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request: Overview* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, February 2012)

⁵⁷ Panetta, *Defense Strategic Guidance*, 8.

