

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM: DOES THE PARTNERSHIP
BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD AND UKRAINE
SUPPORT THE U.S. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY AND IS IT A
RELEVANT MISSION?**

BY

COLONEL KEVIN ELLSWORTH
United States Army National Guard

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2000



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**State Partnership Program: Does The Partnership Between The California
National Guard And Ukraine Support The U.S. Engagement Strategy And Is It A
Relevant Mission**

by

Colonel Kevin Ellsworth
United States Army National Guard

Colonel James Holcomb
Project Advisor

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

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

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Kevin Ellsworth, COL, ARNG
TITLE: State Partnership Program: Does The Partnership Between The California National Guard And Ukraine Support the U.S. Engagement Strategy And Is It A Relevant Mission
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 5 April 2000 PAGES: 23 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The end of the Cold War has presented the free world unique opportunities to create new order and security in Europe. The US National Security Strategy advances the notion that global integration will bring stability and it advocates the use of military engagement activities to promote democracy and build relationships with nations that were once our former adversaries. Developing the trust and confidence of both political and military institutions are key to the promotion of democratic ideals. The National Guard's State Partnership Program is an engagement tool that exemplifies the democratic process through the citizen-soldier and their connection to the heart of America's communities. The involvement of the National Guard in helping new nations build democratic institutions is a sound concept that capitalizes on the strengths that Guard members bring through the combination of their military and civilian acquired skills. The reserve component model also offers emerging nations an economical alternative to more costly active forces and conveys a non-threatening defensive posture to their neighbors. The utility of reserve forces in providing military support to civil authorities during emergencies is another benefit demonstrated through partnership engagement activities. The military and civilian contacts conducted through the State Partnership Program offer great potential for building relationships that promote regional stability while providing the Guard opportunities for overseas deployments in a coalition environment. This paper will examine the California National Guard's partnership with Ukraine under the US engagement strategy and the benefits associated with this national security objective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM: DOES THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND UKRAINE SUPPORT U.S. THE U.S. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY AND IS IT A RELEVANT MISSION..	1
BACKGROUND	1
REGIONAL STABILITY AND UKRAINE	2
PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE.....	4
THE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.....	5
CALIFORNIA-UKRAINE ACTIVITIES	7
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.....	10
OPERATIONS AND RESOURCES.....	10
PROGRAM BENEFITS	12
RECOMMENDATIONS	13
CONCLUSION	14
ENDNOTES	15
BIBLIOGRAPHY	17

STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM: DOES THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND UKRAINE SUPPORT U.S. THE U.S. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY AND IS IT A RELEVANT MISSION

As the former Soviet Union dissolved, Newly Independent States emerged in Central Europe under the challenge of establishing new sovereign nations. The political and economic orientations of these new states affect the future security of Europe and in turn U.S. National Security interests. Stability in Central Europe is dependent upon expanding economic opportunity and minimizing the threat between nations. The U.S. National Security Strategy supports the use of military forces to promote stability and shape the international environment through the advancement of democratic values and international economic cooperation.

The Department of Defense has taken a unique role in shaping the security environment of Central Europe. Partnerships have been developed with key emerging nations to build constructive security relations and promote the development of democratic institutions. Military-to-military contacts are the main component of defense activities designed to shape the international environment. The framework adopted by the Department of Defense to engage emerging nations is NATO's Partnership for Peace which concentrates on developing interoperability and positive relations with military forces in non NATO countries. The US participates in both the NATO program and in a unilateral effort conducted in the spirit of Partnership for Peace. The US initiatives extend beyond military-to-military relationships and promote activities that support economic growth and the development of democratic institutions in emerging nations. Defense efforts are also a joint endeavor that not only spans the services but the reserve components as well.

This paper will examine the use of the National Guard in conducting engagement activities in the spirit of Partnership for Peace. The specific focus will be the National Guard State Partnership Program and the partnership between the California National Guard and Ukraine. I will discuss some of the political and economic complexities facing Ukraine, a Newly Independent State caught in a struggle to form a new government, a new economy, and a national identity. I will then address the California Guard's initiatives to help shape the regional environment in concert with the National Security Strategy and conclude with an assessment of the partnership engagement mission as it pertains to the California National Guard.

BACKGROUND

The fall of the Soviet Union and dissolution of the Warsaw Pact created a complex environment for emerging independent states to form new political and economic structures that would ensure their physical and financial security. As states broke from the Soviet alliance to reestablish their sovereignty, many had fractured economies, limited security and faced the challenges of building state authority, creating representative institutions, and establishing free market economies.¹ The survival of many new states would be dependent upon their ability to maintain delicate relationships between the competing interests of Russia, the European Union and the United States. The complexities involved with

developing new and lasting relations were compounded by disputes on the division of former Soviet assets, territorial borders, trade agreements, and nuclear arms control.² Cultural and ethnic issues would also influence the elements of nation building and change the regional dynamics as each new state defined itself.³

Regional security and economic stability appear to be the collective goals of most former Soviet and Warsaw Pact nations, however, philosophical differences and general distrust impairs their ability to reach mutually beneficial trade and security agreements. Three nations, Poland, Hungary, and Czech Republic who were formerly associated with Russia have moved to the west and joined NATO. Russia has pressed other former Soviet States to form a new alliance called the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Russia has also taken a strong position against NATO enlargement and applied pressure where it can to stop further expansion.⁴

In response to regional concerns over NATO expansion various partnership programs were developed specifically for promoting relations with non-NATO countries. The objective was to create a neutral and non-threatening environment to build cooperation for regional security and economic growth. The core partnership construct is NATO's Partnership for Peace. The United States participates in the NATO program and has also formed independent initiatives which are considered to be "In the Spirit of Partnership for Peace". Partnership programs have been a great conduit for promoting stability and while enhancing regional security is the main objective, more nations are moving toward full NATO membership. Other partnership countries like Ukraine have opted to continue as partners outside NATO for reasons that will be discussed later.

The primary US initiatives conducted in the spirit of Partnership for Peace are the Joint Contact Team Program and the National Guard State Partnership Program. Under the State Partnership Program, California and Ukraine have formed a relationship that extends beyond military contacts and into community activities. Civic and business leaders of both countries have joined the military in promoting democratic values and free market economy through exchange visits and city partnerships.

The next section will discuss the importance of Ukraine in maintaining stability in Central Europe. It is important to understand some fundamental issues that have placed Ukraine in a position of influence between the east and west.

REGIONAL STABILITY AND UKRAINE

Ukraine is considered to be a cornerstone of the new European security architecture. In April 1996, the Secretary General of NATO stated that "Ukraine has an absolutely unique role to play in the stability of Europe and further stated that "stability, security and prosperity in Europe cannot be achieved without stable relations between Ukraine and NATO member countries".⁵ The United States has also declared the importance of Ukraine in its National Security Strategy. The US partnership with Ukraine is referenced on the first page of the President's introduction to the National Security Strategy, and in the regional assessment which states the US has vital security interests in the evolution of Ukraine into a

democratic market economy.⁶ As the third largest recipient of United States foreign aid, there can be no doubt about US interest in Ukraine.⁷

Ukraine is considered equally important to Russia. A report by James Sherr on Ukraine's struggle for independence stated that "without Ukraine's support, Russia stands little chance of restoring its dominance over former Warsaw states in central Europe".⁸ The territory occupied by Ukraine is large and strategically located as both a buffer between the East and West and for port access in the Black Sea. Russia's monopoly on the energy market is also threatened by Ukraine's independence. The Caspian Sea region has substantial untapped oil reserves and Ukraine holds strategic promise as an alternative energy transport corridor which could provide Asian gas and oil to several regional states cheaper than Russia.⁹ Russia's oil business is a significant portion of their economy and any competition could affect their ability to remain solvent.

Russia has not been supportive of Ukraine's independence and views it as temporary. Relations between Russia and Ukraine were fractured over control of the former Soviet Black Sea Naval Fleet, the seaport of Sevastopol and Crimea which is occupied predominately by ethnic Russians. The two nations also held opposing views over the character of the Russian sponsored Commonwealth of Independent States and proposed NATO expansion. Ukraine maintains that joining the Russian dominated alliance would constrain its sovereignty and independence and chooses not to become heavily involved.¹⁰ While Ukraine has refused full CIS integration, they have joined an inter-state economic committee to promote regional trade.

Ukraine's struggle for a new economy is complicated by its ties to Russia, and a European environment where many countries lack the economic or political stability to risk investing in a developing nation with a very uncertain future. The absence of economic reform and support from the West will make Ukraine vulnerable to Russia, which still has considerable economic leverage over the region. Ukraine is heavily dependent on Russian energy supplies, which in the past have been cut off for non-payment causing serious disruptions in Ukraine's economy.¹¹ Russia has also imposed high taxes on Ukrainian goods as a form of economic intimidation. Russia on the other hand is struggling with their own economic problems and may try to exert their influence, but must be careful not to push too far. Ukraine trades extensively with Russia, and if Ukraine falters, Russia is in no position to assume responsibility for Ukraine's financial welfare.

While Ukraine decisively broke from Russian rule, their weak economic environment and dependence on Russian trade presents serious concern over their future economic and political security. Ukraine's physical security is also tenuous because both Russia and NATO consider Ukraine a security buffer between the east and west.¹² With Russia's deep opposition to NATO expansion, a pro-west move could threaten Ukraine's economy and security. While US interests in Ukraine are clear, the US has placed a higher priority on Russian relations.¹³ Ukraine is well aware of the Russia first policy and must be cautious in their approach to nation building to avoid isolation.

The greatest threat to Ukraine's independence however, comes from their own inability to execute economic reform. Ukraine's poor start at an economic overhaul was a collective failure. The west offered support and introduced concepts of reform to revive a free market economy. However, Ukraine inherited a command economy and had no experience or model to guide the transition to the free market.¹⁴ Business had an anti-market focus that perpetuated the inefficiencies of their institutional style management and labor practices. The experience of engaging free market political and legal practices was also non-existent as business tried to reform for competition in external markets.

Ukraine also has an internal east-west division to deal with. There is strong support in the west for a distinct Ukrainian national identity and the eastern region favors association with the Russian federation.¹⁵ Most people in Ukraine support independence but there are sharp divisions along ethnic lines over the pro western policy. The last two independent elections were decisively pro west but the vote was a distinctive regional east-west divide.¹⁶ Political order is not currently threatened by the division but that could change without significant economic and political reform.

Ukraine faces the concurrent challenges of building political institutions, social institutions, and a free market economy. The emerging government will remain vulnerable to indirect exploitation by divisive factions seeking economic and geopolitical gain but such threats are manageable with support from the west. "The real danger, as James Sherr noted, is not that Ukraine will turn eastward, but that it will involuntarily drift in that direction as a result of its failure to modernize its economy and the comparative ease of doing business in the Russian market."¹⁷

While US foreign policy and diplomatic agencies have been working to improve economic and political conditions in Central Europe, the military's role has been to engage non-NATO countries, like Ukraine, with initiatives to promote trust and cooperation among former adversaries. US and NATO partnership programs have offered a non-threatening model to build cooperation among neighbors for collective regional security as an alternative to choosing between NATO and CIS. The trust that builds from these partnerships becomes the catalyst to forge international relationships necessary to build security and promote democratic values. The next two sections will discuss the partnership programs and their objectives.

PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

Partnership for Peace was established in January 1994 as a NATO program to build relations with emerging democracies. The program was adopted to use military relations as a bridge to develop trust and cooperation with the military forces and civil authorities in developing nations throughout Europe. The end state was to "expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance."¹⁸ The framework for meeting PfP objectives offers partner states the opportunity to choose among NATO sponsored programs designed to develop transparent defense budgeting, promote democratic control of

national defense, and conduct joint military exercises with NATO members in peacekeeping, search and rescue, and humanitarian operations.¹⁹ Partnership for Peace expanded their areas of cooperation in 1997 under a program revision titled Enhanced Partnership for Peace. The enhanced program covers a wide spectrum of support in the military field and broader defense related activities to include air space management, civil emergency planning, consumer logistics, and medical services. The program now has 24 members who can choose from over 20 areas of cooperation to strengthen regional stability and security.

The United States adopted Partnership for Peace in 1994 as a key component of the National Security Strategy. The strategy conveys an intent for using the military to help build coalitions and shape the international environment to protect and promote US interests.²⁰ The three core objectives of the National Security Strategy are to enhance security, bolster economic prosperity, and promote democracy. These objectives are embodied in the National Military Strategy as an element of the military's mission to deter war. The National Military Strategy draws from the National Security Strategy, objectives to promote peace and stability by shaping the international environment through peacetime engagement activities, and a requirement for active participation and leadership in alliances.²¹ Partnership for Peace is one program specifically identified to help establish long term relationships with military leaders in other countries which may be inclined to support efforts for increased European security but not as a member of NATO. The National Military Strategy specifically states "Military-to-military contacts with other countries that are neither staunch friends nor confirmed foes build constructive security relationships, help to promote the appropriate role of the armed forces in a democratic society, and enhance stability."²²

Concurrent with the US support of NATO's Partnership for Peace, the Department of Defense has taken a more aggressive and independent role in developing relationships with emerging democracies in Europe. Various theater engagement activities are conducted as a unilateral U.S. effort but in concert with Partnership for Peace objectives. These unilateral activities are considered "In the Spirit of Partnership for Peace" and include the National Guard's State Partnership Program. In the Spirit of Partnership for Peace is defined as US sponsored activities that support the broad objectives of PFP to build regional relations with non NATO members for combined peacekeeping, search and rescue, and humanitarian operations. It is important to note that partner nations identify objectives and the US program supports nation building activities in addition to the interoperability of military forces.

THE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

The State Partnership Program (SPP) supports the national security and national military strategies through engagement activities that promote democracy, encourage market economies, promote regional cooperation and stability, and provide opportunities for members of the National Guard and civilians in their communities to interact with and learn from other nations and cultures.²³ This program was formed from the PFP concept in 1992 before the NATO charter to provide US opportunities

to engage non-NATO countries in a shared environment of regional and international military, political and economic activities.²⁴ The state program now fits under the framework of ISO PfP.

The State Partnership Program started under General Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General John Shalikashvili, Commander-in Chief of European Command as a result of the void created by the fall of the Soviet Union.²⁵ The founding event was the Government of Latvia seeking support to develop "a national military based on the US National Guard model of the citizen soldier."²⁶ The State of Michigan volunteered to partner with Latvia and by 1999 twenty-four US States were partnered with twenty-one nations in Europe and Central Asia.

The National Guard Bureau objectives for the SPP are to demonstrate military subordination to civilian authority, demonstrate military support to civilian authorities, assist in the development of democratic institutions, foster open market economies to help bring stability, and project and represent United States' humanitarian values.²⁷ To support these objectives National Guard Units conduct a wide range of activities which include emergency response, education and training, resource management, military law, environmental protection, community relations, civil engineering, civil affairs, military medicine, transportation, policy development, and counter drug programs.²⁸

Oversight for SPP activities in Europe and Eurasia are provided by EUCOM and CENTCOM in concert with the US Ambassador and Country Team in the host nation, the Joint Staff and the National Guard Bureau. There are five categories in which SPP activities are classified and they are: Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP), Partnership for Peace/In the Spirit of Partnership for Peace (PfP/ISO PFP), Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR), Office of the Secretary of Defense and State Department, and National Guard Bureau (NGB) Special Training (ST) and Deployment for Training (DfT).²⁹ These categories regulate the type of activities that can be conducted under the State Partnership Program and their funding sources. The majority of SPP activities are conducted under JCTP, ISO PfP, AND NGB ST/DFT. The National Guard Bureau Special Training and Deployment for Training governs special training, partner exercises and overseas deployments.

The Joint Contact Team Program is the operational element for planning and executing Theater Engagement Plans. The JCTP structure includes Military Liaison Teams and Traveling Contact Teams. Military Liaison Teams are the planning element that work with the Embassy staff and host country on developing activities that promote civilian control of the military, respect for public law and human rights, professional training for military leaders and other events requested by host nations to support democratic reforms. The team consists of four to six military personnel with an O-6 team chief. The team chief normally serves a one year tour and the other members are assigned for six months. The teams are joint staff and approximately thirty percent are from the reserve components. Traveling Contact Teams are the operational end and work close with partner countries on reshaping military forces, activities to promote democracy, and the development of market economies. Contact team events include teaching US business practices, familiarization visits to the US, multinational conferences and military exchanges.³⁰

Traveling Contact Teams are usually small and formed for short durations from both active and reserve units on a mission basis. The National Guard makes a significant contribution to the Joint Contact Team Program with staff and unit support through the State Partnership Program.

The State Partnership Program adds a unique dimension to national security strategy by involving individual states and communities with foreign nations. Partner states are aligned through common interest such as ethnic or economic similarities which extend into communities and form grass roots relationships. These relationships form a foundation for trust and cooperation that leads to mutually beneficial exchanges. While emerging democracies benefit from a wide range of support to help secure their independence, National Guard units receive unique training and deployment opportunities within a coalition environment.

CALIFORNIA-UKRAINE ACTIVITIES

Previous sections of this paper have addressed the strategic importance of Ukraine in U.S. National Security, and programs to shape the international environment. The opportunities presented under partnership programs have exposed the Ukrainian military, civic leaders and business community to the merits of democracy and free market economy. This section will discuss California-Ukraine partnership events that occurred over a two-year period in training years 1997 and 1998. I should note here that the State of Kansas became an associate partner with California in 1996 and conducts activities with and independent of California. The California National Guard is the lead agency for the Ukraine partnership but the engagement plan and events are closely coordinated with the Kansas Guard. California and Kansas both attend planning conferences with EUCOM and Ukraine to negotiate missions and resources to support the partnership. Most events include representation from both states however there are some activities conducted between Kansas and Ukraine and those events will not be discussed as part of this report.

The California-Ukraine partnership accomplished over fifteen events in 1997. One of the most productive events was a Familiarization Tour which provided Ukraine an opportunity to send members of the military and civic leaders to California for short tours to examine military and civil relationships in the United States. The result of this effort was an event with fourteen Ukrainian military and municipal leaders who came to California and stayed with Guard families to experience the American way of life after daytime meetings with their professional counterparts. The group met with business and industry leaders and local, county, state, and federal government officials to discuss government interaction with business.³¹ The delegation leader Alexander Krainiy was quoted as stating "People have been crying for freedom all these years while living under totalitarianism but they don't know how to use it."³² The military members of the group also participated in a weekend training event with California's enhanced infantry battalion the 1-184 Infantry to observe reserve components in a field training environment.

California Guard members participated in two peacekeeping exercises which provided unique opportunities for training in an international environment. Cooperative Neighbor 97 was a multinational event and the first time California troops deployed to exercise with their partner nation. The second exercise was Peaceshield 97, a computer aided command post exercise in California and the first international peacekeeping exercise hosted by a US National Guard Headquarters. The Peaceshield scenario included humanitarian assistance missions and involved civil agencies such as the California Office of Emergency Services and local law enforcement agencies.³³

The Commander of the National Guard of Ukraine (NGU) General-Lieutenant Valkiv also visited California with nine members of his senior staff as an event. The National Guard of Ukraine is not a reserve force like the US National Guard and does not fall under the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense with the other military forces. The NGU reports directly to the President and has the mission to protect the Constitutional order of Ukraine, support emergencies, and deter outside aggression.³⁴ General Valkiv visited several California units and the National Civil Military Institute. He demonstrated a deep interest in the U.S. Noncommissioned Officer Corps (NCO) structure, education and how it applied to the reserve components.³⁵

The California Air National Guard also conducted a series of events with the Ukrainian Air Force and Army aviation units. The first was an exchange between combat search and rescue units. Eight Ukrainian Air Force Officers and the 129th Air Rescue Wing shared information on rescue and medical procedures. They also conducted parachute jumps together and observed in flight refueling of rescue helicopters. In the second event the Air Guard hosted twelve members from the NGU's Aviation Brigade to discuss environmental issues dealing with the transportation and storage of hazardous materials. The last exchange involved six members of the Air Guard traveling to Ukraine for discussions on logistics issues. Ukraine was seeking information on systems for tracking and accounting for spare parts.³⁶

Other significant events for 1997 included a Special Forces activity with California's Company D, 5th Battalion, 19th Special Forces Group (Airborne). The unit conducted training for fourteen NGU officer cadets in airborne and air assault operations, weapons familiarization, land navigation, medical training and long-range reconnaissance. Another activity was conducted in Ukraine by a delegation from the California Guard, Kansas Guard, National Civil Military Institute, and the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services. The purpose of the visit was to provide information to the Ministry of Emergencies and the National Guard of Ukraine on joint planning and training for civil emergencies.

Training year 97 was very ambitious and activities were targeted at promoting trust and confidence between military forces, enhancing civil-military relations and promoting democratic values. The focus for 98 remained largely the same but with more challenging events and added emphasis on the role of reserve components and promotion of democratic values. The complexity of engagement activities increased as exercises, such as Peaceshield 98, were integrated with civic leader exchanges.

Peaceshield 98 was the premier event with over 50 soldiers from the California Army National Guard working in battalion and brigade cells as members of a multinational peacekeeping force with

representatives from twenty-one countries. The exercise was a great experience for Guard soldiers however, much more was accomplished with the Civic Leader visit scheduled to coincide with the training event. A delegation of fifty people to include elected officials, business representatives, educators, media, and prominent farmers from California traveled to Ukraine to observe the exercise and meet with their civilian counterparts.³⁷ A Peace Corps volunteer obtained student interpreters from a Ukrainian university to assist the group with their discussions. The Mayor of L'viv and the U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine both met with the group and extended a warm welcome to Ukraine. The media coverage of all activities was extensive and a few multi-part series were produced in California's major media markets. High profile events included U.S. teachers in Ukrainian classrooms, farmers discussing equipment and production, and of course the multinational peacekeeping exercise featuring California Guard members. Long term relationships were developed during that visit especially between the farmers and educators. Teachers Reaching Out, a non-profit group in Sacramento California has supported various programs to maintain communication with students and provide materials for use in Ukrainian classrooms. The leaders' trip required extensive coordination but proved a rewarding experience that promoted national objectives and imaged the utility of the reserve components.

Other Army Guard activities included a Special Forces trip to Ukraine to train with NGU Special Forces. Training was conducted in a peacekeeping environment and included route reconnaissance, casualty evacuation and airborne operations. Guard members were awarded Ukrainian jump wings at the conclusion of the exercise. Another activity included an exchange of information on corps and higher logistics systems. Ukrainians traveled to California to develop the foundation for logistics interoperability and the potential for integration in future coalition exercises.

The Air Guard's key event in 98 was a thirty-person deployment from the 163rd Medical Squadron to Ukraine for joint medical seminars. This activity was represented by the total force and cosponsored with the L'viv State Medical University. Ukrainian and U.S. medical specialists gave lectures and exchanged information on emergency medical and dental techniques. The seminars not only brought together civilian and military medical professionals but also hundreds of Ukrainian medical students.³⁸

Military Support to Civil Authority has remained a focus of the partnership program. In 1998 under the Minuteman Fellow Program, a Lieutenant Colonel from the Ukrainian Ministry of Emergencies worked as an assistant operations officer in the California National Guard's Crisis Action Center. The Ukrainian Officer worked during the 98 California floods and developed an appreciation for the unique mission of the National Guard and its relationship with civil authorities during emergencies.

Two unique partnership opportunities were presented in 1998 to promote military subordination to civil authority and the benefits of reserve components. An Officer from California and One from Kansas received the opportunity to instruct at the Ukrainian National Guard Academy in Kharkiv, Ukraine. The National Guard officers taught cadets on U.S. history and culture as well as battalion and brigade tactics.^{98hlite3} In two weeks they reached the future leadership of the Ukrainian military and forged close relationships with their Ukrainian colleagues. The second opportunity was a conference at the

Marshall Center to discuss the role, structure and missions of the United States National Guard. The National Guard of Ukraine requested the conference and California and Kansas co-hosted the event. The Commander of the Ukrainian National Guard and several members of the Supreme Rada attended the conference and developed an understanding of the capabilities, utility, and economical advantage of reserve forces.

Twenty events were conducted in training year 98 and the involvement of California communities added a very unique dimension. Interest in forming sister city relationships grew as a result of civic exchanges. Expanding academic, agricultural, and healthcare contacts is gathering support within California's University system and in the private sector. Military exchanges have been enlightening for Guard soldiers and partnerships have now been developed between units. The 40th Infantry Division (Mechanized), California National Guard has formed relationships with the 6th Division, National Guard of Ukraine and the 93rd Motorized Rifle Division, Ground Forces of Ukraine.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

The program assessment will discuss SPP operations, resources, and benefits. Operations and resources will be viewed from an operational perspective. The benefits section will consider the partnership program's contribution towards National Security goals and the impact on California National Guard soldiers. In researching program benefits I found there was no measurable standard at the State or National level. While you might expect some difficulty in trying to measure the degree of success Ukrainian engagement activities have on regional stability, there is simply no report that addresses the issue. At the operational or State level there were no performance standards developed or after action reviews to provide program strengths and weaknesses.

OPERATIONS AND RESOURCES

The administration of the partnership program is divided at the National Guard Bureau (NGB) between International Affairs in the Chief of NGB's office and the Army and Air components. Policy is established by International Affairs and the components regulate most of the activities through management of overseas training deployments. Once activities are approved by NGB, States coordinate directly with service components in theater to plan and execute the events.

Within National Guard Bureau, partnership program goals are not evident at the working level. There is confusion over program intent in Army Operations and a feeling that engagement activities detract from a unit's primary mission.³⁹ The engagement mission is not on the mission essential task list for National Guard units. The importance of the program has been well communicated but additional resources have not been provided to support events. This results in the program being viewed as a priority but treated as an opportunity. The division of responsibility and authority for SPP activities contributes to operational frustration at the state level. Each event requires theater and one or two levels of NGB approval which is rarely provided in a timely manner.

A former EUCOM Desk Officer stated that shaping through engagement activities was the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs program and the State Partnership Program needs to be an identifiable and resourced component in the CINC's Theater Engagement Plan (TEP).⁴⁰ This issue was discussed throughout the interviews and the prevailing National Guard view was that the planning process does not work well at the theater level. The State Partnership Program directly supports the TEP but the active component is not open to the reserve component input. Theater component commands generally have responsibility for input to the CINC's plan but the absence of any command relationship with the Guard makes the planning for partnership events by thirty States, in over twenty-seven countries, a difficult task. Difficult does not mean insurmountable. Theater plans look three to five years out and while California submitted a five year proposal, activities are generally not approved more than a year out.

California's experience has been more complicated than most because Ukraine was not assigned to a CINC Area Of Responsibility (AOR). The Joint Staff and EUCOM both became involved in the approval process depending on the type of event. Ukraine was assigned to the EUCOM AOR in 1999 which has helped focus the process but generated other issues. California Guard SPP activities are now coordinated through the component commands which subject both army and air proposals to another layer of review and approval. The feeling among the Guard representatives was the SPP is losing its identity and the National Guard was becoming a force provider for missions the active component did not want. The AC leverage is funding. The Guard's perception is, if they want more desirable missions, States or NGB will have to fund them from their training accounts.

The research indicates that SPP is properly focused but not well used by EUCOM. Reserve component missions are not on the AC scope and therefore not included much in theater plans.⁴¹ The Guards view is that their mission is unique and serves as an excellent model for emerging democracies concerned about national security in a resource constrained environment. The utility of the Guard in support to civil authority is a clear benefit of a dual role force but that area receives little attention in theater plans. The California National Guard is in the FY00 EUCOM plan for four MSCA missions out of 122 EUCOM engagement activities with Ukraine. California is listed in the same plan for ten other events. While the number of events has declined from 1998 the advantage of having events in the plan cannot be overlooked.

A barrier and huge source of frustration for the California National Guard has been the absence of commitment from the AC and the compressed planning cycle associated with receiving missions six to twelve months out.⁴² Delays in receiving a theater invitation to participate in events forced units to divert resources from other programs and added to the OPTEMPO problems experienced throughout the Army. The Guard's planning cycle is twenty-four months out and changes create major disruptions. The traditional Guard staff has a difficult time incorporating new missions in their limited time available and the burden falls to the full-time staff which is manned at less than 40 percent of required. Something always suffers when high profile missions are added and it is usually unit or soldier support. With activities

identified in the theater plan, the conditions may improve but the process will not be complete without the timely commitment and resources.

There is no funding allocated to the States specifically for the partnership program. There are however, multiple sources of funding in other programs that may be used with various restrictions. The Traditional CINC Activity fund offers the most flexibility. Interviews with the California National Guard's program manager for International Activities and a former European Command desk officer indicate sufficient funding was generally available in theater but component rivalry and personalities factored into activity allocations.⁴³ Funding for events is a complicated mixture and allocated based on internal priorities of the various players. In most cases units are required to use some of their operations and training money to support events even though activities are not programmed as a mission essential task. There was also a notable shortcoming in funding for program management at the State Headquarters. States are simply not given additional money for oversight and must redirect both personnel and operations funding to support the program.

PROGRAM BENEFITS

Response to the question "How do you measure success?" was uniform. All conceded it was very difficult to measure and really could not be done in the usual army task, condition, and standard construct. A representative from National Guard Bureau Army Operations indicated that they had no strategic view on the partnership program and only measured missions programmed with missions completed. The other views presented by Guard representatives reflected the character of the national security strategy shaping mission. The program objectives to promote stability and democracy are important missions but the training value for reserve units with limited time must be considered. In discussing benefits it is important to remember that Ukraine is a pivotal nation in the new European security architecture and an emerging democracy caught in a struggle to maintain their independence.

The 1997 and 1998 agendas clearly promoted the ideals of democracy, the utility and economic advantage of reserve forces and lasting interpersonal relationships with both civic and military leaders. The groups hosted in California observed the legislative process in action at the State Capitol and interfaced with local leaders to discuss community issues such as crime and economic development. Relationships between government agencies were profiled to demonstrate the effect of cooperation in mobilizing resources to support civil authorities. The support role was stressed to highlight the subordination of military forces in democratic societies. The concept of reserve components and the National Guard in particular was advanced through a co-hosted conference at the Marshall Center and through the Guard's Military Support to Civil Authority (MSCA) mission. Traveling Contact Teams and a MSCA course in California provided the framework for Ukrainian military members to further integrate that mission in Ukraine. Exposure to California National Guard Members from all walks of life demonstrated the advantage reserve members offer the military with their civilian acquired skills and in reverse how reservists connect the military to communities. Relationships are a critical component of every strategic environment and the California Guard definitely connected in this arena. Guard families hosted Ukrainian

civilian and military visitors in their homes and served as ambassadors of the American value system. The civic leader trip to Ukraine was equally productive with U.S. teachers and farmers establishing enduring relationships with their counterparts. Ukraine is reforming slowly but there are positive signs of their progress towards independence. One of the most significant is the reelection of their pro west President in 1999. Ukraine is still troubled with economic problems but the public sustained support for the opportunity and hope that democracy offers. Ukraine has also moved to reform their military structure by downsizing from 750,000 to approximately 200,000.⁴⁴ They are considering other measures to include the development of a more professional force, reserve structure, and placing the National Guard under the control of the Minister of Defense along with the other armed forces. These initiatives are all positive signs that theater engagement activities are a worthy investment in the National Security Strategy.

California National Guard units and soldiers have gained valuable experience through the partnership program. At the staff level, exercise planning in a coalition environment for both peacekeeping and MSCA missions improves readiness for potential overseas missions. Preparing for an overseas deployment also helps update individual readiness processing requirements. Soldiers generally work in one of their specialties which enhances skills and offers experience in working with coalition forces. The cultural exchange has been enlightening for Guard troops who would not otherwise have opportunities to experience other national environments. Deployments have been viewed by the majority of troops as rewarding which has produced a positive impact on retention. The detractors have been the lack of support for planning and coordinating missions and then processing soldiers for deployment. Traditional guard members serving on battalion staffs and the full-time force from the company level up are over taxed trying to execute missions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The partnership program is a valid mission that should continue with some improvements in resources, planning and reviews. First, states should be resourced by the National Guard Bureau for program management and planning based on their level of participation. The current method of redirecting personnel and operations funding hurts other readiness programs. Resourced full-time manning is essential for a quality international program. Event planning is another problem. National Guard leaders and planners must be involved at the theater and component levels when discussions are held on partner nation strategies. The Guard has unique skills and can contribute more to theater plans if included early in the planning process. Planning cycles need to be synchronized with the active component to provide sufficient time for reserve units to engage in a more deliberate process for planning deployments. Missions should be approved by the AC and RC at least twenty-four months out. Evaluations are critical for program improvement and historical record. Detailed after action reviews should be conducted at the unit and State levels to provide some indication of program effectiveness and improvements needed. The results of these reviews should be summarized and maintained at both the State and National Guard Bureau levels for future reference.

CONCLUSION

The State Partnership Program is a useful tool to support the national security engagement strategy. It is a relevant mission for California with one of the most important new states in Central Europe. Ukraine is a strategic priority caught between competing interests in a very troubled region. They have a faltering economy dependent upon trade with Russia and concerns over their future security. Both NATO and Russia consider Ukraine an essential security buffer between the east and west and a pro-west move by Ukraine could threaten their economy and security. The U.S. is in no position to push Ukraine into a western alliance and risk fracturing relations with Russia who is opposed to NATO expansion. The best possible alternative for regional stability is to continuing supporting the progressive growth of Ukraine's new democratic government and transition to a free market economy with the non-threatening, self-paced nature of partnership programs.

California's partnership events have supported objectives to advance civilian control of the military, military support to civil authority, the development of democratic institutions, and free market economies. The Guard modeled the economic advantages, utility, and benefits of maintaining a reserve force over a large active force, which supports both economic and military reform. The interpersonal relationships formed between communities and military members are a unique dynamic that could have a profound impact on Ukrainian public opinion and future national decisions.

Ukraine's journey to political and financial independence will be long and painful. The State Partnership Program is focused on the right objectives to support the National Security Strategy engagement mission and Ukraine's transition to democracy. The focused application of a campaign to influence Ukrainian institutions and community leaders could ultimately determine whether Ukraine survives as an independent state. The California National Guard has made a contribution to the European Command engagement strategy and should continue the partnership mission to promote stability and inspire hope in a troubled European region.

WORD COUNT= 6846

ENDNOTES

- ¹ James Sherr, "Ukraine's New Time Of Troubles," Conflict Studies Research Centre G67, (Oct98):7
- ² F. Stephen Larrabee, "Ukraine's Place in European and Regional Security", Rand Reprints 748, (1998):251
- ³ Sherr,3
- ⁴ Larrabee,259
- ⁵ Sherr,2
- ⁶ William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy For A New Century, Washington D.C.: The White House, October1998:iii,39
- ⁷ Larrabee,256
- ⁸ Sherr,4
- ⁹ Ibid,5
- ¹⁰ Larrabee,252
- ¹¹ Ibid,251
- ¹² Ibid,259-261
- ¹³ Ibid,255
- ¹⁴ Sherr,9
- ¹⁵ R. Craig Nation, "Ukraine: A Pivotal State?" Regional Strategic Appraisals (US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 25Jan-17Mar 2000): 175
- ¹⁶ Ibid,177
- ¹⁷ Larrabee,255
- ¹⁸ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO Handbook, Partnership and Cooperation, (Brussels, Belgium NATO,1998):87
- ¹⁹ Ibid,88
- ²⁰ Clinton,12
- ²¹ John M. Shalikashvili, National Military Strategy, Washington D.C.:September1997:2
- ²² Ibid,13

²³ National Guard Bureau, Doctrine For National Guard Cooperative Efforts With Other Nations, (Arlington VA: National Guard Bureau, 28 May 1998):1

²⁴ John R. Groves Jr. "PfP And The State Partnership Program: Fostering Engagement And Progress," Parameters 29(Spring 1999):45

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ National Guard Bureau, 7

²⁸ Groves, 48

²⁹ National Guard Bureau, State Partnership Program SOP, (Arlington VA: National Guard Bureau), Appendix 2, Annex B

³⁰ Linda D. Kozaryn, "Joint Contact Teams Reach Out To East," nd Available from www.defenselink.mil/cgi-bin/dlprint: Internet; Accessed 8 Oct 99

³¹ Steven Goff, California-Ukraine Partnership Program, "1997 Highlights", Sacramento CA, 1997, 1

³² Ibid

³³ Ibid, 2

³⁴ Alexander Krainiy, Ukraine and Ukrainians, Ukrainian Armed Forces, Sacramento CA. 1999, 32

³⁵ Goff, 2

³⁶ Ibid, 3

³⁷ Steven Goff, California-Ukraine Partnership Program, "1998 Highlights", Sacramento CA, 1998, 2

³⁸ Ibid, 3

³⁹ Dan Bilko, Operations Officer National Guard Bureau, telephone interview by author, 10 February 00

⁴⁰ George Smith, Former European Desk Chief, telephone interview by author, 14 February 2000

⁴¹ Ibid

⁴² Steven Goff, International Affairs Officer, California National Guard, telephone interview by author, 15 February 2000

⁴³ Goff and Smith interviews

⁴⁴ Krainiy, 18

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bilko, Dan, Operations Officer, National Guard Bureau. Telephone interview, 14 February 2000.
- Bukkvoll, Tor, Ukraine and European Security London UK: Wellington House, 1997
- Clinton, William J., A National Security Strategy For A New Century, Washington D.C.: The White House, October 1998
- Goff, Steven, International Affairs Officer, California National Guard. Telephone interview by author, 15 February 2000
- Groves, John R., "PfP And The State Partnership Program: Fostering Engagement And Progress," Parameters 29 (Spring 1999):43-53
- Kozaryn, Linda D., "Joint Contact Teams Reach Out To East," nd Available from www.defense.mil/cgi-bin/dlprint; Internet; Accessed 8 October 1999
- Krainiy, Alexander, "Ukraine and Ukrainians, Ukrainian Armed Forces", Sacramento CA, 1999
- Kuzio, Taras, Ukraine "State and Nation Building", London UK: Routledge, 1998
- Larrabee, F. Stephen, "Ukraine's Place in European and Regional Security," Rand Reprints, Santa Monica CA.: Rand 1998
- Nation, Craig R., "Ukraine: A Pivotal State?" Regional Strategic Appraisals, Carlisle PA.: US Army War College 2000
- National Guard Bureau, Doctrine For National Guard Cooperative Efforts With Other Nations, Arlington VA :May 1998
- National Guard Bureau, State Partnership Program SOP, nd, Available from www.ngb.dtic.mil/bureau/ochief/ia; Internet. Accessed 27 January 2000
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO Handbook, Partnership and Cooperation, NATO, Brussels Belgium, 1998
- Shalikashvili, John M., National Military Strategy, Washington D.C.: September 1997
- Sherr, James, "Ukraine's New time Of Troubles," Conflict Studies Research Centre G67 England: Royal Military Academy 1998
- Smith, George, Former European Desk Chief. Telephone interview by author, 14 February 2000.
- Ulrich, Marybeth Peterson, Democratizing Communist Militaries, Ann Arbor Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1999
- Williams, Nick, "Partnership for Peace: Permanent Fixture of Declining Asset," Survival (Spring 1996): 98-110.