

*International Military Officers in U.S. Professional Military
Education Programs*

EWS Contemporary Issue Paper

Submitted by 1stLT Mehlhorn, Andreas

GERMAN Student

to

Major P.M. Bragg, CG 4

January 2007

Report Documentation Page

*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for the 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 this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 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 a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE JAN 2007		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2007 to 00-00-2007	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE International Military Officers in U.S. Professional Military				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) United States Marine Corps, Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development, Marine Corps University, 2076 South Street, Quantico, VA, 22134-5068				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
				12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited	
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Since the September 11 attacks, Europe has become one of the most important battlegrounds in the global fight against terrorism. Accordingly, U.S. cooperation with European counterterrorism efforts is more vital than ever. Despite often-heated rhetoric, authorities on both sides of the Atlantic have adopted many of the same methods -- and faced similar difficulties -- since September 11. They continue to seek long-term solutions to challenges such as prosecuting terrorists without compromising intelligence, meeting evidentiary requirements within different legal systems, and managing various levels of cooperation between multiple governments and agencies.¹

U.S. forces, European and other militaries are involved in the Global War on Terrorism, which is one of the major reasons that military operations with multinational participation take place. Communication between military forces in this environment takes much effort, especially when unit leaders do not know what to expect from, provide for, and accomplish together with other nations' militaries. Consequently, the U.S. military should involve more international military officers in its higher level professional military educational programs because the U.S. Armed Forces are global players who must increasingly integrate with international forces in coalition environments.

1. Michael Jacobson, *The West at War: U.S. and European Counterterrorism Efforts, Post-September 11* (Washington Institute Publications, May 2006), back cover

Current

Numerous U.S. training programs and education facilities that are open to international officers have existed for decades. Therefore, it is not difficult to find education evaluations and gather appropriate summaries from them. Some of the education programs and facilities are as follows:

- College of Naval Command and Staff
- Army Command and General Staff College
- Air Command and Staff College
- Warfighting Skills Program
- Expeditionary Warfare School
- Command and Staff Distance Education Program
- Air War College
- Army War College
- Industrial College of the Armed Forces
- College of Naval Warfare
- Command General and Staff College

Below are the country account summaries for International Military Education and Training for fiscal years 2005 (actual--funding actually provided in fiscal year 2005), 2006 (actual), 2007 (requested--funding requested under the President's fiscal year 2007 budget) and 2008 (requested). The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program is an instrument of U.S. national security and foreign policy and a key component of U.S. security assistance that provides training on a grant basis to students from allied and friendly nations.²

2. Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, *International Military Education and Training Account Summaries*, <<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/sat/c14562.htm>> (18 December 2007)

Country/Account Summaries International Military Education and Training (IMET) (\$ in thousands)				
Countries/Accounts	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Requested	FY 2008 Requested
Total Africa	9,182	10,177	10,830	13,663
Total East Asia and the Pacific	9,663	9,169	9,850	7,449
Total Europe and Eurasia	30,511	27,703	27,060	25,989
Total Near East	12,691	12,244	14,105	15,727
Total South and Central Asia	9,418	9,085	10,280	10,450
Total Western Hemisphere	13,238	12,876	12,575	11,967
E-IMET Schools	3,369	4,178	3,700	3,755
Total For Fiscal Year	89,012	85,877	88,900	89,500

Security in a broad view is expensive, even for the U.S. Government. On the other hand, depending on international relationships, built through exchanges and professional military education programs, to sell military equipment developed inside the U.S. is a way to get a lot of money back.

The Pentagon predicted last year that it would book about \$13 billion worth of foreign military sales for Fiscal 2006--roughly in line with the last few years. Yet the tally for the year reached nearly \$21 billion, according to Air Force Lt. Gen. Jeffrey Kohler, director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.³

Global Players

The U.S. Department of State, in a release by the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs (August 2007) has recognized the importance of building strong relationships with other countries'

3. Sharon Weinberger, *Foreign Military Sales Expected To Top \$20 billion in 2006*, 19 November 2006, <http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story_channel.jsp?channel=defense&id=news/aw112006p1.xml> (18 December 2007)

militaries. According to this document, the number one goal of the U.S. defense strategy is to "assure allies and friendly nations of the U.S. commitment to their security."⁴

DoD Security Cooperation is an important instrument for executing this strategy. Security Cooperation advances U.S. security interests building defense partnerships for the future. DoD Security Cooperation also prepares the United States, allies, and friendly nations for unforeseen circumstances, enabling us to respond effectively when such events occur.

DoD Security Cooperation involves all of the following objectives:

1. Build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests.
2. Develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and coalition operations, including allied transformation.
3. Improve information exchange and intelligence sharing to harmonize views on security challenges.
4. Provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access and en route infrastructure.⁴

The participation in courses at facilities of the U.S. Armed Forces for the IMOs is a vehicle for building such relationships. Not only are the well-trying, modern military tactics, techniques, and practices (TTPs) taught, but also cultural lessons. To convey such lessons beyond the United States would require much effort and time. Yet IMOs are able to absorb culture during their time in the U.S. almost by osmosis.

4. Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, *Foreign Military Training: Joint Report to Congress, Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007*, August 2007, <<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/fmtrpt/2007/92074.htm>> (18 December 2007)

One of the most important U.S. initiatives is the IMET program, covered in "Over 100 Nations Benefit From U.S. Military Training, Education" by Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr.:

The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, established in 1976, has become a key component of U.S. national security and foreign policy. The program, which is implemented by the Defense Department at the direction of the Department of State, provides training to students from approximately 120 allied and friendly countries, primarily at military schools and other facilities in the United States. More than 11,000 students were trained in Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 alone. Secretary of State Colin Powell believes so strongly in the IMET program that he has nearly doubled its budget over the past four years -- from \$50 million in FY 2000 to \$92 million in FY 2004.⁵

The fact that high ranking European officers are proud of their American education affirms the value of PME as a vehicle for building relationships. As General Janusz Bojarski, a Polish officer who graduated from National Defense University stated, "You must remember that NDU has a tremendous reputation in all our countries, and we will all be proud when we receive our diplomas next week."⁶

5. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr., *Over 100 Nations Benefit From U.S. Military Training, Education*, 09 December 2004, <<http://usinfo.state.gov/xarchives/display.html?p=washfile-english&y=2004&m=December&x=20041209181743sjhtrop0.8697626>> (18 December 2007)

6. Jim Fisher-Thompson, *International Military Officers Value U.S. Defense Education*, 12 June 2007, <<http://usinfo.state.gov/xarchives/display.html?p=washfile-english&y=2007&m=June&x=200706121644481EJrehSiF0.3831751>> (18 December 2007)

Also the Command General and Staff College can be proud of its former students because a lot of them became very important people.

...more than 6,000 officers from 142 countries have completed the course. Of these graduates, 23 have become their country's head of state. Almost half of them have reached the rank of general, and more than 300 have served their countries as ambassadors or key cabinet members. "Our alumni are truly international," said LTC Patrick Madden, chief of the Command and General Staff College's International Officer Student Division at Fort Leavenworth, Kan. "We are, in fact, training the future leaders of the world."⁷

While attending the live firing exercise *Combined Thunder* in MUNSTER/GERMANY, where the 2nd ANGLICO, II MEF, and the German *Panzerartilleriebataillon 215*⁸ were training, this author acquired an understanding of American tactics, techniques, and practices. An American colleague summed up the value of the training exercise: "What we are doing here, working with the German Army directing fire support, is exactly what we will do with the Iraqi Army," said Valderaz.

7. Dunphy, Christopher J., *CGSC INTERNATIONAL*, <<http://www-cgsc.army.mil/DSA/IMSD/download/soldiers.pdf>> (18 December 2007)

8. Adrienne G. Rigez, *2nd ANGLICO lights up Germany during fire support training*, 12 March 2007, <<http://www.usmc.mil/marinelink/mcn2000.nsf/main5/80B11A20DA7ABEE2852572AA00335432?opendocument>> (18 December 2007)

While a student at the Expeditionary Warfare School in Quantico this author also learned about the Marine Corps planning process and other TTPs that enable him to be a liaison officer and share knowledge from the German Officer School in a mutually beneficial manner.

Integration

Security is expensive. Securing an unstable country/area takes enormous effort and money. To bring a war to its end and repair all the collateral damage costs much more money and requires financial assistance from the global players. One way to avoid instability in a country and, therefore, avoid war is to educate and develop its leaders. Direct influence can be achieved through the education and training at U.S. PME Institutions. Human rights, the law of war, and other international laws and procedures are introduced to and practiced by the future military leaders of the world. A democratic country, like the United States can also indirectly influence international students through the cultural experiences and convey the U.S.' understanding of "human values." The impact of this type of education is huge because the integrated foreign students often rise to the highest state or military positions. Such individuals can have a huge influence on their peers and subordinates.

Counterarguments

Some may argue that the United States should not integrate more international military officers in its professional military education programs because a shortage of places in these programs exist for the U.S. military students. Infact, the U.S. military will need to accelerate the number of qualified officers in the future because of the expected increase in conflicts and peacekeeping missions in the world. However, since the United States militaries are spread throughout the world, they need relationships with other countries, and they must show them the kind of planning processes, tactics and procedures which the U.S. forces use. Moreover, once the IMOs become partners, their countries may become more involved in those conflicts and peacekeeping missions and reduce the U.S. forces required in theatre.

Conclusion

The author is a first-time visitor to the United States and its professional military education program, and he is positively impressed about the USMC model of leadership, the widespread and immense patriotism, and the military culture in the U.S. Marine Corps. His point is that "The more time I spend with the American colleagues the better I know their military skills, and the more I will use this knowledge in theatre to combine different

military cultures into one powerful force." In summary the author's experience fulfils USMC doctrine!

Operational commanders must be able to win consensus for joint or multinational concepts of operations and represent effectively to higher headquarters the capabilities, limitations, and external support requirements of their forces.⁹

9. MCDP 1-2, *Campaigning*, August 1997, p.94., (07 January 2008)

Bibliography

- Jacobson, Michael, , *The West at War: U.S. and European Counterterrorism Efforts, Post-September 11*, (Washington Institute Publications, May 2006), back cover
- Bureau of Political-Military Affairs "International Military Education and Training Account Summaries," 2007
<<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/sat/c14562.htm>> (18 December 2007)
- Weinberger, Sharon. "Foreign Military Sales Expected To Top \$20 billion in 2006," 19 November 2006, <http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story_channel.jsp?channel=defense&id=news/aw112006p1.xml> (18 December 2007)
- Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. "Foreign Military Training: Joint Report to Congress, Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007," August 2007, <<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/fmtrpt/2007/92074.htm>> (18 December 2007)
- Bloomfield, Lincoln P. Jr. "Over 100 Nations Benefit From U.S. Military Training, Education," 09 December 2004, <<http://usinfo.state.gov/xarchives/display.html?p=washfile-english&y=2004 &m=December&x=20041209181743sjhtrop0.8697626>> (18 December 2007)
- Fisher-Thompson, Jim. "International Military Officers Value U.S. Defense Education," 12 June 2007, <<http://usinfo.state.gov/xarchives/display.html?p=washfile-english&y=2007&m=June&x=200706121644481EJrehsiF0.3831751>> (18 December 2007)
- Dunphy, Christopher J. "CGSC INTERNATIONAL," October 2000
<<http://www-cgsc.army.mil/DSA/IMSD/download/soldiers.pdf>>
(18 December 2007)
- Rigez, Adrienne G. "2nd ANGLICO lights up Germany during fire support training," 12 March 2007, <<http://www.usmc.mil/marinelink/mcn2000.nsf/main5/80B11A20DA7ABEE2852572AA00335432?opendocument>> (18 December 2007)