



**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.

**THE HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE U.S. ARMY WAR
COLLEGE INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM**

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES R. HICKEY
United States Army

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

USAWC CLASS OF 2001



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

20010622 070

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**THE HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM**

by

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES R. HICKEY
United States Army

Colonel Stephen E. Keeling
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: James R. Hickey

TITLE: The History and Significance of the U. S. Army War College
International Fellows Program

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 28 March 2001

PAGES: 34

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

LTG DeWitt C. Smith, Jr., the longest serving commandant in the USAWC's 100 year history, is responsible for the International Fellows Program's (IFP) creation in 1977. Despite previously rejected considerations, early in his first term as commandant, he directed a review into integrating foreign officers into the USAWC and fought to develop a program which effectively allayed earlier concerns that their presence would hamper free-flowing idea exchange.

The IFP's curriculum enables senior officers destined for high-level leadership positions in their respective armies to improve mutual understanding of national security, operations, and preparedness. Although many IFs and their families are unprepared for the often dramatic lifestyle and culture changes at the USAWC, extensive efforts are made to welcome them into the Carlisle community and prepare them for their year ahead.

To more fully understand the strategic importance of the IFP and its relationship within the Security Cooperation framework, especially the International Military Education and Training Program, an examination into the National Security and Military Strategies is warranted.

Comprehensive measures of the IFP's success can be viewed through the long-term effects on and the stability of the represented countries. A thorough examination by UCP AOR and regions over twenty-four years is completed to underscore the IFP's significance. While it can be argued that the school did not produce these foreign leaders, selection and completion of the program is in many cases enough to assure their continued success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
THE HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IFP	1
TENTATIVE BEGINNINGS	1
ALLAYING EARLY CONCERNS	2
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND A TYPICAL ACADEMIC YEAR	3
FUNDING AND SPONSORSHIP	5
NATIONAL SECURITY & NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIES	6
IMET'S ROLE IN SECURITY COOPERATION (ASSISTANCE)	8
IFP REPRESENTATION BY UNIFIED COMMAND PLAN (UCP)	8
U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND (CENTCOM).....	9
EUCOM'S EUROPEAN AND MID-EAST REGION.....	9
EUCOM'S AFRICAN REGION	10
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	10
PACOM.....	11
SOUTHCOM, CANADA, AND MEXICO	11
CONTINUED SUCCESS	12
CONCLUSION	13
APPENDIX	15
ENDNOTES	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27

THE HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM

On 9 June 2001, 'God willing and Letort Creek don't rise,' Colonel Paul M. Gibson, of the United Kingdom's Parachute Regiment, will step across the Wheelock Bandstand, shake hands with MG Robert R. Ivany, receive a diploma and walk off into history as the 689th International Fellow (IF) to graduate from the United States Army War College (USAWC). He and his forty-one foreign colleagues comprise the twenty-fourth USAWC International Fellows Program (IFP) graduating class born in 1977 under a cloud of great anxiety, apprehension and skepticism.

TENTATIVE BEGINNINGS

Early in 1973, LTG Donald H. Cowles, the Department of the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (DA, DCSOPS), directed a complete review of all aspects of the USAWC. His office had just taken over oversight responsibilities from the DA Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Heading this effort was BG Henry C. Newton, a retired U.S. Army Reserve Officer. As part of this review General Newton considered, but firmly rejected, including foreign officers as resident students at the USAWC.

LTG DeWitt C. Smith, Jr., the longest serving commandant (1974-77 and 1978-80) in the USAWC's one hundred year history, is clearly most responsible for the program's creation and implementation. Despite the previously rejected considerations, early in his first term as commandant General Smith directed a review into integrating foreign officers into the USAWC. The following excerpt from Harry P. Ball's Of Responsible Command: A History of the United States War College provides clear insight into the difficulties and skepticism under which the IFP was born. The passage details General Smith's impassioned fervor and single-minded determination to create the program. It also references some of General Newton's conclusions detailed in the 1973 review.

Of all the schemes contemplated to bring different points of view to Carlisle Barracks, none was more difficult to implement than one involving having officers from armies of other nations at the War College on a resident basis. The step has been often considered and just as often rejected. General Smith's immediate predecessor studied the issue and calculated that it would cost more than a quarter of a million dollars annually, a cost that might have killed the idea if it otherwise had been universally supported. But Smith instituted another review of the issue in 1974. He solicited the opinion of his faculty on the idea as early as the fall of that year and, if he did not meet unanimous opposition, he found a strong consensus that it should not be done. The faculty believed, as had General Newton, that the problems of having to deny foreign officers

classified information and the inhibiting effect those officers would have on the candor of guest lecturers and group discussions were problems without solution. Smith understood but was not impressed by these arguments; he considered them minor compared to the benefits that would accrue.¹

From its tentative beginning with six foreign students, the program has grown to sustain a foreign student body of over forty International Fellows per year. With the exception of 1996, when Russia sent two IFs, there has never been more than one IF per representative country per academic year participating in the program.

ALLAYING EARLY CONCERNS

Throughout the IFP's history, the AWC leadership has effectively allayed the original fears that introducing foreign officers would hamper the free-flowing exchange of ideas if classified matters arose. While there are provisions for including IFs in classified activities, this option is rarely exercised. The current AWC policy for including IFs in classified discussions is as follows:

Should classified access be mutually beneficial to both U.S. students and International Fellows, disclosure authority must be solicited from the National Disclosure Policy Committee. Access to NATO classified information may be provided to International Fellows from NATO nations upon receipt of access certifications as prescribed by treaty regulations.²

Despite this official policy, the commonly accepted practice is to strictly prohibit each IF from all classified academic courses and lectures, regardless of his individual clearance based on bilateral and multi-lateral alliances, treaties and other agreements. For example, despite a Canadian officer's North American Aerospace Air Defense Command (NORAD) clearance or previous assignment in the command, he would not be allowed to attend a classified NORAD lecture as part of the AWC curriculum. The same procedure is followed for NATO member nation officers, ASEAN, ANZUS, etc. This practice was established and is rigorously followed to foster the spirit that all things are equal for the IFs—exclude one, exclude all so that one may not feel inferior to another.

Fostering the spirit of academic equality between U.S. and IF students is also critical to the success of the AWC and limiting the number of classified events throughout the year helps support this intent. Other measures are also taken to ameliorate student conflict when classified events arise. In most cases when U.S. students receive a classified briefing or lecture, the IF counterparts concurrently receive an unclassified version of same briefing in a nearby

auditorium. There are a limited number of classified courses held throughout the Academic Year (AY). Clearly the AWC leadership does its utmost to create and maintain an underlying current, running through all IFP design aspects, to make each IF feel equal and welcome.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND A TYPICAL ACADEMIC YEAR

Presented below are the program's Purpose and Objective statements taken directly from the International Fellows Program: Information Booklet.³

PURPOSE

- The United States Army War College provides fellowships of approximately one year to selected senior officers from allied and other friendly nations. International Fellows are afforded an opportunity to study and research in close association with the USAWC faculty and student body.

OBJECTIVES

- To establish mutual understanding and good working relationships between senior U.S. officers and senior officers of selected foreign countries.
- To offer an opportunity for senior military officers from allied and friendly countries to study, research, and write on subjects of significance to the security interests of their own and allied nations.
- To extend and deepen the professional qualifications of military leaders of other nations.
- To enrich the educational environment of the Army War College.
- To improve the Fellow's firsthand knowledge of U.S. culture and institutions through study and travel.

The AY is segmented into three terms. Term I is comprised of four sequential Core Courses and runs from late July through mid-January. Term II consists of one Core Course, a Regional Strategic Appraisal of one of six world regions, and three elective courses. Term II runs from mid-January through mid-March. Term III consists of four elective courses and runs April through May. A two-week long Strategic Crisis Exercise (SCE) is executed between Terms II and III. Despite the SCE's classified content and systems, the IFs participation is instrumental in the exercise scenario and their knowledge, experience and diverse backgrounds contribute greatly to the overall success of the exercise.

Every attempt is made to make the foreign officers feel equal to each other and to their fellow U.S. students. Nowhere is this more evident than in the academic environment where IFs are offered the same unclassified curriculum offered to their resident U.S. student counterparts. As mentioned earlier, however, IFs are excluded from the electives deemed classified. The most efficacious assimilation of this policy occurs during Core Curriculum Course III, Joint Processes and Land Power Development, in mid-fall each year. The majority of this four-week program of instruction is classified secret due to content and because the procedures exercised in the Joint Operations Program and Execution System (JOPES) are practiced on a classified system. The USAWC leadership schedules the IFs' primary activity during this time-frame as travel to the U.S. Southern Command's (SOUTHCOM) Headquarters in South Miami, Florida, followed by a trip into the SOUTHCOM Area of Responsibility (AOR) and Mexico. The trip provides the multi-faceted benefit of further enhancing each IF's knowledge and experience while avoiding the possibly divisive atmosphere of U.S. students benefiting from exclusive instruction. The careful manner in which the AWC leadership has structured the academic environment has significantly lessened the possible effects early pre-program doubters professed.

Although many IFs and their families are unprepared for the sometimes dramatic lifestyle and culture changes they experience upon arrival to the AWC, extensive efforts are made to welcome them into the community and prepare them for their year ahead. The following passage eloquently describes their reception.

The Fellows' first month was devoted to an extensive orientation period. They received a thorough overview of the academic year ahead, met the key leaders of the Army War College, and received an introductory briefing from the staff on virtually every aspect of their stay at Carlisle. The spouses were also a part of this orientation, meeting people, learning about the Carlisle area school system, and for some taking advantage of English-as-a-Second-Language instruction. We try to link-up each family with a sponsor from the War College staff and a sponsor from the community. The objective is to make our international guests feel a part of this new community, their seminar group, and the school as soon as possible.⁴

In addition to a multitude of community activities, the IFs and their families are introduced to many other aspects of American culture through numerous trips across the United States. The intended purpose of these trips is to expose, and as best as possible educate, each IF and his family to U.S. socio-political, military and cultural norms and values. The SOUTHCOM trip mentioned earlier is the longest and provides each IF with first-hand experience with one of our Unified Geographic Combatant Command's operations both within its headquarters and through

its AOR. This trip and the other major excursions undertaken by the IFs, who accompanies them, and where they go are specified below:

- Washington D.C. with families (3 Days)
- New York City with spouses and U.S. students with spouses (3 Days)
- SOUTHCOM Headquarters; South Miami Beach, Florida; a few countries in the SOUTHCOM AOR and Mexico (2 Weeks)
- Western and Southern U.S. to include Fort Hood, Texas; the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, California; and the Joint Readiness and Training Center at Fort Polk, Louisiana (10 Days)
- Washington D.C. with U.S. Students (3 Days)
- United States Military Academy at West Point, New York (3 Days)

FUNDING AND SPONSORSHIP

Despite separate funding streams, at its heart the IFP is an International Military Education and Training (IMET) Program. IFs generally attend the USAWC under the financial auspices of one of the three following programs:

- International Military Education and Training (IMET)
- Foreign Military Sales or Foreign Military Finance (FMS, FMF)
- Foreign Exchange

In most cases IFs receive per diem that enables them to lead a lifestyle similar to that of their U.S. counterparts in the USAWC. The breakdown of the IF Class of 2001 is twenty-two IMET sponsored students, nineteen FMF/FMS students and one Foreign Exchange student.

To further integrate students and their families into the AWC and surrounding communities, and enhance their overall experience, each IF is assigned sponsors from three distinct groups. One sponsor is from the AWC staff and faculty, one fellow U.S. AWC student from the IF's seminar, and the last a civilian from the Carlisle community. Sponsor responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- The Carlisle sponsor, in cooperation with the IF Office, is responsible for the logistical and administrative arrangements necessary to make the Fellow's year in the United States professionally and personally rewarding.
- The In-class student sponsor is a fellow classmate who assists the IF in adjusting to the requirements and schedules of the U.S. Army War College's classroom.
- The civilian sponsor's responsibilities are primarily social but may include logistical and administrative assistance as well.⁵

NATIONAL SECURITY & NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIES

The United States has been deeply involved with Security Assistance since 1775, the principal difference is that then we were recipients and now we are the world's greatest provider. In 1999 the U.S. provided Security Assistance around the globe in excess of \$32B.⁶ Security Assistance is critical to the formation and maintenance of democratic states and continued stability throughout various forms of governments and sovereignties. An examination into the background and intent of Security Assistance and its relationship to the National Security Strategy (NSS) and National Military Strategy (NMS) is warranted. Security Assistance, (changed to Security Cooperation, effective 1 October 2000), has been woven into the very fabric of the United States of America since our birth as a nation. It is defined in the Department of Defense (DoD) Dictionary as:

Groups of programs authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, as amended, or other related statutes by which the United States provides defense articles, military training, and other defense related services by grant, loan, credit, or cash sales in furtherance of national policies and objectives.⁷

The most current United States National Security Strategy, dated December 1999, espouses *A Strategy of Engagement* founded on continued engagement and leadership abroad⁸. Its three core objectives are:

- To enhance U.S. security
- To bolster America's economic prosperity
- To promote democracy

Foreign policy, plans, programs, and capabilities are designed to achieve these three core national security objectives and developed by various government departments. Security

Assistance Programs are designed specifically with these particular national security objectives in mind.

The U.S. Security Assistance Program is primarily developed by the Department of State (DoS) and implemented by the DoD. Ultimately, the IFP falls under the auspices and is funded by the Department of State (DoS). The specific goals of the U.S. Security Assistance Training Programs themselves are to:

- Promote self-sufficiency
- Encourage the training of future leaders
- Support enhanced relations between the United States and foreign countries
- Expand foreign understanding of the United States and its culture and values
- Participate in International Narcotics Control⁹

While these are stated as U.S. Security Assistance Training Program goals, they adequately express most of the goals of the non-training programs. Thus, they sufficiently express the desired outcomes of our overall U.S. Security Assistance Program.

While there is some debate as to the true goals and benefits of Security Assistance, there is little doubt it is mutually beneficial to the U.S. and each of our partners, and it plays a significant role in our national security. Some contend that Congress approves Security Assistance Programs and appropriates funds in an effort to enhance humanitarian goals while the DoS and DoD are more keen to achieving the three key national security objectives outlined in the NSS. The Secretary of Defense clearly states in the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) that, "A strategy of engagement presumes the United States will continue to exercise strong leadership in the international community using all dimensions of its influence to shape the international security environment."¹⁰ The President addresses some of these benefits and those attributed to other military activities in the NSS when he states:

Through overseas presence and peacetime engagement activities such as defense cooperation, security assistance and training and exercises with allies and friends, our Armed Forces help to deter aggression and coercion, build coalitions, promote regional stability and serve as role models for militaries in emerging democracies. With countries that are neither staunch friends nor known foes, military cooperation can serve as a positive means of building security relationships today that will contribute to improved relations tomorrow.¹¹

IMET'S ROLE IN SECURITY COOPERATION (ASSISTANCE)

The IMET Program is a part of the overall Security Assistance Program, which is planned and scheduled by country and region annually. The IMET grant program was established in 1976 to provide professional, leadership and management training for senior military leaders and selected junior and middle grade officers with leadership potential. For fiscal year 1998 Congress appropriated \$50 million apportioned among more than 100 countries for the IMET program.¹²

As established earlier, the DoS is ultimately responsible for the IFP, however, their involvement basically ends with funding and deciding the representative countries. The DoS relies heavily upon input from the DoD's in those two areas and exclusively on them for developing and executing the program. As such the Commanders-in-Chiefs (CinC) of the respective Unified Geographic Combatant Commands have a significant hand in controlling the program. Each CinC's Theater Engagement Plans (TEP) normally includes all actions that fall under the aegis of the DoD's Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA). This is especially true for recommendations to the IMET program, which is considered the top-level and arguably the most influential course.

The process of planning and scheduling the IMET occurs over an eighteen month period with the involvement of the U.S. Department of State, the in-country U.S. Embassy, the appropriate embassy office responsible for security assistance (U.S. Military Security Assistance Agency, Defense Attache's Office, or and embassy official). The country's training requirements are forecast by DoS, assisted by DoD, and recommended in the Annual Integrated Assessment of Security Assistance (AIASA). These requirements are evaluated in light of foreign policy and political considerations, then submitted for approval and funding in the Congressional Presentation Document. All regional CINCs conduct training and planning workshops, in which the U.S. Military Department Security Assistance training agencies together with the SAO training officers put together the training program and quotas.¹³

IFP REPRESENTATION BY UNIFIED COMMAND PLAN (UCP)

Presented by the current Unified Command Plan's (UCP) specified Geographic Combatant Command's AOR is an objective examination of the history of IF representation at the USAWC. The data detailing the complete twenty-four years of the IFP is presented in the Appendix, "USAWC International Fellows Program Participation by Geographic Combatant Command" at the end of this document. Due to the large number and diverse nature of countries within the U.S. European Command's (EUCOM) AOR, the European and African Regions will be

examined separately. Due to its unique and diverse character, the Sub-Saharan Africa Region is also considered separately. Russia's representation is detailed in the U.S. Pacific Command's (PACOM) AOR and Canada and Mexico appear in the last table, immediately following U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and just prior to the overall IFP totals. The legends displayed on pages A-9 and A-10 explain the symbols and abbreviations used throughout all other pages of the Appendix.

Included in these examinations is the number of International Fellows Hall of Fame honorees from each region. This distinction is bestowed upon only those USAWC IF graduates who have attained the highest position in their service or country, similar to the U.S. Service Chiefs or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. To date, at least, twenty-two IFs have earned this distinction, eighteen of whom have actually been inducted in a formal ceremony held at Carlisle Barracks. Their pictures now adorn the International Fellows Hall of Fame wall in Root Hall.

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND (CENTCOM)

Throughout the twenty-four year history of the IFP, 17% of all IFs are from the CENTCOM AOR. Twelve of the twenty-five or 48% of the countries currently in the AOR have been represented. This representation is somewhat deceptive in that the U.S. has no friendly military relations with Afghanistan, Sudan, Somalia, Iraq and Iran; five other countries are former Soviet Republics; and one is the recently independent Eritrea. That raises the realistic number to 86% and places CENTCOM as the highest represented AOR. The IF's from this AOR have done particularly well achieving general officer rank with almost 83% doing so. The AOR has had one IF from Kenya achieve International Fellows Hall of Fame status, who has yet to be officially inducted. Egypt has had the most consistent representation and is joined by Kuwait, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia in now sending IFs every year. (The CENTCOM data appears on Appendix pages 15 and 16.)

EUCOM'S EUROPEAN AND MID-EAST REGION

One third of all the IFs to ever attend the USAWC call this region home. Thirty-four of forty-nine, or 69.4% of the countries in the European Region, have been represented. This percentage is somewhat misleading in that several of the countries considered in this region's forty-nine include recently independent former Soviet Republic's and some countries with no appreciable militaries. Discounting these countries would raise the percentage above 80% and place the region as one of the highest represented. 47.7% of this region's IFs have achieved

general officer rank. This region boasts more International Fellows Hall of Fame members than almost all others combined with ten. Germany is one of only three countries to have sent a representative every year, two of whom have achieved International Fellows Hall of Fame status. Germany, as well as other long-term U.S. allies Greece, Israel, Italy, Norway, Turkey and the United Kingdom, are now sending IFs every year. Perhaps the most significant IF success in this region lies in the Netherlands where all nine graduates have achieved general officer rank and four of those International Fellows Hall of Fame recognition. (The EUCOM European and Mid-East Region's data appears on Appendix pages 17 to 20.)

EUCOM'S AFRICAN REGION

This region is clearly the most underrepresented in the world. Only 8.3% of all IFs ever attending the AWC have come from the African Region. Twenty of forty-two countries have sent representatives, but of those twenty, nine have only sent one, three have sent two, and three have sent three IFs over the program's entire twenty-four year history. However, almost 44% of the IFs attending from this region have achieved flag officer rank and two of them International Fellows Hall of Fame status. None of these countries have been allowed to establish the attendance consistency of other AORs and regions. However, those best represented include Nigeria with nine IFs and Tunisia with eight IFs. (The EUCOM African Region's data appears on Appendix pages 19 and 20.)

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

A more detailed look at Sub-Saharan Africa highlights it as arguably the most volatile and quite likely the most neglected region on earth. This region is segregated among the EUCOM, CENTCOM, and PACOM AORs. Despite representing nearly a fifth of the world's population, the Sub-Saharan Africa Region has only been allowed sixty-three of the 690, or 9%, USAWC International Fellowships over the past twenty-four years. Nearly half of those positions have gone to Kenya, Nigeria and Senegal while the other half have been spread over seventeen countries with eight of those having only ever sent one representative.

It may be argued that the lack of U.S. involvement, including access to the IFP and other Security Assistance Programs, could have negative effects on economics, democratic ideals and stability in the region. A high-level U.S. Department of State official, currently working with the Department of Defense, and formerly an ambassador to several different African Nations

spanning the entire Sub-Saharan Africa Region said, "IMET is the backbone to our engagement policy" and further stated, " this school [USAWC] is one of the key pillars to IMET."¹⁴

The DoD is using its capabilities and expertise to help create and nurture an "enabling environment" which is conducive to democratization, human rights, conflict resolution, and economic and social prosperity. They currently play a significant role in helping Africans find African solutions to their problems and the importance of IMET to the stability in the region is clearly expressed in the United States Security Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa produced by the DoD's Office of International Security Affairs. It states that the, "DoD, though having no direct role in selection, supports the concept of good governance through IMET. Additionally, DoD can encourage shaping of African militaries to more efficient force structures aligned with legitimate security requirements to make them more responsive to democratic values and to shift resources to developmental needs."¹⁵

PACOM

Nearly a quarter of all IFs hail from the PACOM AOR. Seventeen of forty-three countries in the AOR have sent representatives. While 39.5% representation may appear low in light of our traditional regional allies, numerous countries do not have sizable militaries or even paramilitary organizations that would warrant inclusions and some still have repressive regimes unsuitable to DoS and USAWC standards. Over 69% of this AOR's IFs have achieved general officer rank. This AOR ranks second with eight IFs attaining International Hall of Fame stature. Japan and Korea are the other countries, along with Germany, to have sent a representative every year, one of whom from each country has been inducted into the International Fellows Hall of Fame. In addition to Japan and Korea other long-term U.S. allies Australia, the Philippines, Taiwan and Thailand are now sending IFs to the USAWC every year. Two Australian IFs, two from the Philippines, and one each from Brunei, and Nepal are International Fellows Hall of Fame members. (The PACOM AOR's data appears on Appendix pages 21 and 22.)

SOUTHCOM, CANADA, AND MEXICO

The SOUTHCOM AOR, Canada, Mexico and the overall IFP's totals appear on Appendix pages 23 and 24. Despite being some of our closest neighbors, only 11.3% of all IFs attending the USAWC have come from the SOUTHCOM AOR with 27% of them achieving general officer rank. Brazil, Chile and Venezuela now send IFs every year. Argentina has also established a reasonably consistent attendance record, having had only two years without an attendee in the

past fifteen years. As mentioned earlier, many of the nations of this region have very few, if any, general officers so attaining colonel may be more significant than in any other region. None of the seventy-eight SOUTHCOM AOR graduates is an International Fellows Hall of Fame member.

Our two closest neighbors have also enjoyed much success through their USAWC involvement. Canada has had almost 38% of its IFs achieve general officer rank and one is a member of the International Fellows Hall of Fame. Mexico has had over 47% of its IFP graduates attain general officer rank. Both countries have enjoyed continuous representation for over fourteen years.

CONTINUED SUCCESS

Ninety-nine of 193 countries specified in the UCP defined AORs have been represented in the IFP's history. Of the 648 IF graduates from 1978 through 2000, at least 358, or 55.2%, have achieved flag officer equivalent stature. This number is significantly higher than the 28% of all active duty U.S. graduates. Not captured in this number are the numerous IFs who have risen to their country's higher ranks where there is an extremely limited number or no general officer equivalent. This is especially prevalent in Central and South America, North Africa, excluding Egypt, and some Pacific nations where colonel is considered an exalted rank. 103 of these 358 IFs attended the USAWC having already achieved flag officer status. This may appear to lessen the significance, however, their continued success is demonstrated in that all but thirty-eight of them have attained higher rank since their graduation. A significant number of IFs have risen to their country's highest rank and at least twenty-one have attained the highest military position in their branch of service or government. Remarkably, by comparison, during this same period only eighteen USAWC U.S. graduates have attained our highest level of four-star rank; and of those, one graduate has risen to the top position of Chief of Staff of the Army and another to Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The attendant successes implied with achieving flag rank are interesting, and perhaps significant, in that each of those officers may quite well have profound impact upon their nation after their USAWC association. Clearly noteworthy is the impact on their nation of those twenty-one officers who have attained status qualifying them for the USAWC International Fellows Hall of Fame. Emphasizing the following comparisons is important -- IFs achieve flag rank at greater than twice the rate of U.S. students, and even greater if you consider the colonels from

countries where that rank is exalted, and twenty-one of their number have attained IF Hall of Fame stature in a period when only two U.S. graduates have achieved similar status.

While it can be argued that the school did not produce these leaders, but that they were already influential leaders destined for positions of power, selection and completion of the program is in many cases enough to assure continued success.¹⁶

A significant second order IFP effect is the great associations born between IFs and U.S. students that bear fruit for many years to come. One such example of this effect is expressed in the comments made by a 1992 USAWC graduate, currently in a critical and powerful United Nations position, who said in a presentation to the AWC Class of 2001, "I get more accomplished in my near daily conversations with four or five of my Army War College International Fellows classmates than by any other means."¹⁷

Finally, the following statement from the DoD's Office of International Security Affairs amplifies the power and effects of IMET specifically and the IFP indirectly.

Within the context of the Administration's policy goals, the IMET program provides one of the most economical and effective uses of DoD funds in the long-term. With few exceptions, IMET graduates have positive experiences in the U.S., and return to their countries with a better understanding of the proper role of a nation's military in a democratic civil society. At a minimum, IMET graduates have tools to cope with the problem of peacefully resolving conflicts at home.¹⁸

CONCLUSION

Comprehensive measures of the IFP's success can be viewed through its long-term effects on and stability in the countries that have sent representatives. The impact of the IFP is demonstrated on many, varied levels:

- Cost-effective means of promoting the United States National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy.
- Significantly broadens the personal, academic and professional environments for both students and faculty, and their families.
- The association of senior officers destined for high-level leadership positions in their respective armies does much to improve mutual understanding of nation security problems, operations, and preparedness.
- Successful military leaders return to positions of ever-increasing responsibility and importance in their countries, promoting democracy, regional stability and prosperity.

- The professional and personal associations created at the AWC further enhance future combined, multi-national, or allied operations through better understanding of U.S. Strategy, Operational Art and Tactics, Techniques and Procedures.
- Enriches U.S. views of the world and helps to avoid myopic, close-minded perceptions.
- Fosters international understanding through the injection of foreign views.

As discussed, the benefits of the IFP are invaluable and transcend simply education, a sentiment clearly articulated by the current IFP director, COL Stephen E. Keeling, when he stated 'the relationships that form here among these officers from around the world and their U.S. counterparts will prove invaluable in the future. With the importance of coalition operations of all types, in all regions of the world, the International Fellows Program becomes not simply an important complement to War College studies, but rather an imperative.'¹⁹

WORD COUNT = 5121

USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND

Year Country	LTC	COL/ CAPT	SC/CM/BG/BR IG/CH	MG	LTG	GEN	HALL OF FAME	% FLAG OFFICER	% of ALL IFS	NATION/ # in AOR	% of AOR
EGYPT	0	0	10	10	1	0	0	100.0%	3.04%		
JORDAN	0	0	12	3	2	0	0	100.0%	2.46%		
KENYA	0	1	8	4	1	0	1	92.9%	2.03%		
KUWAIT	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	50.0%	1.45%		
OMAN	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		
PAKISTAN	2	0	5	6	0	0	0	84.6%	1.88%		
QATAR	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	20.0%	0.72%		
SAUDI ARABIA	1	4	4	9	1	0	0	73.7%	2.75%		
SOMOLIA	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	50.0%	0.58%		
SUDAN	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	100.0%	0.58%		
UNITED ARAB EM	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	37.5%	1.16%		
YEMEN	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
CENTCOM	5	21	50	36	6	0	1	82.9%	17.1%	12/25	48.0%

USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND

Year Country	LTC	COL/ CAPT	SC/CM/BJG/BR IG/CH	MG	LTG	GEN	HALL OF FAME	% FLAG OFFICER	% of ALL IFS	NATION/ # in AOR	% of AOR
ALBANIA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.29%		
AUSTRIA	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	60.0%	0.72%		
BELARUS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
BELGIUM	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
BULGARIA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.29%		
CROATIA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	100.0%	0.29%		
CZECH REPUBLIC	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	50.0%	0.58%		
CZECHOSLOVAKI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
DENMARK	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.29%		
ESTONIA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	100.0%	0.14%		
FINLAND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.29%		
FRANCE	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	23.1%	1.88%		
GERMANY	0	8	9	3	2	2	2	66.7%	3.48%		
GREECE	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	50.0%	1.45%		
HUNGARY	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	50.0%	0.87%		
ISRAEL	2	8	8	2	0	0	0	50.0%	2.90%		
ITALY	0	9	5	1	2	0	0	47.1%	2.46%		
LATVIA	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	50.0%	0.29%		
LEBANON	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	50.0%	0.58%		
MACEDONIA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.29%		
NETHERLANDS	0	1	2	3	2	2	4	90.0%	1.45%		
NORWAY	0	5	2	4	4	1	1	68.8%	2.32%		
POLAND	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	1.01%		
PORTUGAL	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.14%		
ROMANIA	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	25.0%	0.58%		
SLOVAKIA	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.43%		
SLOVENIA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	66.7%	0.43%		
SPAIN	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	28.6%	2.03%		
SWEDEN	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	80.0%	0.72%		
SWITZERLAND	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		

LEGEND and TOTALS on PAGES 23 and 24

USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND

Year Country	LTC	COL/ CAPT	SC/CM/BG/BR IG/CH	MG	LTG	GEN	HALL OF FAME	% FLAG OFFICER	% of ALL IFs	NATION/ # in AOR	% of AOR
TURKEY	1	10	3	4	0	1	0	42.1%	2.75%		
UKRAINE	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.87%		
UNITED KINGDOM	0	11	3	2	0	0	0	31.3%	2.32%		
YUGOSLAVIA	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.43%		
EUR REGION	20	108	54	28	14	6	10	47.7%	33.3%	34/49	69.4%
ALGERIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.14%		
BOTSWANA	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	33.3%	0.43%		
BURKINA FASO	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
BURUNDI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
CAMEROON	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
CONGO	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
GHANA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	66.7%	0.43%		
IVORY COAST	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		
MALAWI	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	100.0%	0.29%		
MALI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
MOROCCO	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	16.7%	0.87%		
NIGER	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
NIGERIA	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	100.0%	1.16%		
SENEGAL	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	16.7%	0.87%		
SOUTH AFRICA	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.43%		
TUNISIA	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	44.4%	1.30%		
UGANDA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.14%		
ZAIRE (CONGO)	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	25.0%	0.58%		
ZAMBIA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
ZIMBABWE	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		
AFR REGION	10	23	16	5	3	0	2	45.3%	8.3%	20/42	47.6%
EUCOM	30	131	70	33	17	6	12	43.9%	41.6%	55/91	60.4%

LEGEND and TOTALS on PAGES 23 and 24

USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND

Year Country	LTC	COL/ CAPT	SC/CM/BG/BR IG/CH	MG	LTG	GEN	HALL OF FAME	% FLAG OFFICER	% of ALL IFs	NATION/ # in AOR	% of AOR
AUSTRALIA	0	4	8	6	1	1	2	80.0%	2.90%		
BANGLADESH	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	100.0%	1.01%		
BRUNEI	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	100.0%	0.14%		
CAMBODIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.14%		
INDIA	0	0	8	2	6	0	0	100.0%	2.32%		
INDONESIA	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	88.9%	1.30%		
JAPAN	0	7	0	5	11	1	1	70.8%	3.48%		
KOREA	0	17	2	2	3	0	1	29.2%	3.48%		
MALAYSIA	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	77.8%	1.30%		
MONGOLIA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
NEPAL	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	100.0%	0.43%		
PHILIPPINES	0	9	5	1	2	0	2	47.1%	2.46%		
RUSSIA	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.58%		
SINGAPORE	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	16.7%	0.87%		
SRI LANKA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	100.0%	0.29%		
TAIWAN	0	5	0	2	2	0	0	44.4%	1.30%		
THAILAND	0	3	6	5	2	0	0	81.3%	2.32%		
PACOM	2	56	39	39	30	3	8	69.4%	24.5%	17/43	39.5%

USAWC INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMAND

Year	LTC	COL/ CAPT	SC/CM/BG/BR IG/CH	MG	LTG	GEN	HALL OF FAME	% FLAG OFFICER	% of ALL IFS	NATION/ # in AOR	% of AOR
Country											
ARGENTINA	0	11	1	1	0	0	0	15.4%	1.88%		
BOLIVIA	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		
BRAZIL	4	6	0	3	1	0	0	28.6%	2.03%		
CHILE	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.72%		
COLOMBIA	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	66.7%	0.43%		
DOMINICAN REPUB	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
ECUADOR	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	14.3%	1.01%		
EL SALVADOR	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	1.01%		
GUATEMALA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.29%		
HONDURAS	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.58%		
PERU	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	50.0%	0.29%		
TRINIDAD & TOBA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
URAGUAY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.14%		
VENEZUELA	0	9	5	2	0	0	0	43.8%	2.32%		
SOUTHCOM	16	42	10	8	2	0	0	27.0%	11.3%	14/32	43.8%
CANADA	0	13	2	3	2	0	1	36.8%	2.90%		
MEXICO	3	7	3	4	1	0	0	47.1%	2.61%		
USA	3	20	5	7	3	0	1	41.7%	5.5%	2/2	100.0%
TOTALS	56	270	174	123	58	9	22	52.8%	99/193	99/193	51.3%
	IFS ACHIEVED FLAG RANK 1978-2000:		358	TOT IFS 1978-2000:		648	% FLAG RANK:		55.2%		

SYMBOL	RANK
L	Lieutenant Colonel
E	Colonel/Captain(Navy)
G	Special Colonel (Thailand)
E	Colonel-Major (Ivory Coast, Morocco, Tunisia)
N	Brigadeer/Brigadeer General
D	Major General
	Lieutenant General
	General
	Note 1: Flag Rank Equivalent from Countries Listed

LEGEND and TOTALS on PAGES 23 and 24

ENDNOTES

¹ Harold P Ball, Of Responsible Command: A History of the United States Army War College (Carlisle Barracks, PA, The Alumni Association of the U.S. Army War College, 1983), p. 475.

² U.S. Army War College, International Fellows Program: Information Booklet, Academic Year 2002 (Carlisle Barracks, PA, U.S. Army War College, 2001), p. 7.

³ Ibid., p. 4.

⁴ Stephen E. Keeling, "International Fellows Program" The Alumni Association Newsletter, no. XXXIX, (Fall 2000): p. 4.

⁵ U.S. Army War College, Guide for Sponsors of International Fellows, USAWC Circular No. 550-1 (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 24 April 1991), p. 2.

⁶ DSCA (Facts Book) -- Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts, September 30, 1999, Published by Deputy for Financial Management Comptroller, DSCA; available from <<http://web.deskbook.osd.mil/reflib/DDOD/001EN/001ENdoc.htm#T2>>; Internet accessed 24 September 2000.

⁷ Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Pub 1-02, Dictionary of Military Associated Terms, 1 Sep 99; available from <<http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/dodict>>; Internet; accessed 24 September 2000.

⁸ William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 1999, p. 3.

⁹ Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest In Fiscal years 1999 and 2000, Volume I, U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Department of State, Joint Report to Congress, March 1, 2000; available from <<http://www.fas.org/asmp/campaigns/training/fmtrep.htm>>; Internet; accessed 27 September 2000.

¹⁰ William S. Cohen, Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review, Washington, D.C., The Pentagon, May 1997, p. 7.

¹¹ Clinton, p. 11.

¹² U.S. Department of Defense. DoD 5105.38-M, Security Assistance Management Manual (SAMM) DESKBOOK'S ONLINE SAMM DOD 5105.38-M. 1 September 2000. Available from <<http://129.48.104.197/sammchg.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 19 September 2000.

¹³ Stephen E. Keeling, International Military Education and Training: A Shaper of the Security Environment of the Future, Strategy Research Project (Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 7 April 1999), p. 9.

¹⁴ The quote made in this passage is from remarks made by a speaker participating in the Regional Studies Appraisal Lecture Series.

¹⁵ Department of Defense, United States Security Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa, (Washington, D.C., Office of International Security Affairs, August 1995), pp. 6-7.

¹⁶ Keeling, IMET: A Shaper of the Security Environment of the Future, p. 14.

¹⁷ The quote made in this passage is from remarks made by a speaker participating in the Commandant's Lecture Series.

¹⁸ DoD, p. 15.

¹⁹ Keeling, "International Fellows Program", p. 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ball, Harold P. Of Responsible Command: A History of the United States Army War College. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, The Alumni Association of the U.S. Army War College, 1983.
- Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 1999.
- Cohen, William S. Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Washington, D.C., The Pentagon, May 1997.
- Keeling, Stephen E. International Military Education and Training: A Shaper of the Security Environment of the Future. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 7 April 1999.
- Keeling, Stephen E. "International Fellows Program" The Alumni Association Newsletter, Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, No. XXXIX, (Fall 2000): 4-5.
- Larson, Charles R. "IMET: A Cornerstone of Cooperative Engagement." DISAM Journal (Summer 1996): 96-102.
- Metz, Steven. Refining American Strategy in Africa. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, February 2000.
- Scott, Julius G. Security Assistance: Who Decides How Much? Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 1 April 1996.
- U.S. Army War College. Guide for Sponsors of International Fellows. USAWC Circular No. 550-1, Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 24 April 1991.
- U.S. Army War College. International Fellows Program: Information Booklet, Academic Year 1993. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 22 January 1992.
- U.S. Army War College. International Fellows Program: Information Booklet, Academic Year 2002. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 22 January 2001.
- U.S. Department of Defense. DoD 5105.38-M, Security Assistance Management Manual (SAMM) DESKBOOK'S ONLINE SAMM DOD 5105.38-M. 1 September 2000. Available from <<http://129.48.104.197/sammong.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 19 September 2000.
- U.S. Department of Defense. United States Security Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington, D.C., Office of International Security Affairs, August 1995.