

Title: International Military Education & Training Brings Cross Border Unity & Diversity.

By David Manning

Presentation: American security and defense policy through foreign military training and cooperation with likeminded democracies are force multipliers.

This paper draws upon real-world experiences of foreign military officers and diplomats chronicled (First Person) in my global arms series which examines the strategic and tactical benefits derived from the United States government's International Military Education and Training (IMET) programs with long-lasting military relationships around the world.

Since the Second World War, the United States government has had, as a deliberate component of its national security policy, the cultivation and maintenance of direct military ties with foreign military establishments.

These programs are notably conducted through military and diplomatic exchanges in defense education and training protocols, class seminars, and field applications. Since 1894 more than 15,000 Foreign Defense and Diplomat personnel have graduated from US Defense Institutions.

International Defense Education and Training builds lasting friendships with interoperability skills and influence. These links allow access to territory, infrastructure, and information sharing as Windows to the World – in a profession of Arms spread in vast networks of friendships. We learn new defense capabilities universally rooted in culture and defense techniques in which we rely for successful interoperability.

Our defense training institutions define Common Bonds that apply to defense power across the full geographical spectrum. Defense relationships are built on trust and understanding in the things we have in common.

We cultivate these alliances through tolerance and mutual understanding, in their many shades of grey, despite all the divisive politics. Because we can surge lots of things but the one thing we cannot surge, is trust.

As Professor David Last says, if we learn more about where and how military leaders are educated, we are then better placed to shape transnational education to address new and changing threats based on shared evidence.

What better platform is there for defense leaders, journeymen, and diplomats, of all stripes, to congregate, educate and collaborate on defense tactics, stratagems, and command-and-control systems to better interoperate as a team.

We learn who we are from a shared frame of reference in diversity and civil-military societies. We gather a sense of history and geography to better understand because nations' views of history differ by their national roots.

These global, historical perspectives reflect our foreign policies in the geopolitics and social & economic conditions of the time.

We learn what a liberal (or illiberal) democratic society looks like from the foreign students' own geopolitical and social realities. These things are not linear either but more about learning who we are as a civilization because we learn what to think and how others think about us, culturally, geopolitically, and strategically.

These officers and diplomat alumni who advance to flag and senior leadership exercise their long held political and strategic ideology in governing and military leadership.

President El Sisi of Egypt, a US Army War College graduate, rules his nation with an iron hand of rule. Elsie's governing style and ideology was outlined in his USAWC theses in 2006.

Security has everything to do with economics and economics has everything to do with security. Geography and History have everything to do with both. These are political and leadership frames of reference in the minds of foreign officer and diplomat graduates, but dependable alliances are paramount to security cooperation.

Keeping dependable allies on board through unified relationships amid security challenges while balancing values and interests of all our global

allies. On paper the alliance looks grand. In times of crises the alliance is tested on its core principles to democratic values.

Dave Manning is an Independent Writer on International Military Education & Training, International Relations, and Alliance Partnerships. He chronicled more than ninety-six international military officer and diplomat alumni in four volumes in his Global Arms Series across several US War & Staff College Institutions. He enlisted in the United States Air Force in 1972 and served as a services-logistician throughout Europe with USAFE, AAFES, NATO, the Balkans, and European Defense Commands from 1974 to 1998.

France, the UK, and Italy had always their unilateral interest that counters NATO's collective interest.

Germany, a staunch NATO ally but reluctant to build up its defense force's and aren't particularly keen on NATO's Nuclear Sharing Strategy.

Despite these differences IMET provides broader lens to defense capabilities and human constructs while learning new doctrine and discerning useful capabilities of hard, soft, and smart power applications.

But expectations need be tempered. Foreign Students come in with biases reflecting their empires of culture in their linguistics that opens the soul of their nation's purview of Capacity, History & Geography.

In a world of changing geopolitics, the US will miscalculate, get it strategically wrong; and sometimes with lies, arrogance and hubris. The humiliation of losing is a major hindrance to US honor.

What makes US Foreign Policy delicate is that its making be domestically inward looking before it can project outward policy.

When Mr. Biden says America is back-he means America is back so long its interest aren't at stake. Multilateralism works for the US until it's no longer in the interest of the US. Being a global power has risk and benefits, DIWD&D.

The US abrupt, and messy withdrawal from Afghanistan in the postmortem will force the US to do some introspection, with itself and its allies, on where we need be in 21st century order, beginning with truth and trust building.

To accept the things, we can't possibly change and move forward with what we can change. Without the arrogance, and lies, and apply the lessons learned of perpetual war and miscalculation.

I'd like to see training curriculums focus more on the stopping of Intellectual Property Theft. More coordinated efficiency for rapid & coherent, contingency response mechanisms.

And reinforce the political dialog for Europe (EU) to adopt a serious strategic vision with teeth; encourage NATO-Eur to invest more on its defense spending to confront a near security threat without US involvement.

A stronger emphasis on hybrid means of warfare to stop downrange corruption in its tracks, minimizing the flows of financial-currency assets to-from-bad actors; new ways to avert supply chain disruptions, to better manage climate change patterns and pandemics.

There always be strategic decisions upending a nations long view of grand strategy, particularly when nations interests are at stake, real or imagined. Students come in with their baggage of presumption and politics. Exmp. MS. Macron?

We have a global dichotomy of economic and security interest with the US, Europe and China largely hinged on Indo Pacific security. We need to do better job discerning real threats with China. I fear that US F/P in the Indo-

Pacific going forward be complex given the human emotions involved.

In Closing: The US through IMET garners more winners of cooperation than the occasionally turned bad actors and geopolitical setbacks.

Leadership in the 21st Century is not only challenged with shaky democracies, globalization, polarization, cell phone chip technology but also with high velocity crises rooted in history and geography – via ideology, culture, migration, ethnicity, trade routes, natural resources, topography, and economy.

We hope for the best of cooperative outcomes but need to keep realism in mind, be ready for the unexpected. In the end, a trustful alliance makes a better interoperable team than apart left to a nation's own devices but must begin with Trust and Truth.

Part II: Global Security is Maritime Centric: The Oceans are what keeps globalization moving; our maritime allies, friends, and partners are paramount to maintaining open Sea lines of communication

We have a defeat of distance by way of industrial and military technology. The US has a great naval power of three hundred warships; Japan has the largest navy in Asia, which China envies. All to protect a western, liberal, world order. In things like free flow of commerce, vital resources like oil and natural gas flowing through vital chock-points for economics to happen.

Maintaining millions of tons of commerce moving about the world via water, the US, even with its three hundred ships, and Japan's credible navy, cannot secure all this alone. We need dependable partners amidst a massive, competing global security interest.

Strategically, the US, and its allies dominate the Western-Hemisphere. But at the center of American geopolitics are the Oceans - and to ensure that no one power dominates the Eastern Hemisphere in a hegemonic kind of way. This is a challenge for western powers, but not a direct security threat.

China is remaking the east with its foothold in the South China Sea, its exponential growths and massive development in over sixty countries; while offering very cheap loans; not asking questions about human rights or the environment, nor does it export its political ideology. But they are the one is writing the big checks.

China's "One-Belt Road" system connecting Europe to Central Asia through the Strait of Malacca is an ambitious goal but comes with economic and security concerns that the west will have to contend with. Because the center of competitive gravity is subtly moving eastward!

The Indian Ocean, its 72,000,000 Sq.KM girth, is the third largest Ocean on earth. The IO emerged from a tranquil place during the Cold-War period to a major Sea line of commercial traffic; just as it was in ancient times: Portuguese, and Dutch mariners have traversed the IO for

commercial trade for hundreds of years, navigating on the predictable monsoon trade winds.

China and India's vast maritime presence in competing security interest in the east-China Sea and Indian Ocean is expanding exponentially. All the while Pakistan's navy competes for its own interest and acts as a proxy between India and China, while Pak. hedges for more security control in the China-Pak. Economic Corridor supporting its blue economy.

Maritime Security concerns are afoot in areas like the Intermedium, the land between the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea. An area with 200 m. people, future security concerns are bound to intensify in strategic competition. The Intermedium by design is still a concept but could potentially foster a separate economic block in contention with the EU zone; and where will Russia's interest lie in all this.

The transforming Arctic region with a north-west passage projected with uninhibited access by 2025, and threats of global terror acts, North Korea's Nuke goals. Turkey, a NATO Ally hedging toward a major Mediterranean power and potentially putting its near neighbors at strategic odds.

Conclusion: despite our contentious global politics, and its geo-strategic interest, the United States, and its allies, has a global responsibility, albeit deliberate or by default. The policy to admit foreign military officers to US defense training institutions is not only a means to enhance our own national security, but also means of creating links of defense cooperation around the world; it's good to have a friend/cell number in your pocket.

This defense cooperation helps to build new and sustain old relationships that can influence a softer and smarter power in a globalized-complex world. But even with all its good intension and treasure, there are still no guarantees, least not in the short term. Assumptions and mistakes be made with benefit of hind-sites, and geo-political risk will continue to evolve, but the potential benefits are many.

Friend, the late Congressman Ike Skelton of Missouri once said: these international military programs turn out many more winners of cooperation and friendships than the few "bad apples" who might turn tyrant. Exporting international military education is simply a risk the U.S. must take for the benefit of a more interconnect and secure world, and IMET allows the opportunity for just that!

