

2014

The State Partnership Program: States as Global Actors: The Implications of Nonaggressive National Forces

Ellen Ahlness
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/jur>



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#), and the [Military and Veterans Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ahlness, Ellen (2014) "The State Partnership Program: States as Global Actors: The Implications of Nonaggressive National Forces," *Journal of Undergraduate Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato*: Vol. 14, Article 1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56816/2378-6949.1045>

Available at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/jur/vol14/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Undergraduate Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

THE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM: STATES AS GLOBAL ACTORS
THE IMPLICATIONS OF NONAGGRESSIVE NATIONAL FORCES

Ellen Ahlness
POL 431
International Relations
Professor Kawabata
March 25, 2014

Abstract

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States sought to increase its influence in Western Europe and Central Asia. The primary military mechanism used to increase presence and ideological influence was the State Partnership Program. This program, modeled heavily after the Norwegian Reciprocal Troop Exchange, used reserve forces instead of active duty forces to lessen the aggression levels perceived by Russian command. This use of reserve forces gave individual American states a greater degree of involvement in international military operations. Since the creation of the State Partnership Program, 65 state/country partnerships have been established. The goals have also shifted from a purely military focus to a more infrastructural bent.

By examining the motivations for involving reserve military forces through both realist and neoliberal lenses, this paper examines degree to which different causes influenced the creation of the State Partnership Program, and how these theories influence the continued operations of these military partnerships. The US-Norway and US-Poland partnerships were chosen as case studies, as each was established on strong military and democratic foundations. These different methods of analysis found that there were significant realist intents in beginning these partnerships, but that there is neoliberal purpose for maintaining the partnerships. This analysis shows there are potentially larger implications for partnering states with countries than just lessening perceived aggression. States have a higher capacity to specialize, can share cultural and ancestral identities, and can support countries in their attempts to join international partnerships and IGOs.

Author Biography

Ellen Ahlness is an undergraduate student at Minnesota State University- Mankato. She is from White Bear Lake, Minnesota, where she graduated in May 2013 with an Associate of Arts degree from Century College. She is currently double majoring in International Relations and Scandinavian Studies. She has two articles published in *Cross Sections Journal*, an undergraduate journal for Scandinavian Studies: *Lapp* and *The Handshake that Made History*, which respectively examine Scandinavian culture and participation in international military relations. She also has an article undergoing review for the NCUR proceedings, which focuses on Janteloven in Norwegian author Thorbjørn Egner's literature. Ms. Ahlness plans to continue her work as a graduate student in Political science upon graduation from MSU-Mankato. After earning her doctoral degree, she anticipates participating in an international volunteer organization, followed by teaching either International Relations or Scandinavian studies at the university level.

Faculty Mentor Biography:

Eiji Kawabata (B.A., Keio; M.A., Northwestern; Ph.D., Pittsburgh) is Associate Professor of Political Science at Minnesota State University, Mankato, where he teaches courses in Asian politics and international relations. His research focuses on Japanese politics, comparative public policy, and international political economy. He has authored a book, *Contemporary Government in Japan: Dual State in Flux* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2006), and a book chapter in "Reforming the Bureaucracy," in Sherry Martin and Gill Steel, eds., *Democratic Reform in Japan: Assessing the Impact* (Lynne Rienner, 2008). His journal articles and book reviews appeared in *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, *Social Science Japan Journal*, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, and *Governance*. He is currently working on two research projects: the Politics of Privacy in the Asia-Pacific, and a partnership with scholars from the U.S., Japan, and Germany, collaboratively examining Japan's information governance. He has received numerous research grants, including the Center for Global Partnership Small Grant, the Social Science Research Council Abe Fellowship, and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Postdoctoral Fellowship. He has been a visiting researcher at major universities, including University of California, Berkeley; Australian National University; and University of Tokyo. In summer 2014, he will be a resident scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars in Washington, DC.

Introduction

As the Soviet Union fell apart into smaller, autonomous republics, American policymakers sought to increase Western influence in former Soviet states. They believed an American presence in Western Europe would minimize instability, while supporting and maintaining democratic governments and practices in these new states. One of the ways in which the United States kept a military presence in Western Europe during the early 1990s was through the State Partnership Program. Western policymakers thought that a partnership between U.S. National Guard troops and the newly independent republics would be less threatening to the former Soviet Union.

This paper identifies the dependent and independent variables before moving into a brief history of the State Partnership Program and its precursor, the Norwegian Reciprocal Exchange Program. The focus will then be on the implications of using reserve forces in military exchange programs, looking specifically at Norway and Poland as examples of countries involved in partnership programs. The dependent variable of this case study is the level of perceived aggression the United States displays through involvement in military exchange programs. This variable can be measured in relative terms by examining the actions taken by opposing states to try and restore the balance of power, and thus their own security. The U.S.'s State Partnership Program, created during the time of the Soviet Union collapse, reached out to former Soviet countries as well as other countries that had been independent, yet still under the Russian sphere of influence.

Several independent variables play into the level of perceived aggression. First is the geographical location of the state with whom the U.S. partnered. Soviet Russia would be less

concerned by a military partnership with Norway, which is further away from Russia and is more economically and culturally tied to Western Europe, than it would be with a partnership with Poland, which is adjacent to the Soviet Union and is of ideological importance to the union. Additionally, the kind of military force that is used in a military exchange can affect the perceived level of aggression. For example, active duty forces or Special Forces would be seen as extremely threatening by Russia, especially in the wake of the Cold War. Conversely, the use of National Guard or Reserve forces would be less threatening, since these are part-time military members.

The next independent variable is the length of the existence of the military exchange. The NOREX partnership between Minnesota and Norway, for example, has continued for 41 consecutive years. The exchange between Illinois and Poland has lasted 21 years, and the partnership between Virginia and Tajikistan has lasted 11 years. Under the neoliberalist school of thought, the longer lasting a military partnership, the wider its spectrum of capabilities tends to be, since it is based on a longer foundation of trust and cooperation.

A term to be defined for this paper is 'security cooperation.' As one of the goals of the State Partnership Program, it is important to clearly identify what cooperation is. Keohane defines cooperation differently than harmony, since cooperation is not just the absence of conflict, but rather the ability to work through a difference in goals and ideals (2005). The Department of Defense identifies *security cooperation* as interactions that serve three functions: build relationships to promote U.S. security interests, develop self-defense military capabilities in allied states, and create peacetime and wartime access to a partner state (Waage, 2007, p. 168). These partnerships can include security assistance, enforcement support, engagement scenarios,

and educational exchanges. What may begin as a partnership with a specific intent among these goals may develop into having a different and more applicable goal over time.

Literature Review

Howard is one of the first scholars to discuss the implications of American state involvement in U.S. diplomacy and military policy. In his articles, he has taken a firm stance that states “can, and do” play an important role in contemporary U.S. foreign policy (Howard, 2004, p. 179). The State Partnership Program is the primary interface that gives states an increasing role in international affairs by implementing military engagement programs. Typically, foreign policy gives states a limited international role, creating a decision-making bias (Waage, 2007, p. 174). Increasingly, the State Department reveals a growing role of states carrying out U.S. foreign policy, including “high politic” focus on national security issues (p. 159).

Petrova’s detailed case study on the Maryland-Estonian partnership of the State Partnership Program illustrates a suggested transition of the importance of states in shaping foreign policy in America (2012). Howard uses this case and the Poland-Illinois partnership to show that state military forces (Reserve and National Guard) have come to play not only a large role, but an essential role in overseas operations. He states that Poland in particular has acted as an agent for democracy in Western Europe. From a military perspective, this promotion of democracy may be from a successful and non-aggressive military partnership with the United States’ National Guard forces. Despite the wide success detailed, the use of states remains “underappreciated” due to the prevalent approaches to foreign policy analysis, which view states as tools of the federal government (2004, p. 183). This literary response came about 30 years late. It was in the early 1970's that the U.S. military’s high command changed its military

philosophy. Rather than dispatching only active duty forces for defense missions and priorities, policy was changed to involve U.S. military reservists for future conflicts (Office of the Assistant, p. 8). This gave Minnesota's National Guard leaders the opportunity to form international relationships as part of their now expanded role in national defense.

History of the Norwegian-Minnesotan Partnership

When combat operations in World War II ended in 1945, an American Infantry Battalion was dispatched to assist the Norwegian military in expelling the nearly 400,000 German soldiers from Norway (Myklebust). This joint mission with Norway's military fostered a deep, professional relationship between the Norwegian military and the members of the 99th Infantry Battalion. In the decades following WWII, the U.S. military focused on new issues: the Cold War, the Korean Conflict, and the war in Vietnam. During these crises, the U.S. maintained close ties with Great Britain, France, and other NATO allies, and built U.S. military bases throughout West Germany (Tauschweizer). Additionally, European nations threatened by the propaganda and intimidated by the Eastern Bloc received military and diplomatic assistance from the United States government. Norway, however, was largely left alone to defend its northern border from a possible Soviet invasion. The post-WWII American troop withdrawal from Norway resulted in a decline of the close military relationship that had developed between the two countries. Prompted by this decline, the Minnesota National Guard and Norwegian Home Guard attempted to revitalize military relations through the 1974 U.S.-Norway Troop Reciprocal Exchange Agreement. This was the start of an annual troop exchange program between the two militaries that renewed diplomatic and military relations between Norway and the U.S., and consequently served as a model for the State Partnership Program.

The difference in American and Norwegian military priorities contributed to the lack of interest in pursuing any joint military training exclusively or via NATO channels between the two countries during the first half of the Cold War era; therefore, the close relationship the U.S. military once had with Norway continued to deteriorate. This lack of military connectedness highlighted an area of relations that could serve to be revitalized. If the relationship between two states with such similar values and aspirations could be dissolving so quickly without a partnership, surely the relationship between states less ideologically-oriented would suffer even greater.

History and Implications of the State Partnership Program

Colonel Walter Renfro, senior manager for the National Guard Bureau's international program in Washington, D.C., noted that the troop exchange could serve as a model for a new program which would partner U.S. states with other countries (Ahlness). After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and the emergence of free countries from the former Soviet bloc, a partnership training program was deemed the right strategic effort to build favor with these new nations. Colonel Renfro suggested forming a 'State/Nation Partnership Program', modeled after Minnesota's and Norway's military training exchange, in which American states would exchange military personnel with partner nations to promote international cooperation. Within these partnerships, military troops travelled to each other's country to train in joint development programs and to work under the guidance of foreign officers—a skill that became extremely important as Norwegian and other NATO troops generated a greater presence in Afghanistan (Støren). The exchange of troops thus provided mutual training benefits, while also increasing cultural and fraternal ties (Scofield).

The State Partnership Program links state National Guard units to the military reserve components of other countries through U.S. military engagement programs. This typically involves going through the U.S. Department of State, implying that at the national level diplomats have control over the program. Even though the yearly exchanges require federal ‘go-aheads,’ the state-level National Guard has become, and remains, the primary agency for implementing U.S. military engagement programs within the reserve forces. From an institutional perspective, it is clear that the State Partnership Program provides states an increasingly growing role in shaping U.S. foreign policy. Looking at the ‘second level’ of international politics, as discussed by Waltz, neither foreign policy nor federalism is able to address the growth of state policies because of the divided nature of the programs used. That is, implemented on a national level, while carried out on a provincial level.

Choice of Cases

Norway was selected as the first case for examining the relationship and effects of using American states in international diplomacy and military joint efforts. While the precursor to the State Partnership Program, and therefore not technically a component of the program, Minnesota’s relationship with Norway illustrates the success a province-level state and a nation-state can create by engaging each other’s reserve forces to promote international military security. Norway was already a democratic country, even with a more socialist economy, but it was suffering economically and militarily. While Poland was a good partner because it could influence surrounding states to adopt more democratic policies (as this paper continues to illustrate), Norway was a good partner because it could work with the United States in more global endeavors, such as in contributing to Middle East stability. Harald Støren, the current Defense and Security Policy Counselor of the Norwegian Embassy in Washington D.C., states

that Norway is the United State's most active and financially supportive partner in promoting diplomacy between Pakistan and Israel, and is the world's most generous donor to international aid for Middle Eastern refugees and infrastructure establishments .

Besides using their membership in regional organizations to initiate and support democracy, some new democracies like Poland have used "quiet diplomacy" to prevent backsliding or breakdowns in neighboring states (Petrova 2012; 135). Poland in particular has acted to provide political and moral support to pro-democratic forces by fostering a national pro-democratic environment. This is especially true in Poland's relationship with Ukraine. Petrova argues that Poland has been trying to pressure Ukraine's political leadership to adopt democratic policies and practices since Ukraine gained its independence in 1991 (2012). Poland is thus an ideal case for examining the larger implications of the State Partnership Program because of the multitude of levels (presidential, parliamentary, and local) that Polish officials engage Ukrainians to discuss the benefits of democracy, whether in the political, social, or economic realm. Poland "shares its transition experiences and EU integration problems that it had faced itself in the past" in order to inform and foster the development of other states towards a democratic future (2012, p. 137).

Case Presentation

At a reserve force level, each U.S. governor and their appointed Adjutant Generals retains control over their state's National Guard forces. This is only interrupted under conditions of emergency, when the president has authority to federalize the Guard troops and airmen. The original role of the National Guard was to serve as the defender of a state's territory against

enemies and natural disaster relief, yet the former purpose is “largely obsolete” (Howard, 2004, p. 184). Today, the continued usefulness of the Guard exists at a more national level.

The State Partnership Program creates an arena for the United States to bring up concerns across diplomatic and economic realms as well. One issue brought up in meetings with the Norwegian and Danish diplomats has been the emerging issue of the "Far North," or the Arctic polar region (Cossalter). The relationship between Minnesota and Norway, and the focus on winter operations, has been a link and the impetus for both countries to participate in and lead a dialogue regarding the growing importance of the Arctic region for transportation, fishing, and oil exploration. The exchange is an essential component between Norway's and Minnesota's past connection, and is a strategic link to the future of the Far North.

Minnesota's Major General (Retired) Larry Shellito has acknowledged that "in reality, we have Minnesotans in Afghanistan, working in an area that's monitored by the Germans, while working alongside Norwegians and Croatians. We're all NATO members who have found ways to work together" (Retirement Address, 2010). Since the formation of the Norwegian Exchange, not only have training objectives been met with Norway, but Minnesota National Guard soldiers have connected with international personnel and have a stronger global perspective. Further, both Minnesota and Norway are able to identify, implement, and follow through on shared goals, such as peacekeeping missions, resulting in greater security for both nations (Phillips).

The United States also sought to increase security in Western Europe. When determining which nations to join with under the State Partnership Program, U.S. military leaders eventually determined it would engage in regular military to military contact with former Warsaw Pact nations. This drew from a more ‘historical acceptance’ of democratic principles, and sought to

build off a past connection to make the military exchange more successful. This can be seen as mimicking the NOREX program, which drew from a WWII military presence and years of cultural connections between Norway and Minnesota. Because these nations have past connections, the establishment of a military partnership came easier, as well as “nonobtrusively,” since there was no ‘surprising outreach’ on the part of the United States in Western European states (Howard, 2004, p. 139).

For the United States, shaping the democratic transition underway in Eastern Europe was certainly of national interest. By partnering the Illinois National Guard with Poland, the United States sought to familiarize the region with the idea of a functioning, democratically-controlled military. Within Poland, civic groups, interest groups, and other forms of collectives have generally supported democracy as principle. On the national level, the government has focused on creating an international dialogue and attitude that advocates democracy in the way it interacts with its neighboring countries. For Poland, the struggle against the East was a battle against Russian imperialism, which had threatened Poland for centuries (Petrova 2012, p. 135). Engaging in a military partnership with the United States, even though only reserve forces, was an act of defensive realism. Policy and best interests intersected to direct Poland to act in response to the historical threat Russia poised to it. This defensive realism continued for decades beyond the initial effects of military training. Poland was a significant motivator behind support for Ukraine’s Orange Revolution in 2004 by the European Union (p. 137). Early military events with Poland were very popular in Eastern Europe, and the Baltic nations, to include Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, asked to participate in the program. Poland can thus be seen as a legacy of the State Partnership Program’s goal: to help countries transition to democracy so that they may then support others in their transitions as a regional influence.

Branching Out: State Partnership and Specific Objectives

While the original objective of the State Partnership Program was to establish a military presence in Eastern European states after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the different partnerships have taken different paths over time. In the early 1990's, Eastern European countries were open to learn about military reforms and operation, and many sought to eventually join NATO. Over time, though, both the United States and the respective European partners became aware of the number of possibilities available to them by partnering with each other. By coordinating efforts at an institutional level between the state Guard leadership and Department of State liaisons, policymakers were able to create programs based more on their host country's needs and capabilities. Obviously, the partnership between Estonia and Maryland has different areas of potential than the partnership between Virginia and Tajikistan.

Military officials and policymakers have argued that the earlier partnerships lacked the “necessary cohesiveness and focus” to effectively promote democratic principles (Howard, 2004, p. 142). After a decade of connections, participating countries are more comfortable asking for assistance in areas of concern—many of which fall outside the realm of the military. A military partnership has led to economic, political, and humanitarian connections that go far beyond the realm of military operations. The Estonian-Maryland partnership has grown above and beyond its original exchange purpose—that of a military exchange to promote joint training—into one that links civilians with civilians, and civilians with their military counterparts on both sides of the ocean. This partnership is sometimes considered the “most mature” of the State Partnership Program exchanges, right after Illinois and Poland. In both of these cases, the United States played a significant role in shaping the transformations toward democracy, and teaching the Estonian and Polish militaries NATO vernacular, procedures, and values.

Realism and the State Partnership Program

While the U.S. fostered new relationships with former Soviet bloc countries, it strived to not provoke the Russian Federation. Therefore, the U.S. made the conscience decision to exclude active military forces from partnerships. Military liaison teams were comprised of only National Guard members, supporting the military intelligence community's contention that the use of reserve troops for a military exchange lowered the perceived threat of the program by the Russians. The Department of Defense directed National Guard Bureau to develop a training program, and National Guard liaison teams were sent to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, limiting the threat to Russians while signaling support of the U.S. to fledgling nation-states (Waage). These programs were formalized within the newly created State Partnership Program. The Norwegian-Minnesota troop exchange had become a model for diplomatic discussions to develop these new partnerships at a national level. In addition, this partnership is supported by the realist theory in international relations, as the United States acted as an overseas balancer, attempting to gain a greater proportion of power relative to Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The quick and decisive creation of military partnerships in the former Soviet realm of influence established an American presence by creating a challenger to the Russian regional hegemony. While Japan has been a previous balancer of power against Russia, the creation of the Soviet Union, as well as the disestablishment of the Japanese military post-WWII, meant that the U.S. had to intervene if they wanted to keep Russia's proportion of power from growing too much relative to neighboring states.

Offensive and Defensive Realism and the American Movement

From the offensive realist theory, the United States saw an opportunity for expansion and its own interest-implementation with the collapse of the Soviet Union. The consequent weakness of the Russian state (due to its regime transition, sudden loss of national unity and identity, and sharp economic decline) created an opening for the U.S. to establish military presence without threat of retaliation from the former Soviets. Even in the past, the United States demonstrated a commitment to offensive realism by stationing troops in Norway after the collapse of German's Third Reich. At the time, Norway was economically poor, morally drained, and infrastructurally damaged, but it was also the perfect place for the United States to create a troop presence and portray itself as a military relief. Even though Norway was a poor country at the end of WWII, it would serve the U.S.'s interests well to invest in its well-being. By "investing in a share" of Norway's national wellness, the United States would then have the opportunity to "cash in" on economic, diplomatic, and military growth that would occur in the following decades.

From a defensive realist perspective, longer partnerships can signal more of a threat against the common enemy of the cooperating states. This variable ties into the final independent variable: the number of military partnerships a state is engaged in. An increased number of partnerships a state is engaged in can threaten its opposing powers, who may feel the need to engage in partnerships of their own to maintain a balance of alliances and power. The use of American state-level militaries with nation-states designates the expanded role of American states in national defense. The purpose of the State Partnership Program is to create less of a defensive reaction by opposing states that are more likely to be threatened by the expansion of American military endeavors. The stationing of Russian troops in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia was a reaction to the formation of the State Partnership Program. Threatened by the encroachment of American forces (regardless of the fact they were reserve troops), Russia sought

countermeasures to create a balance of power against the offshore hegemony. The defensive actions taken by Russia led the United States to send only reserve forces. Under defensive realism, it becomes increasingly difficult for American troops to operate in a former Soviet realm, since any activity taken can easily be perceived as hostile and aggressive.

Neoliberalism and the State Partnership Program

The final theoretical basis for the State Partnership Program is also the least contributable to the reason for establishing the military partnership. Neoliberalists would argue that the United States created military partnerships with former Soviet republics to foster an internal environment favorable to the growth of democracy. This would not be done to further the influence of American power and interests in these newly separated states, but would be out of the desire of American policymakers to establish democracy, the most humanitarian and productive of all forms of government. The fact that the United States may gain international presence in Eastern Europe would not have played as large a role in directing policy decisions as the desire of America to act in goodwill towards other nations. The fact that Russia within the Soviet Union had fallen would serve as a punishment, since it was a 'bad' international actor and deserved to have collapsed for trying to subjugate other states to be its subordinates.

The Impact of Institutions on Military Policy

The U.S. Department of Defense has acted as an institution to support American interests and security cooperation goals by engaging partners along military, social, political, and economic channels. As a national institution, the Department of Defense is able to connect with host countries at the national level. The inclusion of state-level institutions creates more direct access to connect with local levels as well. By using multiple institutions with varying sizes and

areas of impact, the range and depth of defense capabilities can be reached in a state-to-state partnership. The implications of the State Partnership Program's use of multiple institutions is that a variety of organizations are needed in international cooperation efforts, since even seemingly single-issue partnerships still dissect in a number of areas. The continued and future combination of national and state-level institutions will likely result in success in state partnerships, and can thus be used as an international model, especially between ideologically Western and Eastern Europe/Central Asian states. By using institutions to create channels for free communication and the exchange of ideas, states not only reinforce common military pursuits for security, but also the importance of highlighting this value in a political arena as well.

Conclusion

The implications of the State Partnership Program go beyond the realm of expanded military capabilities. The effects and increased cooperation expand across political, social, and economic realms. The intent of the partnership was also to promote subordination of the military to civilian leadership, a strong respect and deferment to human rights, and a defense—rather than cult of the offense—oriented military posture (Howard, 2004, p. 148). This defensive model can be seen as promoting both defense realism and, to a degree, neoliberalism, as avoidance of offensive military practices promotes peaceful relations and cooperation between two states, each assuming that the other will act in fellowship and kindness towards the other. Most of the newly independent states partnered with through the State Partnership Program had militaries that were based on the economically-draining and nationally-aggressive Soviet model, which focused on countering the expansion of NATO and saw NATO as an offensive realist threat.

The Norwegian-Minnesotan Troop Exchange demonstrates a successful partnership between two military forces, and continues to make a positive impact by influencing world events, including Middle East involvement and global economic aid distribution. It also demonstrates the power of sustained relationships in creating strong diplomatic ties and global impact. The original delegates could not have anticipated the wide-ranging policy impact of the partnerships, such as the emergence of the Far North as a policy issue. The U.S.-Norway Troop Reciprocal Exchange legacy is that of a model for a successful international partnership program. It also demonstrates that of an effective and enduring relationship that advances the mutual interests of the United States and Norway, as well as sets the stage as a model for the State Partnership Program. The State Partnership Program finds its legacy through the partnership between Illinois and Poland, illustrating the ability of a leading nation in a region to influence others towards democratic policies, whether they have military or civilian applications.

Works Cited

- Ahlness, E. D. (2008). *Minnesota Army National Guard. Strategic Security Implications of the National Guard State Partnership Program*. Pennsylvania : U.S. Army War College.
- Bekke, D. (2004). *The Military Historical Society of Minnesota. Norwegian-Americans and the 99th Infantry Battalion (Separate)*. St. Paul, Minnesota Military Museum: Minnesota National Guard.
- Bergen, H. R. (1945). *History of the 99th Infantry Battalion*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Military Historical Society of Minnesota.
- Brovold, B. I., Lovelace, J.J. (2006). *Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States Army and the Norwegian Home Guard*. Oslo, Washington, D.C.: Heimevernet Historier.
- Brown, R. A., Fedorochko, W., and Schank, J. F. (1995). *Assessing the State and Federal Missions of the National Guard. Parameters*, Vol 6 (4). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Dorenbush, T. J. (1994). *Minnesota Army and Air National Guard: Memorandum of Agreement Between The Department of Defense of the United States of America and The Ministry of Defense of Norway Concerning Reciprocal Exchange Procedures Concerning The U.S. and Norwegian Armies*. St. Paul: Adjutant General Office.
- Fry, E. (1998) *The Expanding Role of State and Local Governments in U.S. Foreign Affairs*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- “GDP Ranking.” (2013). *World Development Indicators*. The World Bank. Retrieved February 5, 2013.
- Heil, G. (1987, March 30). Little Falls woman trains with Guard in Norway. Morrison County Record, pp. 4.
- Howard, P. (2004). The Growing Role of States in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the State Partnership Program. *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol 5 (2), pp. 179-196.
- Jervås, B. (2005). *U.S. Army, with Collaboration from Norwegian Home Guard: 99th Battalion (Separate)*. St. Paul: Adjutant General Office.
- Keohane, R. O. (2005). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lluberes, A. L.(1974, February 11). 28 Norwegian Guardsmen at Ripley for Training. Little Falls Daily Transcript, pp. 1.
- Moran, J. (1989, February 27). Visiting With the Norwegians. Morrison County Record, pp. 19.

Myklebust, T. (2007, Winter). Reunion of the Viking Battalion. *News of Norway*, pp 6.

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs. Department of Defense of the United States of America. (2008). *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*. Washington D.C.: Department of Defense.

Petrova, T. (2012). How Poland Promotes Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, Vol 23 (2), pp. 133-147.

Phillips, A. (2010, September 25). Minnesota Guard Provides Local Training With A Global Impact. Camp Ripley Report: Minnesota National Guard, pp. B2

Traushweizer, I. (2008). *The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas.

“International Comparisons of GDP per Capita and per Hour, 1960-2011.” (2012). *Division of International Labor Comparisons*. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved February 5, 2014.

Waage, H. H. (2007). The Minnow and the Whale: Norway and the United States in the Peace Process in the Middle East. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* Vol 34 (2), pp. 157-176.

Wuertz, A. (1989, March 27). National Guard troops train in Norway. Morrison County Record, pp 8.