Attribution status For attribution	Not for attribution	Interview Code
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------

DO NOT FILL OUT THIS BOX IF THE INTERVIEW IS NOT FOR ATTRIBUTION If this interview was conducted on a for-attribution basis, fill out the fields in this shaded box. If this interview was conducted on a not-for-attribution basis, do not fill out this shaded box. Instead, add a code above and list this informant in the Index of Confidential Informants.							
Evaluation Code	E-11	Ind	ex I-52.A	Loca	tion	om	
Title	Interview of Earl Anthony Wayne						
Purpose	To identify long-term factors undermining the Afghan government's authority and legitimacy, as well as successes and failures in U.S.						
Informant name	Earl Anthony Wayne						
Informant title	Deputy Ar	nbassador	to Afghanista	ın			П
Title status	Current	t	Former	Phone	Number		
Email address							
Informant has expressed fear of retaliation, reprisal, or embarrassment	Yes	No No	confiden	rmant has requested tiality and rer agreed	Yes	No No	
Informant is a foreign national	Yes	No No	Inves	by sent to stigations rectorate	Yes	● No	
Interview date	12/21/21						
SIGAR Attendees	Daniel We	eggeland, S	Senior Subjec	t Matter I	Expert, \$	SIGAR/RAD	
Record prepared by	Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Date prepared 5/20/22						
Record reviewed by	Dan Fishe	er, Analyst	in Charge,	Date revie	ewed 5/2	25/22	

INTERVIEW OF
EARL ANTHONY WAYNE
BY
DANIEL WEGGELAND

+ + + + +

DECEMBER 21, 2021

+ + + + +

This transcript was produced from audio provided by the Office of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MR. WEGGELAND: This morning we are interviewing Ambassador Anthony Wayne. The rules for today's interview include the following,
Ambassador Wayne has agreed that we can attribute his comments, essentially up to his name, in the public report, and we will also be recording today's interview. Of course, if at point he wishes us to pause, we will pause and not record those comments. Ambassador Wayne, does that work for you?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: That works me.

MR. WEGGELAND: Excellent. Thank you very much for joining us this morning. We have this set, currently, for an hour, but if you're willing to go longer, we have also time, as well. I'll let you know when we're getting close to the hour, and then check in with you and see how you want to proceed.

Before we kick off, looking at your background it seems that the best time period

Thank you.

that you can comment as an observer, direct observer on Afghanistan affairs would be from the time you were made the Coordinating Director for Development and Economic Affairs at the Embassy, which would've been June 2009, through your tour as Deputy Ambassador under Ambassador Eikenberry, which started in May 2010, and I assume that ended May-ish, June-ish of 2011, is that?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: June of 2011.

MR. WEGGELAND: June of 2011. Okay.

Would that be fair to say that is the time period that you had the most focus and direct observation on Afghanistan, or are there subsequent experiences you'd like us also to be aware of?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I'll mention a couple other things. So, there, sort of, have been three periods of time where I paid attention to Afghanistan. The most intense, certainly, was 2009 through 2011 because I was there, and my wife went with me, and she worked at the Embassy while we were there. From September 2011 through

the beginning of 2003 I also was the lead coordinator for the State Department on reconstruction efforts, international reconstruction efforts on Afghanistan.

So, I was the Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, and at that time the State Department really didn't have a bureau that focused on crisis response and rebuilding and things like that. So, we took the lead to organize international donors including starting while fighting was still going on in Afghanistan because we realized that there was going to have to be a rebuilding effort afterwards, a new government, helping to recreate the economy and make the economy better going forward. started working with the World Bank and the UNDP and some key donors, particularly the Japanese, volunteered to be our partners in convening the first donor conference to get the outlines of what was going to be needed, where people should invest, asking people to make pledges. So, we had a whole series of meetings leading up, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some big donor meetings but led up to a very large donor meeting in Tokyo in January of 2002. Through the next year we worked to keep donors coordinated and to try to support from capitals the work that was going on on the ground to get the economy going again to provide for the needs of Afghan people.

So, this was a period where, I think it's fair to say, few people really knew what they were doing well, and there was, I mean, One Afghanistan was a real disaster, much worse than when I went back again, or when I went there in 2009. Donors were trying to figure out how to support Afghanistan, and they did a number of things that weren't too smart as they were going forward, including giving lead responsibility to different donors for different sectors, which really didn't work very well because people didn't coordinate during that period of time. Of course, in peril of this was the political process of getting the Loya Jirga to convene in Germany and trying to get a political structure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

up and running, which they did. Eventually, I handed this responsibility off to my colleagues in the South Central Asia bureau once they were staffed up to keep working on this, which was really the end of 2002, beginning of 2003, because I got to focus on Iraq ***(20:51:54)***.

So, then I went off and really didn't work on Afghanistan, per say, until spring of 2009. Dick Holbrooke had been named the special representative. He was looking to assemble a team of senior specialists to go out to Afghanistan to beef up, his idea was we should beef up our presence there and our efforts there on the civilian side as well as the military I was recruited to do that from where I was serving as Ambassador to Argentina, and I think in part because of my earlier experience on Afghan reconstruction and that I had been the Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, so I had also worked on Iraq and other rebuilding efforts for the economies.

So, I then left Argentina, has a brief

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	period, very brief time in Washington, and then
2	headed out to Kabul in June of 2009 in a newly
3	created job which was called the Coordinator for
4	
5	MR. WEGGELAND: Development and
6	Economic Affairs?
7	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: CDDEA, Coordinating
8	Director
9	MR. WEGGELAND: Coordinator Director
10	for Development and Economic Affairs.
11	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Economic Affairs.
12	That was it. Right. Long title.
13	MR. WEGGELAND: Right.
14	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: So, the idea was
15	that we would have four ambassador ranked people
16	at the Embassy, and part of the reason for that
17	was there were so many senior military officers
18	there, three and four stars, that you had to have
19	people that were of similar rank for them to
20	seriously engage them. This was the theory.
21	MR. WEGGELAND: Sufficient wasta?
22	

that was fueled by Karl Eikenberry who had been a three star general there and now was ambassador, and so he knew, sort of, how generals thought.

So, he thought this was key and we would pair up with the other generals and commanders and work in different areas.

So, my area of responsibility for the first year was to try to bring much more coordination to the civilian assistance effort and then try to coordinate with DoD, which was doing a lot of assistance, a lot of what would normally be civilian assistance as part of their military activities. For understandable reasons, they were trying to win hearts and minds locally. But we had a number of different civilian agencies with about four billion dollars worth of programs underway at that period of time. Ι think it was fair to say they were not well coordinated, and I think it's fair to say that like much else in Afghanistan, you were innovating as you went forward, as SIGAR has detailed in many of its reports. So, people made

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mistakes, and they were doing that. They were often working at the very extreme of their ability, their capacity to act because there was so much going on and so much happening. We were trying to deploy civilians out to the various military installations around the country at the same time we were trying to bring in better coordination, first among ourselves then with the U.S. forces and the NATO forces and with other donors and with the Afghans all at the same time.

So, we used to joke with each other that it was like flying a combat mission on a big plane while you were rebuilding the plane at the same time and getting conflicting instructions about what you should be doing and you were getting new members dropping into your crew on a regular basis, because, as you remember, at that period of time, everybody served one year and that was it. So, you had this massive knowledge and brain drain on a regular basis. It was really dysfunctional, but you tried to do the best you can. There was a lot of political

pressure to produce results back from Washington.

So, a lot of regular, once a week deputies and

principles readings and once a month, for a

while, meeting with the President on video with

everybody on.

So, a lot of attention to what was happening there, and we were trying to staff at a time when it was really hard to get enough civilians, knowledgeable civilians, experienced civilians to come out. So, as you remember, they were trying this method of, oh, I've forgotten it, something 10. A procedure by which you were hiring --

MR. WEGGELAND: Right, 3161 is the hiring authority for a State Department.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes, 3161, that's it. So, you were getting a mixed bag. You got some really outstanding people and some people who were just there for money and some people who weren't up to living in a war time situation.

So, you had to manage, you were trying to manage people, manage a process, manage the substance,

deal with all these other people, and it did make it a really complex situation.

So, anyway, in that first year, in became clear to me and to my colleagues, pretty clearly, that the political modernization of structures in Afghanistan had not yet taken place. This was still a patron-client relationship based on tribes and family ties and other things superimposed in this structure that we were trying to support of a more modern government.

So, you had a lot of what we would call corruption, but for Afghans it was just taking care of your family and building networks that could support you because that's the way it had been done for generations and generations given the weakness of the government structures there. You had a thin layer of technocrats, some of whom were very good but a number of whom, under their veneer of having a western education, were still Afghans who grew up in Afghanistan and felt all those other pressures from their

families and others to help out, and their clans and their tribes.

And we were all learning this because, you know, I'd never served in Afghanistan, I came in from Argentina, which had it's own problems but a different kind of problems, and a lot of my colleagues the same way. So, we were trying to learn all of this, be culturally sensitive, figure out what's the best way to deal in this culture and get good results as we were discovering what was going on. By the time I had been there, by the fall, I had concluded that once we somehow got a better hand on managing corruption, not eliminating it, the government we were working with would not be seen as legitimate over the longer period of time, and I think that remained a problem throughout our whole stay there, as I saw when I came back to this later on.

MR. WEGGELAND: On that point, very briefly, would it be fair to say, from your perspective, that, at least at that time, which I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

guess would be the fall of 2009, is that right?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right.

MR. WEGGELAND: The assessment, at least that you had, was that corruption could not be or had not been mitigated despite all the accountability, oversight, et cetera, et cetera, efforts that the international community collectively, or individually in the case of the U.S. Government or the implementing agencies, had imposed.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: That's correct.

MR. WEGGELAND: Obviously, your arrival is the start of your time line to observe things, but it's not the start of the U.S. intervention. So, all the donor conferences up to that point saying things like corruption is bad and needs to be dealt with, all the efforts to try to whittle away at this big problem, that at least after you got a chance to get your feet under you and have a look at it as much as one could, this giant monster in the fall of 2009, that the assessment is essentially whatever we've

been doing up to now is insufficient to deal with this corruption challenge and that that challenge is a threat to the legitimacy and/or authority of the Afghan state.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right. And part of the challenge was that a number of people that the U.S. Government and NATO were relying on to fight the Taliban effectively were corrupt and killed people, sort of, unnecessarily, I mean, depended on the individual and where you were and things. But it was like, and this isn't true of everybody, there were a number of people with whom, whether or not they were corrupt, if they were you couldn't see it, who knows. And we never saw that Karzai himself was personally corrupt, but he had a lot of people in his network that were, that were key in his patronclient network. And a lot of people that the military worked with who were effective generals had a lot of big flaws including corruption. a lot of the governors around the country and political leaders had a big chunk of corruption.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

They ran their states okay in some cases and less well in others, or their provinces, but there was a lot of corruption going on. So, you weren't modeling. And there weren't really modern political parties that existed within these ***(21:02:32)*** sort of to counter this as we got forward. Thinking back to my old political science training decades before, we learned how modern political parties evolved, and that helped eliminate the corruption in the old royal systems in Europe and elsewhere and in the United States, but that wasn't really happening for a lot of reasons.

MR. WEGGELAND: Just so I'm clear, because corruption is a term that can mean a lot of things to different people, and I just want to make sure I'm understanding how you're using it. So, the general definition of corruption is abusing public office for private gain, but I assume that if one is effectively governing a province that it might not be personal gain it might be trying to solidify a coalition or to

redirect it towards a different, so it would potentially be fraud if one says, yes, I use this money for this purpose but actually used it for another, that would be fraud, but I guess this is a more general, the impression I get is the more general sense of corruption being used in Afghanistan as redirecting resources towards other ends and not exclusively personal benefit like I am enriching myself. I just wanted to clarify that.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Exactly. It really was both kinds because a lot of it was diverting funds that came through assistance or went to the government and then came down there to build coalitions to sustain things, even if it wasn't done efficiently ***(21:04:09)*** payoffs in order to keep people so wealthy. But there was other that was personal enrichment, and we found both of them. Then, that dividing line, what I discovered was that the dividing line between what is morally okay and what is morally not okay in that society was just very different because

there was a lot of pressure on people to protect their, take care of their families. And that's not quite the same thing that we feel in western, I mean, of course we love our families, but we're not going to divert money to do that. But for Afghans, it was okay to give job opportunities and contracts and other things to family members even if they weren't the best to receive that because that was part of your responsibility.

so, there are all these different things going on simultaneously and we in the west had tried to fix some of it, all the western donors and everybody, and I could see where there were improvements in accountability, and while I was there I could see the Finance Ministry improving its accountability, but it was way short of making substantial gains. Some of that corruption in a war situation it's going to happen, and it's okay. The problem is, as I came to see it, if it undermines legitimacy of the government that you're trying to work with, that's not good, and if it undermines, thus, our

goals, U.S. goals there and our own view of legitimacy because we're seen as facilitating a corrupt, ineffective government. If it were a somewhat corrupt but effective government, that's a different situation, you have to make those judgments around the world, and we do that all the time. This was just a really, really difficult situation. So, at some point over those months it became clear that the cost of really calling out some of the senior level diversion of funds for non-official ends and not producing good results at a high level wasn't going to be called to account because at the top levels of the U.S. Government it would create too much disruption to the war effort. So, they said, let's keep working. It was basically, you guys keep working on it as best you can going forward.

MR. WEGGELAND: Would it be fair to say that trying to, I guess this is a two part question. So, the first one is, would it be fair to say that the surveillance, whether active or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

passive, the surveillance capabilities necessary to get a good sense of is this individual acting corruptly, that that's a significant investment of time and energy on the part of the U.S. Government to get to a specific did this individual commit a corrupt act?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: We did not have the capacity to do that in most cases.

MR. WEGGELAND: And then in those cases where we did that that --

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: The most effective way of doing this was when we used technical means to uncover either money transfers or conversations.

MR. WEGGELAND: So --

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Then we didn't really have the people to go out and investigate that stuff because you have to get into that society, so you have to have Afghan partners to do that. What happened was, in part, in a couple areas, anti-drug area because they develop, as they do around the world, DEA had a special

investigation unit, these people are all vetted, they actually started finding stuff. Then, when the treasury people came out from OPEC and started tracking money they started finding stuff.

But that didn't take you all the way because it just showed you that there's this channel and there's money flowing through it, too much money, but you really couldn't go investigate a lot of it because the justice system was ***(21:08:31)*** a couple of areas. Plus, you were busy doing all this other stuff. It was really complex. When Petraeus came out, for example, he hired McMaster to come and try to set some examples of finding corrupt people and going after them, and they had a really hard time of doing that. I think that was a right effort to do, but it was very hard to do.

As I say, some of the people that we identified as we believed were among the most diverting of money for their own ends were also very effective, either militarily or in running a

province. So, what did you do? How could you do that? It kept coming up to a number of really difficult and hard choices.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. So, after the very labor intensive effort to first identify do we have sufficient evidence then that queues up the second challenge, what does one do with it. I guess it often -- correct me if I'm wrong, it sounds as if it appeared that there were often forks in the road where it was a choice of, do we take the cost of picking a fight on this issue, or in doing so does that undermine the effectiveness of our counterpart and that this made it a very difficult choice over and over again, is that a fair way of summarizing it?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: That's a good way to look at it. And a lot of times we didn't have sufficient evidence. As you said earlier, we didn't have the ability to investigate the evidence that we had to take it further just because of the limits of what we could do. Then we came to these various forks in the road, and

it was very hard.

There were certain instances like the Kabul bank crisis where eventually we had to keep pushing because so much money was involved, even though they were really top well connected in the economy and the society and to Karzai people who were involved in this corrupt act of diverting money away, bank fraud and doing other things.

And with a lot of pressure they got some punishment but they didn't, as you know, they got off fairly lightly after a couple years of scrutiny. That was a very big case.

And this was happening at all sorts of different levels, a lot of which we didn't know about because you'd have to, you'd pick up little things about this road construction where we're spending all this money, some of it's going to the Taliban, some of it's going to the local people who let you go through, is that really corruption, some of it's who's getting the truck contract to bring all the asphalt in, et cetera. You just couldn't do that around the country.

MR. WEGGELAND: So, it sounds almost as if, at a certain point, the conclusion is basically any intervention, any development or development like effort will involve bad things, corruption, pay off to the Taliban, et cetera. So, it almost sounds as if the question then becomes, do you do anything or do nothing, I mean, in its most extreme --

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I think for us the question came, when it was a big enough thing, can we get this practice changed? So, we would have targeted interventions to deal with specific cases that came up. But we didn't think we were going to change the system to prevent things like this from happening. It's like the customs houses. Through a lot pressure from us and other donors we got them to increase the collection at customs houses, but I don't think we ever eliminated the corruption and the skimming that was taking place, and it was just go up and down depending on how much pressure there was from Kabul to Washington. As we heard in the last

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

couple year it just started skyrocketing again.

Part of the interesting thing is, at those

moments when it looked like there might be a

reduction in U.S. support and other things, the

temptation to be corrupt just went way up because

people were tempted, I better get what I can now

because it's not going to last. Anyway, gigantic

problem, really hard to figure out.

I eventually, I faced this in different ways when I went to Mexico. My conclusion was we didn't have a good set of anticorruption policies as a U.S. Government, in general, so not just in Afghanistan. We had some tools that sort of worked and donors, some tools that worked, but they're far from perfect and especially at a place where you're so deeply involved it's really hard.

Now, let me just step back a minute.

The other thing that, the big difference that

came out in the summer of that first year that I

was there was when we were debating the surge,

and you know that there were a set of cables then

embassy sent in to Washington ***(21:14:13)*** channel that were then leaked by people who either didn't agree with McChrystal's strategy or wanted to undermine Eikenberry for arquing against McChrystal's strategy. So, just philosophically we had a very intense review, and we pretty quickly came to the conclusion that if we're going to change this place we really needed to plan for at least 10 years of intense development assistance, institution building programs and keep working on it repeatedly and repeatedly and repeatedly to try and change people, and bring newly educated people who had gone through the high school and university systems there into active government with a hope that a number of them would have a different set of approaches to how you run governments. Not that they'd be perfect but that they would know there's a value to having transparency and less corruption and more accountability to doing things.

And that was just so when it became

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

clear that the surge was going to have a date certain.

MR. WEGGELAND: As in an end or a beginning date?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: As an end date, that we were really disappointed because we'd already concluded that's not going to work. Plus, we didn't think it would work on the Taliban side. We kept thinking, unless you can get to the Taliban and Pakistan they're just going to wait us out. And, as you know, we never got to the Taliban and Pakistan.

So, I mean, we were good soldiers if we were diplomats or not, we worked really hard, and our aid team worked really hard to try and get these programs out there even though they were managing more programs than they could effectively manage as you guys and the aid inspector general and the state found when they looked at INL and others, that was happening.

But we tried very hard, and we tried to work with others to be both careful and get stuff done.

But wars don't get, it's hard to win wars and transform societies in a two year period or three year period or four year period. It doesn't work.

So, once you've made a decision to go in to a place as massively as this decision was made, they're going to be a certain number of time tables that you need to show progress. That was a big source of tension during that period of time between us and the military. The military, we're told, you've got this really short time frame and we've got to change everything. aid and other people just kept saying privately, no way you're going to change society this quickly. And that led to a lot of tension and yelling and things back and forth. Eventually we got beyond that and people understood that they were under pressure to deliver but they should listen to this expertise of people who had worked on development around the world, and they did eventually. We got a modus vivendi and worked forward. The tension of the time line was always

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there throughout the whole two years that I was in Kabul.

So, would it be fair MR. WEGGELAND: to say, and I don't know if this is just a military versus civilian perspective or if it's, principally military actors tended to articulate one way and principally civilian senior leaders articulate another, but it sounds as if there is almost a philosophical debate between how much we can, through our efforts, shape the environment versus how much we can respond and maybe, if the conditions are favorable we can take it to the next level, but if they're not, we can't, through our efforts alone, create that change. Maybe the military senior officials were more sensitive to, there's a limited time therefore we have to transform it through our energies. Again, not saying this is in all cases, but senior civilian officials who are saying if the conditions are not right, no matter what you do, you can't force society to change on your time line. Would that be a fair description of the underlying debate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that happened to be viewed as a bureaucratic fight?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: And both Yes. sides, what we came to understand, military is perfectly legitimate to have a tactical need to get the support of the local people. want to give them things, that's support. understand that. But that's not going to change that local society, or change their view of governance, or change their practices over the long run. You need to get that tactical advantage and then you have to have enough space where there's a legitimate government and services and other things operating that people's loyalty will start going toward, in this case, the Afghan government as a service provider, as a legitimate force and as something that you are willing to work for, as distinguished from tolerate, and appreciate the school, but if it came to that or your family, your tribe, or other things, no, you would change. And that's why, in so many ways, what I came to conclude was our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

most effective programs, in general, over the long run, were education and health because people valued being alive, and when they got educated they started seeing things differently, especially as they go through elementary and secondary school.

MR. WEGGELAND: And on that point, one of the documents that I suppose was issued during your tenure, I don't know if you were still the coordinating director or if you had transitioned to deputy ambassador, was the October 2010 post performance management plan, which, from my reading of the various documents to come out of the conflict, is perhaps the most nested. says the President's West Point speech, the regional stabilization strategy, and then the integrated civ-mil campaign plan, and then you have this document the post performance management plan. One thing that I remember stands out to me to this day is under the strategic coherence discussion for health, why does the U.S. Government investment help, is this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

line that it is the best way to build active support for the government. Which is, presumably, a behavioral change. And I don't know if you're familiar with that document or this line of thinking but you mentioning health and education, I guess one of the things I would ask is, when we make this assertion that healthcare leads to active support, did you have a strong sense at the time that that was based off the experience in Afghanistan or is this more, well, if anything is going to work hopefully it's something that directly benefits people.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Well, I think aid believed that from all their experience. But the example that really brought it home to me was midwives, our training for midwives, and the Afghan people started calling them angels, and that was their term for them because they would go into these little villages with nobody there and they would save mothers and children just by knowing how to deliver a baby and what to do in a

emergencies. I went to a number of the
graduation ceremonies around the country, at
least two of them, I can't remember, and I saw
there was a real affection towards these young
women who were doing it. They were so proud. To
me that just drove home, these guys are right.
This was an example, people really appreciate it,
and people will remember that while they might
forget other things. Now, it doesn't mean, I
supported training for farmers, how to grow stuff
better and all that stuff, I mean, you've got to
do that too, but these were two really important
things. And then the other thing, I just kept
meeting young Afghans who both were graduating
from high school and graduating from university.
It was so different. They were optimistic, they
viewed the world differently, they understood
there's a world out there, they'd clearly read a
lot about that outside world and what was going
on, and they were so different than the older
generations. You could just see in talking with
them and all the different opportunities they had

that this is the future that we want here.

But what's that mean? That means that you've got to be there for 15 years running these programs, at least, to have a couple of cohorts.

And then they've have to get rid of all those nasty old war lords and corrupt people above them, and that never happened in our time there.

So, if you've going to really go into a country and invest like we did, you just have to think about a 20 year time frame, I now conclude thinking about it.

Now, it might not be wise to make that choice to go in and stay that long, but it's unwise to make the choice to go in and try and do it in a couple years, especially with a country in the state of development of Afghanistan.

Different thing for Germany after World War II, you know, Japan, relatively educated, developed institutions, things like that. I mean, look at Korea. Look how long it took in Korea for them to get beyond the military dictatorship and then a corrupt democratic system and all that stuff.

It takes a long time to do these kind of things.

So, anyway, yes, there was a difference of perspective between the military and the civilians. We eventually, we did work that through, we talked it through, we understood each other, we understood what the needs were. But there was a big difference of perspective after I'd been out there and the perspective from Washington about time lines and what was needed to really make a difference if you want to do that.

Yes, that civ-mil plan. So, we started doing the first civ-mil plan while I was still the coordinating director.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. I think that was 2009, the first one I'm seeing.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: That's right. And then we did one in 2010, which was a lot better. We brought the Afghans in to that one, and we had a real process where civilians and military debated back and forth to come up with these common plans, and it was really healthy to do,

and then we involved the Afghans in debating part of this too. That was very healthy. It was a big step forward. I don't know what happened after I left. But it was what you needed to build consensus. We looked at all sorts of different sectors and did that, and that helped us get much better aligned going forward.

Then, as I understand, of course, once the decision was made to draw down and the draw down took place, even when I was there, we wrote this in cables and stuff, we said, if we draw down this economy is going to go into recession unless you somehow change this economy by that time. Because right now they just have so much of their activity, the employment is tied to the ISAF and U.S. presence. Of course, that's what happened, as you --

MR. WEGGELAND: It sounds almost like a catch 22 that the dependency is the creation of our intervention, but if we withdraw the intervention past a certain unknown minimal threshold that everything will collapse.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes.

MR. WEGGELAND: So, it sounds like your tenure featured a number of very wicked trade offs that were, at least the arguments between members of the family could be mitigated, or at least the way we expressed ourselves to each other, but the underlying issue, perhaps, persisted.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE:. Yes. The contradictions built into the intervention were Then when I came back from Mexico always there. at the end of 2015 I started an informal group on Afghanistan with an Afghan-American, and we hosted lunches every six weeks or so among people who had served in Afghanistan before, some of whom were still working on it at the World Bank and the IMF and things. So, we kept that going and it still goes now. So, then we watched this whole process. This is part of what led to a number of joint op-eds that I've done with others over these last five years sort of tracking this But you could see these same tensions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

were working out until they really just fueled the collapse with the Trump Administration policy and then finally the Biden Administration decision at the end. And you could see it coming, and we wrote regular op-eds saying this is what you need to do to keep things going warning of bad things that were going to happen, and bad things happened.

So, it is, from your perspective writing the story of this whole thing, I think these contradictions were there all the way through, and we managed them better or worse during this whole period of time, but they were always there, and they were always threatening the operation.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. I imagine that you're in a unique position having seen it from the beginning and then seeing it at the height, or at least the lead up to the height, right?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right.

MR. WEGGELAND: Because 2009, 2010, 2011, that's where the groundwork was laid for

the high point in, say, 2012. I suppose one of
these tensions that presumably you would've seen,
I mean, I haven't gone through declassified
internal memorandum from the late 2000 era, early
2002, is this, what I get the impression of, very
clear directive, we don't want to own the
problem. We don't want a nation build. The
President when he was a candidate said, no nation
building. We don't want to own it despite
recognizing that there's all types of problems in
this country that is Afghanistan. And from Dov
Zakheim's book I get the impression it was trying
to convince other allies to pony up so that we
wouldn't own it, get the UN to take it, get the
Europeans or someone to handle it. I guess by
the time you come back, 2009, 2010, we clearly
own it. We being the U.S. Whether it's owning
in the sense of the military or owning in the
sense of the civilian effort and now trying to
make sense of, so, if we own so much how can we
disengage if the President's direct is to do so.
Is that a fair

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I think that's right. I think at the very beginning we wanted to share responsibility with a lot of people.

That didn't work. Then I think they made that flawed decision also to not accept the Taliban overtures early on.

MR. WEGGELAND: It's what

(21:30:56) refers to as the original sin.

Even though I've heard him use that phrase in

other conflicts too, it seems to be his favorite

phrase.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I do think it was a big mistake. It wasn't the only mistake. It was a big mistake.

Then, if we had remained, I might be wrong, but I have a sense if might have stayed focused on Afghanistan maybe we could have been smarter in those years, but we didn't. We did this extremely questionable and strategically flawed decision to go into Iraq. And that meant people weren't paying attention to Afghanistan.

So, sort of by default is became ours. The

Taliban regained enough strength to start being more active. And then we had a decision to make, are we going to respond to the Taliban's increased strength there. And Obama made the decision, yes, let's get out of Iraq and we'll stay and try and win Afghanistan.

Again, I would've rather like to see a longer term commitment to stay, but at a much lower level of military presence and not having us so much taking the lead in doing fighting and having more of an effort on trying to set up a longer term reconciliation policy. Which is, when I got back from Mexico, is what I started looking at and with others seeing, is there a way we can actually get people talking to each other and build trust over a five year period of time. Have international forces help provide a space for people to work together in a coalition government, that whole kind of thing, which wouldn't be easy, but we're seeing the alternative right now, which isn't a very nice alternative either.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. Once sense I get from speaking with, particularly senior level and former senior officials, is almost this confusion/frustration around the fact that there were objective improvements in, say, the socioeconomic sector, more girls going to school, more kids going to school, more access to healthcare. And yet, the Taliban violence patterns continue to trend up in the way that we did not want. I guess as you reflect on the type of scrutiny, the time lines, or questions that you received with these regular meetings with the White House, did you get the sense that that was a shared question and maybe people were trying to figure out, okay, so what do we need to do to reverse this? There seemed to be agreement things are objectively better, but in the political security realm they're not, they're getting worse.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right. Well, during my time actually in Kabul the main explanation was that Taliban had this sanctuary

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in Pakistan and they could just retreat there and recover, heal their wounds, and then come back in and recruit more people, both from Afghans but from Pakistanis also who were in that border region and stuff and come back in. I thought that explained part of it. The other part was that the government in Kabul never really was able to develop strong enough service provision at local levels, and there were a lot of reasons. I mean, we could debate about this. A lot of people thought they should've been more decentralized government control. So, you had governors that weren't just dependent on Kabul but they had to build a local following. That, of course, has a trade off with corruption and other stuff, but there wasn't a formula that really established that legitimacy in the eyes of Afghans. So, there's a difference, I think, between, I don't ever think the Taliban was popular across the country. I always think it's 20 percent or less.

But that doesn't mean the government

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There's a difference there. was popular. government was tolerated because they did some good things, they did some bad things, and I think that was the problem. There wasn't a way, and then the further we got into this, the more we became the foreigner. I mean, we stood out more as the foreigner. So, that, if you think about it, you think of the Chinese Communists against the Japanese and the Vietnamese against the Americans and all this stuff. At some point if you become the bigger target because you're the one who's different, then you've given the power to the other person.

So, sometime between when I left in 2011 and when I came back and looked at it again in, let's say, especially 2018, 19, 20, we had become the enemy. And I think that was part of the side effect of the intensified bombing campaigns, probably, in 17, 18, 19, because we were hitting a lot of people that we didn't mean to hit, or that weren't meant to be hit, let's put it that way. And I think that helped shift

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this to be increasingly, let's get rid of the Americans, we're tired of war, we don't need this going on, especially in rural areas. Not in urban areas but in rural areas.

So, there is, again, I think that
Pakistan contributed a lot to this by providing
that sanctuary to the Taliban during the years
that I was there. That was certainly my view of
it. But the government also contributed by not
having the formula that could create their own
legitimacy so that they could really, we wouldn't
have to be so out front, that we could be more
out of sight. But the combination of sanctuary
and our big presence and their illegitimacy just
wasn't a formula for success.

MR. WEGGELAND: I guess if a major talking point of your opponent is that their opponent is a puppet, being so clearly on the stage reinforces that line of argument. Not saying it's the right answer.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: No, not saying it's true, but over time, and then especially if

you're getting nightly bombings. It's interesting because, to his credit, Karzai was saying this, especially in 2011 when I was there. And I just thought he was under too much pressure doing this stuff. But I think he sensed, he didn't have the answer, but he sensed that he was getting, his credibility was being undermined by the fact that local Afghans were being killed by the United States.

MR. WEGGELAND: I guess it was his line of argument that the war should not be fought in the villages, I believe that's how he framed it.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right. Now, he needed to have a strategy, which he did not have, really, for building the legitimacy of his own government. But his point, I think his feeling that he was being undermined and we were being undermined was probably correct.

MR. WEGGELAND: So, we're at the hour, and I want to be respectful of your time. Do you have time for one or two followup questions?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Sure, we can go a little bit longer. Yes.

MR. WEGGELAND: Okay. Great. I just wanted to ask, on the point that you raised about the Taliban not having, perhaps, not more than 20 percent support. I assume that's derived from things like The Asia Foundation, annual surveys, and things like that.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: And other surveys that were being done at that time. Right.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. So, I guess the question I would have is, if we presented as basically a binary between the Afghan, the Islamic Republic and the Taliban, that's kind of how we think about it. Saying one has a preference for the other is not the same, presumably, as one taking steps to ensure one side wins over the over, right? The level of dedication can be very different, and indifference could be as deadly to the Afghan state as reported support for the Taliban. I guess if it's presented an either or, do you

prefer this one or that one, you're understanding was about an 80/20 split, but when it comes down to who's going to stand up and fight for it, either now or in the final reckoning, that maybe preference was insufficient.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes. No, that's what I was trying to get at in saying that that didn't make the Afghan government legitimate. Ιf you had a legitimate government that people felt these guys care about me, I'm willing to work with them and fight with them, that's different than saying, I really don't want the Taliban here. I think that's what, I mean, very early on I got the sense that that's what really needed to be addressed. There needed to be more things that had people have a preference, an active preference. I mean, I think if people had to choose they would choose the government but would they fight for the government? That's really the And I don't think they got to the point. thing.

MR. WEGGELAND: It sounds as if we need to unpack the concept. When we say

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

legitimacy it's often operationalized in a survey response of preferences, but the idea of legitimacy is much more than that. It's not just, well, if given the choice I'd choose A over B, but I'm also not going to do anything about it. I'm not going to put my neck out to support A over B. I guess the difference conceptually is an important one in retrospect.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: It is. So, what you need is an extra couple of questions to get at that. You prefer the government but would you work with the government? Would you fight for the government? That's what you're getting at.

MR. WEGGELAND: I remember a comment that Antonio Guistozzi, the scholar on Afghanistan made, this was maybe 2015, and I need to speak with him and run this down, but it was some type of report launch, I think was an ARU report launch or something, but he made this offhanded comment of the middle class are not joining the Afghan national security and defense forces in combat roles. I mean, they seem to be

willing to join the ministries and direct it, but they don't seem to be showing a lot of skin in the game. He took that as a concerning point. They have the most to lose if this falls apart, but we're not seeing families taking decisions or individuals taking decisions to really put themselves in the most overt way to protect the Islamic republic. I didn't know if reflecting on your time if you had a sense that that was true or not or if it was just not something that was thought about. What choices people make now as indicative of not just preference but actually this active support issue.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I think they would say we're actively supporting the government by being in government ministries and doing the kind of functions that other Afghans can't do because we have the education to do it.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: So, I think the, I do think in all societies you're going to find the middle class will drive ***(21:43:31)***

government, right.

MR. WEGGELAND: Or civil society or contractors.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: They'll do other things and be out on the front lines. But I do think it comes back to are you willing to take an active role in supporting this regime and this government in doing that. I don't really think it has to do with, am I going to go out there and fight in Zabul province. Hell, no, I'm never going to go to Zabul province if I can help it is what most people from Kabul would say, at any level.

Clearly, even up to the very end, there were many Afghan National Security Force forces who were fighting pretty vigorously and dying in large numbers. So, it wasn't that they weren't willing to die, it was that there was a big chunk of the population that wasn't willing to join actively in that effort.

MR. WEGGELAND: I mean, the rapid collapse of the cities, again, this is where

you'd have the greatest concentration of people with the most to lose if the republic falls.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Exactly.

MR. WEGGELAND: And yet, it seemed as if virtually no resistance outside of the initial attempt in Herat.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Well, there's a lot that needs to be unpacked there. Of course, I wasn't there, and you can do this, but I think over the last two years it was a systematic tearing down of the moral and legitimacy of the government in Kabul. Some of it by their own infighting from the election results forward, a lot of it by that. A lot of it by the United States moves of legitimizing the Taliban and of delegitimizing the government like making them release those 5,000 prisoners which included all sorts of people that everybody knew were terrorists and murderers, including the Afghan citizens of the Islamic Republic. They knew that.

So, I think that moral of non-Taliban

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Afghans was just severely undermined over the last two years and people felt isolated and alone and that there's no way they could hold out. The Taliban were good fighters, no question about that. They're well organized. They could act effectively in a military or a terrorist or an insurrectionist role, whatever you want to call them. They were good at that. It happened gradually. And, as I said, we became more widely viewed as the outside problem.

MR. WEGGELAND: So, my final question is just to followup on a comment you made where you said, where the perception increased That the United States would reduce its investments or its presence that corruption increased. I think you were talking about customs collection as one example of this. Could you give a sense of, I mean, rhetorically the international community kept signaling, and I suppose your tenure would have been maybe one of the first big signals that the investment and the intervention was not going to last forever. And I suppose also signaling to

the Afghan government, you need to increase
revenues because it will be necessary for
continued survival. Whether we call this a
sustainability issue or whatnot. But did you
ever get the sense during your tenure that the
Afghan government senior officials truly
appreciated that if they did not generate revenue
on their own that they could not persist? Or did
you get the sense that it was almost like calling
a bluff of, yes, you say you're going to go, but
I don't really believe you. Or you say you're
going to reduce but it's not going to hurt me
enough to change my behavior. Because you
would've been there during one of the first big
phases of, hey, we're going to leave, seriously,
you all start doing something different, please.
And what you observed, at least in That comment,
was what they changed was corruption short-term,
let me rent seek in the immediate term because I
don't think this is going to last. I was just
wondering if you could share a bit on that.
AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I think that there

are a couple things going on. During this period of time people at the top levels of the finance ministry and other places understood they needed to increase their leverage. And a lot of them were committed to reducing corruption, and so they did increase. There were a number of years where you can see the percent of GDP coming in, actually it went up. I think the highest it got was 13 percent of their income or something like that of the budget they cover.

So, there were improvements made during this period. Part of the challenge is it was hard to sustain. You have a lot of rent seekers who were out there. What you needed is a regular process for purifying the rent seekers and the ones taking money off the process. That was hard to do.

And then as you had a more rapid turnover of finance minsters and deputy finance ministers and others over the last decade, that made it doubly hard to do. And, of course, the finance ministry is not the whole government.

So, you had a whole other part to the government who weren't even performing as well as they were performing. So, there was always this temptation at various levels to do this.

I know there was one study that went on in the last several years pointing out that congress, the parliament in Afghanistan, was always demanding rent, special things for their district, for their families, for people they knew That would come into the government in the finance ministry on a regular basis. So, it was very much ingrained in the system, and it was hard even if you made some progress, it was hard to sustain that progress if you couldn't institutionalize these practices. Now, that's what the donors were trying to do in the period of time that I was There. I think they made some progress by consistent interaction, but it was not sustained progress, it would go up and down. Then when you started having more political infighting among the Afghans themselves it just fueled more of this, I better get what I can now

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because look how divided we are, this is all going to fall apart.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right. And the sense I got was when international donor pressure to increase revenues was articulated that the Afghan Ministry of Finance would go to the easiest sources of revenue, so indirect, like customs is something that is more observable if it transits through a customs port. You don't have to go out and tax every individual.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes, I agree.

MR. WEGGELAND: I guess one point of tension was that another source, and easier source of revenue to access was taxation on the beneficiaries of the intervention, the implementing partners, the local NGOs.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: That was a regular pressure. And other governments do this also.

They often will tax international companies because international companies have a set of standards they have to maintain to keep functioning internationally. So, in the

Afghanistan case that was the aid providers and the contractors, and they were right there, and they were easier to follow because they do have a set of books even if some of them are doctored here and there, but in general they try to look like they're being legitimate and doing stuff, so that's easier for you to tax. The other thing is the bigger companies.

MR. WEGGELAND: Like Roshan the telecomms, for example?

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes, exactly. If it's a bigger company it's easier to tax them. When you don't have the infrastructure to tax SMEs or common people, you find indirect ways to put taxes on it. And that's true for developing countries all around the world.

MR. WEGGELAND: And I guess in this particular case, if the donor imperative is to increase sustainability but the easiest way to raise revenue is to tax the unsustainable, the detris of the unsustainable intervention, i.e. the construction companies doing work for the

intervention, the NGOs receiving maybe a second 1 2 third, fourth tier the programming money. doesn't actually resolve in any substantive way 3 4 the sustainability challenge. 5 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Especially No. when they decide to leave. When there's no more 6 military construction you can't tax those 7 8 companies and those companies employ less people 9 and are generating less wealth. 10 MR. WEGGELAND: I guess on this 11 particular point, did you get the sense that 12 donors were parsing out or were they looking at 13 overall revenue principally regardless of source, 14 or was it, certain types of revenue mobilization like direct taxation is much better from a 15 16 sustainability standpoint. Was it just, okay, 17 they hit X percent of GDP, that's good. 18 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes. 19 MR. WEGGELAND: So, more the former 20 than the latter. 21 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Most donors 22 couldn't get into a more detailed level of

analysis, to be very honest. I mean, it was hard for us, and we had, by far, the largest set of people working on development issues and finance issues of anybody. So, you had a lot of other donors that just didn't have that. They were lying on the road bank, you know, we're fine. The IMF who weren't there for much of the period. They didn't really get down to that level of analysis, because I remember sitting around a bunch of those different donor meetings during that period of time. There were not that many people who got below the macro figures.

MR. WEGGELAND: This sounds very similar to the issue around legitimacy versus preference. The measurement, who do you prefer, is then interpreted to mean, well, you're only 20 percent legitimate versus the Islamic Republic being 80. I guess a similar issue with this. If we think of taxation as, perhaps, a core element of the social contract, which is reciprocal between citizens and state, then an increase in revenue overall is, more legitimacy/a better

social contract. But if, in the case of
Afghanistan, the economy is so skewed the revenue
collections have focused on a chimera of a GDP
then is it really reflective of the concepts that
we hope it represents, the way we measure it.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Well, I think what people were looking at, is there any way we can make this economy more sustainable. Remember, it's an economy that is largely subsistence, farming, so much poverty. I mean, even in the best of times, 50 percent poverty. So, there's not a lot of sources of income. We kept, I remember my colleagues working in the economic section and in AID looking for industries that they could make profitable. After I left they started flying stuff out, as you remember, agricultural products to the gulf and other places and India and places in this search for anything that you could do. Of course, Afghanistan has the curse of being next to Pakistan that won't let goods go through, and they couldn't trade with India. India would've

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

had a big trade with Afghanistan if there could've been a free flow of goods through Pakistan, but they wouldn't do That because they're rivals, Pakistan and India. So, there were all sorts of limits on where Afghanistan was and then what was possible economically. It was like, bang, bang, bang, one blow after another on the economic side.

MR. WEGGELAND: I guess basically the state Afghanistan could afford in no way would match what we though was minimally necessary to prevail in this conflict with the Taliban. Is that a --

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Yes. For sure. I think that is right. Especially when you had a neighbor next door that was quite willing to see the Taliban as a lever for pursuing their own geostrategic interests. It was a terribly, terribly complex situation.

MR. WEGGELAND: Ambassador Wayne,
you've been so generous with your time. Is there
anything else you want to say to us before,

I'm going to look AMBASSADOR WAYNE: forward to seeing after you've talked to everybody what you come up with. I will be very interested to see. It's an important story to tell, and there are so many lessons that we should be able to draw from it, at least to help inform us as we go forward. I guess I would say, the one thing I haven't said that is sort of evident, is That we really have to be modest and humble when we get into situations like this. don't know how to handle these situations. can learn from previous experiences, but they're way more complex than we think we understand. Especially if people get in there for one year and they're supposed to apply all these lessons in a very different society and a different situation, it's like we're just weighing ourselves down with unneeded weights and thinking we understand what we're doing, when in reality we need to be really humble about what we're trying to do.

MR. WEGGELAND:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Hopefully the result

will meet your minimum threshold of satisfaction. I don't know if we're going to aspire to saying, this is what one should do, but I think if we can better inform one's imagination of what actually happened, I would count that, personally, as a success, then maybe that could help encourage a greater humility if one has a greater appreciation of what it was we knew or didn't know or thought we knew and wasn't actually true or just accepting the breadth of the various attempts That were made. It's one of these things where any time someone says, well, if only we did X. It's like, well, did you think we didn't.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Exactly.

MR. WEGGELAND: When you have so many interventions and so much money the imagination is empowered to do whatever you can come up with.

AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right. It's more like, if only we did A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, all at once and did them well.

MR. WEGGELAND: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Great. Very nice 2 to talk with both of you. Thank you very much. 3 MR. WEGGELAND: 4 Obviously, if there's anyone else you would 5 suggest we speak with to help inform our work, please let us know, happy to followup and engage 6 with anyone you suggest. ***(21:59:27)*** the 7 8 fire hose but also try and make sure we get the 9 right mix of perspectives to inform this work. 10 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Right. Well, so, 11 I mean, I think all the people who were in ambassador or deputy ambassador roles throughout 12 the whole period of time would be interesting to 13 talk to. Some of the aid directors we still 14 remain engaged in the issues also. I don't know 15 16 who you have on your list to, 17 MR. WEGGELAND: I think we're going to 18 send out through the American Foreign Service 19 Association a blast email asking for folks, 20 particular ambassador or deputy ambassador, 21 AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Do it through the 22 AAD also, the American Academy of Diplomacy.

1	MR. WEGGELAND: I think that's how we
2	got connected, I believe.
3	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Anyway, there are
4	a number of people around who still pay attention
5	and think about this. So, I'm sure they'd be
6	willing to cooperate and collaborate with you.
7	MR. WEGGELAND: Great. If you can put
8	in a good word if anyone asks.
9	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: I'll be happy to.
10	MR. WEGGELAND: Thank you, very much.
11	AMBASSADOR WAYNE: Take good care.
12	(End of recording.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Α **AAD** 64:22 ability 9:3 21:19 able 42:8 62:6 **abusing** 15:19 Academy 64:22 **accept** 39:5 accepting 63:10 access 41:7 56:14 **account** 18:13 accountability 13:6 17:14,16 25:20 act 9:3 19:6 22:7 52:5 acting 19:2 active 18:22 25:15 31:1 31:8 40:2 47:16 49:13 50:7 actively 49:15 50:20 activities 8:13 activity 35:15 actors 28:6 addressed 47:15 Administration 37:2,3 advantage 29:12 **affairs** 3:2,4 4:6 6:20 7:6,10,11 affection 32:4 afford 61:10 **Afghan** 5:7 6:18 14:4 19:19 29:16 31:18 46:13,20 47:8 48:21 50:15 51:19 53:1,6 56:5 Afghan-American 36:13 Afghanistan 1:21 3:2 3:13,19 4:4,11 5:11 5:14 6:8.12 8:20 11:6 11:21 12:4 16:7 24:13 31:10 33:16 36:13,15 38:11 39:17,21 40:6 48:16 55:7 57:1 60:2 60:20 61:1,5,10 **Afghans** 9:10 11:13,21 17:6 32:14 34:19 35:1 42:3,18 45:8 49:17 52:1 55:21 **agencies** 8:16 13:9 agree 25:3 56:11 agreed 2:5 agreement 41:16 agricultural 60:17 aid 26:15,18 27:13 31:14 57:1 60:14 64:14 aligned 35:7

alternative 40:21.22 ambassador 2:3,5,10 2:12 3:6,6,9,16 6:16 7:7,11,14,15,22 8:2 10:16 13:2,11 14:5 16:11 19:7,11,16 21:16 23:9 26:5 29:3 30:11 31:14 34:17 36:1,9 37:20 39:1,12 41:20 44:21 45:14 46:1,9 47:6 48:9 49:14,20 50:4 51:3,7 53:22 56:11,17 57:11 58:5.18.21 60:6 61:14 61:20 62:1 63:15,19 64:1,10,12,12,20,20 64:21 65:3,9,11 American 64:18,22 **Americans** 43:10 44:2 **analysis** 59:1,9 and/or 14:3 angels 31:18 **annual** 46:7 answer 44:20 45:6 **Anthony** 1:1 2:3 anti- 24:11 anti-drug 19:21 **Antonio** 48:15 **anybody** 59:4 anyway 11:3 24:7 34:2 65:3 apart 49:4 56:2 appeared 21:9 apply 62:15 appreciate 29:19 32:7 appreciated 53:7 appreciation 63:8 approaches 25:17 area 8:7 19:21 areas 8:6 19:21 20:11 44:3.4.4 Argentina 6:16,22 12:5 arguing 25:4 argument 44:19 45:11 arguments 36:4 arrival 13:13 articulate 28:6,8 articulated 56:5 **ARU** 48:18 Asia 6:3 46:7 asking 4:21 64:19 asks 65:8 asphalt 22:21 aspire 63:2 assemble 6:10 assertion 31:7 assessment 13:3,22 **assistance** 8:9,11,12

16:13 25:10
Assistant 4:5 6:19
Association 64:19
assume 3:7 15:20 46:6
attempt 51:6
attempts 63:11
attention 3:18 10:6
39:21 65:4
attribute 2:5
audio 1:20
authority 10:15 14:3
aware 3:15

В **B** 48:5,7 63:20 baby 31:22 back 5:12 10:1 12:18 15:7 24:18 27:16 34:21 36:11 38:16 40:13 42:2,5 43:15 50:6 background 2:22 bad 13:17 23:4 37:7,8 43:3 **bag** 10:17 bang 61:7,7,7 bank 4:16 22:3,8 36:16 59:6 **based** 11:8 31:9 **basically** 18:16 23:3 46:13 61:9 basis 9:17,20 55:11 **beef** 6:12,13 beginning 4:1 6:5 26:4 37:18 39:2 behavior 53:13 behavioral 31:3 believe 45:12 53:11 65:2 believed 20:20 31:15 beneficiaries 56:15 benefit 16:8 benefits 31:12 best 2:22 9:22 12:9 17:8 18:17 31:1 60:11 better 4:15 9:7 12:13 24:6 32:11 34:18 35:7 37:12 41:17 55:22 58:15 59:22 63:4 beyond 27:17 33:21 **Biden** 37:3 big 5:1 9:12 13:18 14:20,22 22:12 23:10 24:19 27:9 34:7 35:3 39:13,14 44:14 50:19 52:20 53:14 61:1 bigger 43:11 57:8,12

binary 46:13 bit 46:2 53:21 **blast** 64:19 **blow** 61:7 **bluff** 53:10 **bombing** 43:18 bombings 45:1 book 38:12 **books** 57:4 border 42:4 **brain** 9:20 breadth 63:10 brief 6:22 7:1 **briefly** 12:21 bring 8:8 9:7 22:21 25:13 **brought** 31:16 34:19 **budget** 54:10 build 16:14 31:1 35:5 38:7 40:16 42:14 **building** 11:14 25:10 38:9 45:16 **built** 36:10 bunch 59:10 bureau 4:7 6:3 bureaucratic 29:1 **Business** 4:6 6:19 **busy** 20:12

C C 63:20 cables 24:22 35:11 call 11:13 52:7 53:3 called 7:3 18:13 calling 18:10 31:18 53:9 campaign 30:17 campaigns 43:19 candidate 38:8 capabilities 19:1 capacity 9:3 19:8 capitals 5:4 care 11:14 17:2 47:10 65:11 careful 26:22 case 13:8 22:12 29:15 57:1,18 60:1 cases 15:1 19:8,10 23:13 28:18 catch 35:19 CDDEA 7:7 Central 6:3 ceremonies 32:2 certain 22:2 23:2 26:2 27:7 35:21 58:14 **certainly** 3:19 44:8 cetera 13:6,6 22:21 23:5

billion 8:16

alive 30:3

allies 38:13

comments 2:6,10 decentralized 42:12 challenge 14:2,2,6 21:7 45:19 commit 19:6 decide 58:6 54:12 58:4 **corrupt** 14:8,13,16 18:3 commitment 40:8 **chance** 13:19 18:4 19:6 20:15 22:7 decision 27:5,6 35:9 **change** 23:14 25:8,12 37:4 39:5,20 40:2,5 committed 54:5 24:5 33:6,22 27:12,14 28:14,21 common 34:22 57:14 corruption 11:13 12:14 decisions 49:5,6 29:8,9,10,21 31:3 Communists 43:8 13:4,16 14:2,20,22 declassified 38:3 35:13 53:13 **community** 13:7 52:18 15:3,10,15,18 16:6 dedication 46:19 **changed** 23:11 53:18 companies 56:19,20 17:18 22:20 23:5,19 **deeply** 24:16 24:12 25:20 42:15 default 39:22 **channel** 20:8 25:2 57:8,22 58:8,8 **check** 2:19 company 57:12 52:15 53:18 54:5 **defense** 48:21 children 31:21 complex 11:2 20:13 definition 15:18 corruptly 19:3 delegitimizing 51:16 chimera 60:3 61:19 62:13 cost 18:9 21:11 Chinese 43:8 concentration 51:1 **could've** 61:2 deliver 27:18 31:22 demanding 55:8 **choice** 21:10,14 33:13 **concept** 47:22 **count** 63:5 33:14 48:4 concepts 60:4 democratic 33:22 counter 15:6 **Department** 4:2,7 10:15 **choices** 21:3 49:11 conceptually 48:7 counterpart 21:13 **choose** 47:18,18 48:4 concerning 49:3 countries 57:16 depended 14:10 **chunk** 14:22 50:19 conclude 29:22 33:10 dependency 35:19 country 9:6 14:21 22:22 cities 50:22 concluded 12:12 26:7 32:2 33:8,15 38:11 dependent 42:13 conclusion 23:2 24:11 citizens 51:20 59:21 depending 23:21 42:20 deploy 9:5 civ-mil 30:17 34:12,13 25:7 **couple** 3:17 19:20 **civil** 50:2 **conditions** 28:12,19 20:11 22:11 24:1 33:4 deputies 10:2 civilian 6:14 8:9,12,15 conference 4:19 33:15 48:10 54:1 deputy 3:6 30:11 54:19 28:5,7,18 38:19 conferences 13:15 course 2:8 5:20 17:4 64:12,20 conflict 30:14 61:12 35:8.16 42:15 51:8 derived 46:6 **civilians** 9:5 10:9,9,10 34:4.20 conflicting 9:14 54:21 60:19 description 28:22 **clans** 12:1 conflicts 39:10 cover 54:10 despite 13:5 38:9 clarify 16:10 confusion/frustration create 18:14 28:14 detailed 8:22 58:22 detris 57:21 **class** 48:20 49:22 41:4 44:10 **clear** 11:4 15:14 18:9 congress 55:7 created 7:3 develop 19:21 42:8 26:1 38:6 **connected** 22:5 65:2 creation 35:19 developed 33:18 **clearly** 11:5 32:18 consensus 35:5 credibility 45:7 developing 57:15 38:16 44:18 50:14 consistent 55:18 credit 45:2 **development** 3:4 7:5,10 23:3,4 25:10 27:20 **client** 14:18 construction 22:16 **crew** 9:16 33:16 59:3 **close** 2:18 57:22 58:7 **crisis** 4:8 22:3 coalition 15:22 40:18 **Dick** 6:9 continue 41:9 culturally 12:8 coalitions 16:15 dictatorship 33:21 continued 53:3 **culture** 12:10 die 50:18 coherence 30:21 contract 22:21 59:20 currently 2:16 cohorts 33:4 60:1 **curse** 60:20 difference 24:19 34:3,7 collaborate 65:6 **contractors** 50:3 57:2 **customs** 23:15.18 34:10 42:18 43:1 48:7 **collapse** 35:22 37:2 contracts 17:7 52:16 56:7,9 different 5:17,17 8:6,15 contradictions 36:10 12:6 15:16 16:1,22 50:22 D colleagues 6:2 11:4 37:11 17:10 18:5 22:14 12:7 60:13 contributed 44:6,9 **D** 63:20 24:10 25:16 32:16,20 collection 23:17 52:16 control 42:12 **DANIEL** 1:2 32:22 33:17 35:6 collections 60:3 convene 5:21 43:12 46:19 47:11 date 26:1,4,5 collectively 13:8 convening 4:18 53:16 59:10 62:16,16 day 30:20 combat 9:12 48:22 conversations 19:14 **DEA** 19:22 differently 30:4 32:17 combination 44:13 convince 38:13 **deadly** 46:20 difficult 18:8 21:3,14 come 10:10 20:14 cooperate 65:6 deal 11:1 12:9 14:1 Diplomacy 64:22 30:13 34:21 38:16 **coordinate** 5:19 8:10 23:12 diplomats 26:14 42:2,5 55:10 62:3 coordinated 5:4 8:19 dealt 13:17 direct 3:1,12 38:21 49:1 coordinating 3:3 7:7 debate 28:9.22 42:10 58:15 63:18 comes 47:2 50:6 30:10 34:14 directive 38:6 debated 34:21 coming 21:2 37:5 54:7 coordination 8:9 9:8 debating 24:21 35:1 directly 31:12 **coordinator** 4:2 7:3,9 director 3:3 7:8,9 30:10 commanders 8:5 **decade** 54:20 **comment** 3:1 48:14,20 core 59:19 decades 15:8 34:14 52:12 53:17 correct 13:11 21:8 **DECEMBER** 1:4 directors 64:14

disappointed 26:6 disaster 5:11 discovered 16:20 discovering 12:11 discussion 30:21 disengage 38:21 disruption 18:15 distinguished 29:18 district 55:9 diversion 18:11 divert 17:5 diverting 16:12 20:21 22:7 divided 56:1 dividing 16:19,20 doctored 57:4 document 30:18 31:4 **documents** 30:8,13 **DoD** 8:10 doing 5:10 8:11 9:1,15 14:1 19:12 20:12,17 21:12 22:8 25:20 32:5 34:13 40:10 45:5 49:16 50:8 53:16 57:6 57:22 62:19 dollars 8:16 donor 4:19 5:1,2 13:15 56:4 57:18 59:10 donors 4:10,17 5:3,13 5:17 9:10 17:13 23:17 24:14 55:16 58:12,21 59:5 door 61:16 doubly 54:21 **Dov** 38:11 drain 9:20 draw 35:9,9,11 62:6 **drive** 49:22 dropping 9:16 **drove** 32:6 dying 50:17 dysfunctional 9:21 Ε

E 63:20 **EARL** 1:1 earlier 6:17 21:18 early 38:4 39:6 47:13 easier 56:13 57:3,7,12 easiest 56:6 57:19 easy 40:20 economic 3:4 4:6 6:19 7:6,10,11 60:13 61:8 economically 61:6 economies 6:21 economy 4:14,15 5:6 22:6 35:12,13 60:2,8 60:9

educated 25:13 30:4 33:18 **education** 11:20 30:2 31:6 49:18 effect 43:18 **effective** 14:19 18:4 19:11 20:22 30:1 **effectively** 14:8 15:20 26:18 52:6 effectiveness 21:13 efficiently 16:16 effort 4:13 8:9 18:15 20:17 21:5 23:4 38:19 40:11 50:20 efforts 4:3,4 6:13,21 13:7,17 28:10,14 **Eikenberry** 3:6 8:1 25:4 either 19:13 20:22 25:3 40:22 46:22 47:4 election 51:13 **element** 59:19 elementary 30:5 eliminate 15:10 eliminated 23:19 eliminating 12:14 **email** 64:19 embassy 3:4,21 7:16 25:1 emergencies 32:1 **employ** 58:8 employment 35:15 empowered 63:18 encourage 63:6 **ended** 3:8 ends 16:8 18:11 20:21 enemy 43:17 energies 28:17 energy 19:4 engage 7:20 64:6 engaged 64:15 enriching 16:9 enrichment 16:18 ensure 46:17 environment 28:10 era 38:4 **especially** 24:16 30:5 33:15 43:16 44:3,22 45:3 58:5 61:15 62:14 **essentially** 2:6 13:22 established 42:17 et 13:6,6 22:21 23:5 **Europe** 15:11 Europeans 38:15 eventually 6:1 22:3 24:9 27:16,21 34:4 **everybody** 9:18 10:5

14:12 17:13 51:18

62:3

evidence 21:6,18,20 evident 62:9 evolved 15:9 exactly 7:22 16:11 51:3 57:11 63:15 **example** 20:14 31:16 32:7 52:17 57:10 examples 20:15 Excellent 2:14 exclusively 16:8 existed 15:5 **experience** 6:17 31:10 31:15 experienced 10:9 **experiences** 3:14 62:12 expertise 27:19 explained 42:6 explanation 41:22 expressed 36:6 extra 48:10 **extreme** 9:2 23:8 extremely 39:19 eyes 42:17

F **F** 63:20 **faced** 24:9 facilitating 18:2 fact 41:4 45:8 fair 3:11 5:9 8:18.19 12:21 18:19.21 21:15 28:3,22 38:22 **fairly** 22:11 **fall** 12:12 13:1,21 56:2 falls 49:4 51:2 familiar 31:4 families 12:1 17:2,4 49:5 55:9 family 11:8,14 17:7 29:20 36:5 far 24:15 59:2 **farmers** 32:10 farming 60:10 favorable 28:12 favorite 39:10 featured 36:3 **feel** 17:3 feeling 45:17 feet 13:19 felt 11:22 47:9 52:2 fight 14:8 21:11 29:2 47:3,11,19 48:12 50:10 fighters 52:4 **fighting** 4:11 40:10 50:16 figure 5:13 12:9 24:8 41:15

figures 59:12 final 47:4 52:11 finally 37:3 finance 17:15 54:2,19 54:19,22 55:11 56:6 59:3 **find** 49:21 57:14 finding 20:2,4,15 fine 59:6 fire 64:8 first 4:19 8:8 9:8 11:3 18:21 21:5 24:20 34:13,16 52:20 53:14 five 36:21 40:16 fix 17:12 flawed 39:5,20 **flaws** 14:20 flow 61:2 flowing 20:8 flying 9:12 60:16 focus 3:12 6:6 focused 4:8 39:17 60:3 **folks** 64:19 **follow** 57:3 following 2:4 42:14 followup 45:22 52:12 64:6 force 28:20 29:17 50:15 forces 9:9,9 40:17 48:22 50:16 Foreign 64:18 foreigner 43:6,7 forever 52:22 forget 32:9 forgotten 10:11 forks 21:10,22 former 41:3 58:19 formula 42:16 44:10,15 forth 27:16 34:21 forward 4:15 5:16 8:21 15:7 18:18 27:22 35:3 35:7 51:13 62:2,7 fought 45:12 found 16:18 26:19 Foundation 46:7 four 7:15,18 8:16 27:3 fourth 58:2 frame 27:12 33:10 framed 45:13 fraud 16:2,4 22:8 free 61:2 front 44:12 50:5 fueled 8:1 37:1 55:22 functioning 56:22 functions 49:17 funds 16:13 18:11 further 21:20 43:5 **future** 33:1

G **G** 63:20 qain 15:19,21 gains 17:17 game 49:3 **GDP** 54:7 58:17 60:3 general 1:21 8:2 15:18 16:5,6 24:13 26:19 30:1 57:5 generals 8:3,5 14:19 generate 53:7 generating 58:9 generations 11:16,16 32:21 generous 61:21 geostrategic 61:18 **Germany** 5:22 33:17 getting 2:18 5:21 9:14 9:16 10:17 22:20 41:19 45:1,7 48:13 giant 13:21 gigantic 24:7 girls 41:6 give 17:6 29:7 52:17 given 11:17 43:12 48:4 giving 5:16 goals 18:1,1 **goods** 60:21 61:2 governance 29:10 governing 15:20 government 4:14 11:11 11:17 12:14 13:9 14:7 16:14 17:21 18:3,4,14 19:5 24:12 25:15 29:13,16 30:22 31:2 40:19 42:7,12,22 43:2 44:9 45:17 47:8,9,18 47:19 48:11.12.13 49:15.16 50:1.8 51:12 51:16 53:1,6 54:22 55:1,10 governments 25:17 56:18 governors 14:21 42:13 gradually 52:9 graduating 32:14,15 graduation 32:2 greater 63:7,7 greatest 51:1 grew 11:21 ground 5:5 groundwork 37:22 group 36:12 grow 32:10 **guess** 13:1 16:4 18:20 21:8 31:6 38:15 41:10 44:16 45:10 46:11,22

58:10 59:18 61:9 62:7 Guistozzi 48:15 qulf 60:17

Н H 63:20 hand 12:13 handed 6:2 handle 38:15 62:11 happen 17:19 37:7 happened 19:20 29:1 33:7 35:3,17 37:8 52:8 63:5 **happening** 9:4 10:7 15:12 22:13 23:15 26:20 happy 64:6 65:9 **hard** 10:8 20:16,18 21:3 22:1 24:8,17 26:14,15 26:21 27:1 54:13,17 54:21 55:13,13 59:1 headed 7:2 heal 42:2 health 30:2,21 31:5 **healthcare** 31:8 41:8 healthy 34:22 35:2 heard 23:22 39:9 **hearts** 8:14 height 37:18,19 **Hell** 50:10 help 12:1 30:22 40:17 50:11 62:6 63:6 64:5 helped 15:9 35:6 43:22 helping 4:14 **Herat** 51:6 hey 53:15 high 18:12 25:14 32:15 38:1 highest 54:8 hired 20:14 hiring 10:13,15 hit 43:21,21 58:17 hitting 43:20 Holbrooke 6:9 hold 52:3 home 31:16 32:6 honest 59:1 hope 25:15 60:5 hopefully 31:12 62:22 hose 64:8 hosted 36:14 hour 2:16,19 45:20 House 41:13 houses 23:16,18 humble 62:10,20 humility 63:7

hurt 53:12

i.e 57:21 idea 6:12 7:14 48:2 identified 20:20 identify 21:5 II 33:17 illegitimacy 44:14 imagination 63:4,17 imagine 37:16 IMF 36:17 59:7 immediate 53:19 imperative 57:18 implementing 13:9 56:16 **important** 32:12 48:8 62:4 **imposed** 13:10 **impression** 16:5 38:5 38:12 improvements 17:14 41:5 54:11 improving 17:16 include 2:4 included 51:17 including 4:10 5:16 14:20 51:19 income 54:9 60:12 increase 23:17 53:1 54:4,6 56:5 57:19 59:21 increased 40:4 52:13 52:15 increasingly 44:1 India 60:18,22,22 61:4 indicative 49:12 indifference 46:20 indirect 56:7 57:14 individual 14:10 19:2.6 56:10 individually 13:8 individuals 49:6 industries 60:14 ineffective 18:3 **infighting** 51:13 55:21 inform 62:7 63:4 64:5,9 informal 36:12 infrastructure 57:13 ingrained 55:12 initial 51:5 **INL** 26:20 innovating 8:21 inspector 1:21 26:19 installations 9:6 instances 22:2 institution 25:10 institutionalize 55:15 institutions 33:19

insufficient 14:1 47:5 insurrectionist 52:7 integrated 30:17 intense 3:19 25:6,9 intensified 43:18 intensive 21:5 interaction 55:18 interested 62:4 interesting 24:2 45:2 64:13 interests 61:18 internal 38:4 international 4:3,10 13:7 40:17 52:18 56:4 56:19,20 internationally 56:22 interpreted 59:16 **intervention** 13:15 23:3 35:20,21 36:10 52:21 56:15 57:21 58:1 interventions 23:12 63:17 interview 1:1 2:4,8 interviewing 2:3 invest 4:21 33:9 investigate 19:17 20:10 21:19 investigation 20:1 investment 19:3 30:22 52:21 investments 52:14 involve 23:4 involved 22:4,7 24:17 35:1 Iraq 6:6,20 39:20 40:5 **ISAF** 35:16 Islamic 46:14 49:8 51:20 59:17 isolated 52:2 **issue** 21:11 36:7 49:13 53:4 59:14,18 **issued** 30:8 **issues** 59:3,4 64:15

J 63:21 January 5:2 **Japan** 33:18 Japanese 4:17 43:9 Jirga 5:21 job 7:3 17:6 join 49:1 50:20 joining 2:15 48:21 joint 36:20 joke 9:11 iudgments 18:6 **June** 3:5,9,10 7:2 June-ish 3:8

instructions 9:14

48:7 56:12 57:17

manage 10:21,2 26:18 managed 37:12 management 36 50:13 massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 26 McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10: meetings 4:22 5	mobilization 58:14 modeling 15:4 modern 11:10 15:4,9 modernization 11:5 modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 month 10:3 month 10:3 month 10:3 month 10:3 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 N
managed 37:12 management 36 massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 26 McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	modeling 15:4 modern 11:10 15:4,9 modern 12:10 15:4,9 modernization 11:5 modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
management 30 managing 12:13 massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 29 McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	modern 11:10 15:4,9 modernization 11:5 modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
managing 12:13 massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	modernization 11:5 modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
massive 9:19 massively 27:6 match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	modest 62:9 modus 27:21 moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
match 61:11 matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	moments 24:3 money 10:19 16:3 17: 19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
matter 28:20 May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	money 10:19 16:3 17:
May-ish 3:8 McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 1,5 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	19:13 20:4,8,9,21 22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
McChrystal's 2: McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	22:4,8,17 54:16 58:2 63:17 9 15:15 13 32:9 9 38:3 6,20 22 50:21 6 60:10 6 60:10 6 60:10 7 moral 51:11,22 7 morally 16:21,21 7 morning 2:2,15 7 mothers 31:21 7 moves 51:15 7 murderers 51:19 7 name 2:6 7 named 6:9 7 nasty 33:6
McMaster 20:14 mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 1,5 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	63:17 monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
mean 5:10 14:9 17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	monster 13:21 month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
17:4 23:8 26:1 32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 46:2 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	month 10:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
32:11 33:2,19 42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 46:2 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	9 38:3 months 18:9 moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
42:10,22 43:6 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 46:2 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	moral 51:11,22 morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
0:5 47:13,17 48:2 52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 42:9 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	morally 16:21,21 morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
52:18 59:1,16 64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 42:9 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	morning 2:2,15 mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
64:11 means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	mothers 31:21 moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
means 19:13 33 meant 39:20 43 42:9 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	moves 51:15 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
meant 39:20 43 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	3:21 murderers 51:19 59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
42:9 measure 60:5 measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	59:15 N name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
measurement 5 meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
meet 63:1 meeting 5:2 10:	name 2:6 named 6:9 nasty 33:6
0:2 meeting 5:2 10:	0:4 32:14 named 6:9 5:1 nasty 33:6
	5:1 nasty 33:6
maatings // '''	
40:8 41:12 59:10	nation 38:7,8
members 9:16	
33:19 36:5	NATO 9:9 14:7
62:1 memorandum 3	
35:5 mention 3:16	61:11
mentioning 31:	
40:14 method 10:11	need 27:8 29:5,11 37:
Mexico 24:10 3	
40:13	48:10,16 53:1 62:20
middle 48:20 49	
0:2,6 midwives 31:17	
6,18 militarily 20:22	
2,15 military 6:14 7:	
9:6 14:19 27:1	:10,10 51:8
3:16 28:5,6,15 29:4	
18 34:3,20 38:18	8 40:9 nested 30:14
20 52:6 58:7	network 14:17,18
4 4 4	networks 11:14
4,14 minds 8:14	never 12:4 14:15 26:1
4,14 minds 8:14 12 minimal 35:21	1 33:7 42:7 50:10
	new 4:13 9:16
12 minimal 35:21	0
12 minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11	0 newly 7:2 25:13
minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1	
minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20	1,16 NGOs 56:16 58:1
minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1,	1,16 NGOs 56:16 58:1
minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1, ministry 17:15 8	NGOs 56:16 58:1 54:3,22 nice 40:21 64:1 nightly 45:1
minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1, ministry 17:15 8 55:11 56:6	NGOs 56:16 58:1 54:3,22 nice 40:21 64:1 nightly 45:1
12 minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1, ministry 17:15 5 55:11 56:6 minsters 54:19	NGOs 56:16 58:1 nice 40:21 64:1 nightly 45:1 non-official 18:11 non-Taliban 51:22
12 minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1, ministry 17:15 5:55:11 56:6 minsters 54:19 minute 24:18 mission 9:12	NGOs 56:16 58:1 nice 40:21 64:1 nightly 45:1 non-official 18:11 non-Taliban 51:22 normally 8:12
12 minimal 35:21 minimally 61:11 minimum 63:1 ministers 54:20 ministries 49:1, ministry 17:15 5 55:11 56:6 minsters 54:19 minute 24:18	NGOs 56:16 58:1 nice 40:21 64:1 nightly 45:1 non-official 18:11 non-Taliban 51:22 normally 8:12

prevail 61:12 54:6 65:4 34:3,7,8 37:9 **parsing** 58:12 prevent 23:14 **numbers** 50:17 part 6:17 7:16,22 8:12 perspectives 64:9 14:5 17:9 18:20 19:4 Petraeus 20:13 previous 62:12 0 19:20 24:2 35:1 36:19 **phases** 53:15 principally 28:6,7 58:13 **Obama** 40:4 42:6,6 43:17 54:12 philosophical 28:9 principles 10:3 objective 41:5 55:1 philosophically 25:6 prisoners 51:17 objectively 41:17 particular 57:18 58:11 phrase 39:9,11 private 15:19 observable 56:8 64:20 pick 22:15 privately 27:13 particularly 4:17 41:2 picking 21:11 **probably** 43:19 45:19 observation 3:13 observe 13:13 parties 15:5,9 place 11:7 23:20 24:16 problem 12:17 13:18 partners 4:18 19:19 17:19 24:8 38:7 43:4 25:8 27:6 35:10 observed 53:17 observer 3:1,2 56:16 **places** 54:3 60:18,18 52:10 **Obviously** 13:12 64:4 passive 19:1 plan 25:9 30:12,17,19 problems 12:5,6 38:10 **October** 30:11 patron- 14:17 34:12,13 procedure 10:12 patron-client 11:7 offhanded 48:20 plane 9:13,13 proceed 2:20 office 1:20 15:19 patterns 41:9 **plans** 34:22 process 5:21 10:22 officers 7:17 pause 2:9,9 **please** 53:16 64:6 34:20 36:19,22 54:15 officials 28:15,19 41:3 pledges 4:21 54:16 pay 23:5 65:4 **paying** 39:21 Plus 20:12 26:8 produce 10:1 53:6 produced 1:19 offs 36:4 **payoffs** 16:16 point 2:8 12:20 13:16 **old** 15:7,10 33:6 **people** 4:20,21 5:7,9,18 18:8 23:2 30:7,15 producing 18:12 older 32:20 7:15,19 8:22 10:18,18 38:1 43:10 44:17 products 60:17 once 6:3 10:2,3 12:13 10:19,22 11:1 14:6,9 45:17 46:4 47:20 49:3 profitable 60:15 27:5 35:8 41:1 63:21 14:12,16,18 15:16 56:12 58:11 programming 58:2 16:17 17:1 19:17 20:1 pointing 55:6 one's 63:4 programs 8:17 25:11 ones 54:16 20:3.15.19 22:6.19 policies 24:12 26:16,17 30:1 33:4 **policy** 37:2 40:12 op-eds 36:20 37:5 24:6 25:2,13,13 27:13 progress 27:8 55:13,14 55:18.19 **OPEC** 20:3 27:17,19 29:6 30:3 political 5:20,22 9:22 11:5 14:22 15:5,7,9 31:13,18 32:7,8 33:6 protect 17:1 49:7 operating 29:14 operation 37:15 36:14 39:3,21 40:15 41:18 55:20 **proud** 32:5 provide 5:6 40:17 operationalized 48:1 40:18 41:14 42:3.11 ponv 38:13 provided 1:20 opponent 44:17,18 43:20 47:9.16.17 popular 42:20 43:1 opportunities 17:6 49:11 50:12 51:1,18 population 50:19 provider 29:16 32:22 52:2 54:2 55:9 57:14 **port** 56:9 providers 57:1 optimistic 32:16 58:8 59:3,12 60:7 position 37:17 providing 44:6 province 15:21 21:1 order 16:17 62:14 64:11 65:4 possible 61:6 organize 4:10 **people's** 29:14 **post** 30:11,18 50:10,11 percent 42:21 46:6 54:7 organized 52:5 potentially 16:2 provinces 15:2 original 39:8 54:9 58:17 59:17 poverty 60:10,11 provision 42:8 outlines 4:19 60:11 power 43:13 **public** 2:7 15:19 practice 23:11 punishment 22:10 outside 32:19 51:5 perception 52:13 perfect 24:15 25:18 practices 29:10 55:15 52:10 **puppet** 44:18 prefer 47:1 48:11 59:15 outstanding 10:18 perfectly 29:5 purifying 54:15 overall 58:13 59:22 performance 30:12,18 preference 46:16 47:5 purpose 16:3 oversight 13:6 performing 55:2,3 47:16,17 49:12 59:15 pursuing 61:17 pushing 22:4 overt 49:7 peril 5:20 preferences 48:2 period 2:22 3:11 5:8,19 presence 6:13 35:16 put 43:22 48:6 49:6 overtures 39:6 owning 38:17,18 7:1 8:17 9:18 12:16 40:9 44:14 52:15 57:15 65:7 presented 46:12.22 27:2,3,3,9 37:13 Р Q 40:16 54:1,12 55:16 **President** 10:4 38:8 59:7,11 64:13 President's 30:15 38:21 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S question 18:21 23:6,10 periods 3:18 pressure 10:1 17:1 22:9 41:14 46:12 52:4,11 2:1 paid 3:18 persist 53:8 23:16,21 27:18 45:4 questionable 39:19 pair 8:4 persisted 36:8 56:4,18 questions 41:11 45:22 **person** 43:13 pressures 11:22 Pakistan 26:10,12 42:1 48:10 **presumably** 31:3 38:2 44:6 60:21 61:3.4 personal 15:21 16:8,18 **queues** 21:6 personally 14:15 63:5 quickly 25:7 27:15 Pakistanis 42:4 46:17 parliament 55:7 **perspective** 12:22 28:5 pretty 11:4 25:7 50:16 quite 17:3 61:16

	I	I	I
R	remained 12:17 39:15	says 16:2 30:15 63:12	sides 29:4
raise 57:20	remember 9:17 10:10	scholar 48:15	SIGAR 8:21
raised 46:4	30:19 32:3,8 48:14	school 25:14 29:19	sight 44:13
ran 15:1	59:9 60:8,13,16	30:6 32:15 41:6,7	signaling 52:19,22
rank 7:19	rent 53:19 54:13,15	science 15:8	signals 52:20
ranked 7:15	55:8	scrutiny 22:12 41:11	significant 19:3
rapid 50:21 54:18	repeatedly 25:11,12,12	search 60:18	similar 7:19 59:14,18
read 32:18	report 2:7 48:18,19	second 21:7 58:1	simultaneously 17:11
reading 30:13	reported 46:21	secondary 30:6	sin 39:8
readings 10:3	reports 8:22	Secretary 4:5 6:19	sitting 59:9
real 5:11 32:4 34:20	representative 6:10	section 60:14	situation 10:20 11:2
reality 62:19	represents 60:5	sector 41:6	17:18 18:5,8 61:19
realized 4:12	republic 46:14 49:8	sectors 5:17 35:6	62:17
realm 41:18	51:2,20 59:17	security 41:18 48:21	situations 62:10,11
reason 7:16	resistance 51:5	50:15	six 36:14
reasons 8:13 15:13	resolve 58:3	seeing 30:4 34:16	skewed 60:2
42:9	resources 16:7	37:18 40:14,20 49:5	skimming 23:19
rebuilding 4:8,13 6:21	respectful 45:21	62:2	skin 49:2
9:13	respond 28:11 40:3	seek 53:19	skyrocketing 24:1
receive 17:8	response 4:8 48:2	seekers 54:14,15	smart 5:15
received 41:12	responsibility 5:16 6:2	seen 12:15 18:2 37:17	smarter 39:18
receiving 58:1	8:7 17:9 39:3	38:2	SMEs 57:14
recession 35:12	result 62:22	send 64:18	social 59:20 60:1
reciprocal 59:20	results 10:1 12:10	senior 6:11 7:17 18:10	societies 27:2 49:21
reckoning 47:4	18:12 51:13	28:7,15,18 41:2,3	society 16:22 19:19
recognizing 38:10	retreat 42:1	53:6	22:6 27:14 28:21 29:9
reconciliation 40:12	retrospect 48:8	sense 16:6 19:2 31:9	50:2 62:16
reconstruction 1:21 4:3	revenue 53:7 56:7,14	38:18,19,20 39:16	socioeconomic 41:6
4:4 6:18	57:20 58:13,14 59:22	41:1,13 47:14 49:9	soldiers 26:13
record 2:9	60:2	52:17 53:5,9 56:3	solidify 15:22
recording 2:7 65:12	revenues 53:2 56:5	58:11	somewhat 18:4
recover 42:2	reverse 41:16	sensed 45:5,6	sort 3:17 8:3 14:9 15:6
recreate 4:14	review 25:6	sensitive 12:8 28:15	24:14 36:21 39:22
recruit 42:3	rhetorically 52:18 rid 33:5 44:1	sent 25:1	62:8 sorts 22:13 35:5 51:18
recruited 6:15	rivals 61:4	September 3:22 series 4:22	61:5
redirect 16:1	road 21:10,22 22:16	seriously 7:20 53:15	sounds 21:9 23:1,6
redirecting 16:7	59:6	served 9:18 12:4 36:15	28:8 35:18 36:2 47:21
reduce 52:14 53:12	role 50:7 52:7	service 29:16 42:8	59:13
reducing 54:5	roles 48:22 64:12	64:18	source 27:9 56:13,14
reduction 24:4	Roshan 57:9	services 29:14	58:13
refers 39:8	royal 15:10	serving 6:16	sources 56:7 60:12
reflect 41:10	rules 2:3	set 2:16 20:15 24:11,22	South 6:3
reflecting 49:8	run 25:17 29:11 30:2	25:16 40:11 56:20	space 29:12 40:17
reflective 60:4 regained 40:1	48:17	57:4 59:2	speak 48:17 64:5
	running 6:1 20:22 33:3	severely 52:1	speaking 41:2
regardless 58:13 regime 50:7	rural 44:3,4	shape 28:10	special 1:20 6:9 19:22
region 42:5	,	share 39:3 53:21	55:8
regional 30:16	S	shared 41:14	specialists 6:11
regular 9:17,20 10:2	sanctuary 41:22 44:7	shift 43:22	specific 19:5 23:12
37:5 41:12 54:15	44:13	short 17:17 27:11	speech 30:15
55:11 56:17	satisfaction 63:1	short-term 53:18	spending 22:17
reinforces 44:19	save 31:21	should've 42:11	split 47:2
relationship 11:8	saw 12:18 14:15 32:3	show 27:8	spring 6:8
relatively 33:18	saying 13:16 27:13	showed 20:7	stabilization 30:16
release 51:17	28:18,19 37:5 44:20	showing 49:2	staff 10:7
relying 14:7	44:21 45:3 46:15 47:7	side 6:14,15 26:9 43:18	staffed 6:4
remain 64:15	47:12 63:2	46:18 61:8	stage 44:19
	I	I	I

theory 7:20 stand 47:3 surveillance 18:22 19:1 20:14 25:12 26:15 survey 48:1 they'd 25:18 32:18 65:5 standards 56:21 33:14 40:6 57:5 64:8 standpoint 58:16 **surveys** 46:7,9 thin 11:18 trying 5:13,22 8:14 9:5 survival 53:3 **things** 3:17 4:9 5:15 stands 30:20 9:7 10:7,11,21 11:10 12:7 15:22 17:21 star 8:2 sustain 16:15 54:13 11:9 13:14,16 14:11 stars 7:18 15:16 16:15 17:7,11 18:20 38:12,19 40:11 55:14 **start** 13:13,14 29:15 sustainability 53:4 22:8,16 23:4,14 24:4 41:14 47:7 55:16 40:1 53:16 57:19 58:4,16 25:21 27:16 29:7,14 62:21 started 3:7 4:16 20:2.4 sustainable 60:8 29:21 30:4 31:6 32:9 turnover 54:19 20:4 24:1 30:4 31:18 sustained 55:19 32:13 33:19 34:1 two 18:20 27:2 28:1 32:3,12 45:22 51:10 34:13 36:12 40:13 system 20:11 23:14 36:17 37:6,7,8 41:17 55:20 60:16 33:22 55:12 43:3,3 46:7,8 47:15 52:2 starting 4:10 systematic 51:10 50:5 54:1 55:8 63:12 type 41:10 48:18 state 4:2,7 10:15 14:4 systems 15:10 25:15 third 58:2 types 38:10 58:14 26:19 33:16 46:21 thought 8:3,4 42:5,11 Т U 59:21 61:10 45:4 49:11 63:9 **states** 15:1,11 45:9 tables 27:8 **threat** 14:3 **U.S** 9:9 13:9,14 14:7 tactical 29:5,11 threatening 37:14 51:15 52:14 18:1,14 19:4 24:4,12 stay 12:17 33:13 40:6,8 taken 11:6 three 3:18 7:18 8:2 27:2 30:22 35:16 38:17 threshold 35:22 63:1 **stayed** 39:16 takes 34:1 **UN** 38:14 tied 35:15 **step** 24:18 35:3 **Taliban** 14:8 22:18 23:5 **uncover** 19:13 steps 46:17 tier 58:2 underlying 28:22 36:7 26:9,10,12 39:5 40:1 **stood** 43:6 41:8,22 42:19 44:7 ties 11:8 undermine 21:12 25:4 story 37:10 62:4 46:5,14,21 47:12 times 21:17 60:11 undermined 45:7,18,19 tired 44:2 strategic 30:21 51:15 52:4 61:12,17 52:1 strategically 39:19 Taliban's 40:3 **title** 7:12 **undermines** 17:20.22 **strategy** 25:3,5 30:16 talk 64:2.14 today's 2:4,8 understand 29:4.8 35:8 45:15 talked 34:5 62:2 **Tokyo** 5:2 62:13.19 told 27:11 strength 40:1,4 talking 32:21 40:15 understandable 8:13 strong 31:9 42:8 44:17 52:16 tolerate 29:19 understanding 15:17 structure 5:22 11:9 target 43:11 tolerated 43:2 47:1 **structures** 11:6,17 targeted 23:12 tools 24:14.14 understood 27:17 **study** 55:5 tax 56:10,19 57:7,12,13 top 18:13 22:5 54:2 32:17 34:5,6 54:3 **stuff** 19:18 20:2,5,12 57:20 58:7 tour 3:5 underway 8:17 26:22 32:10,11 33:22 taxation 56:14 58:15 tracking 20:4 36:21 **UNDP** 4:16 trade 36:4 42:15 60:22 35:11 42:5,16 43:10 59:19 unique 37:17 45:5 57:6 60:16 taxes 57:15 61:1 unit 20:1 subsequent 3:14 team 6:11 26:15 training 15:8 31:17 **United** 15:11 45:9 51:14 subsistence 60:9 tearing 51:11 32:10 52:14 substance 10:22 technical 19:12 transcript 1:19 university 25:14 32:15 substantial 17:17 technocrats 11:18 transfers 19:13 **unknown** 35:21 transform 27:2 28:17 substantive 58:3 telecomms 57:10 unnecessarily 14:9 **success** 44:15 63:6 tell 62:5 transitioned 30:10 unneeded 62:18 sufficient 7:21 21:6,18 temptation 24:5 55:3 transits 56:8 unpack 47:22 suggest 64:5,7 tempted 24:6 transparency 25:19 unpacked 51:8 summarizing 21:15 tended 28:6 treasury 20:3 unsustainable 57:20,21 **summer** 24:20 trend 41:9 tension 27:9,15,22 **unwise** 33:14 superimposed 11:9 56:13 tribe 29:20 urban 44:4 **support** 5:4,14 11:10 tensions 36:22 38:2 tribes 11:8 12:2 use 16:2 39:9 11:15 24:4 29:6,7 tenure 30:9 36:3 52:19 tried 9:21 17:12 26:21 31:2,8 46:6,21 48:6 53:5 26:21 truck 22:20 49:13 term 15:15 31:19 40:8 value 25:19 true 14:11 44:22 49:9 supported 32:10 40:12 53:19 valued 30:3 terribly 61:18,19 supporting 49:15 50:7 57:15 63:9 various 9:5 21:22 30:13 **suppose** 30:8 38:1 terrorist 52:6 truly 53:6 55:4 63:10 **Trump** 37:2 52:19,22 terrorists 51:19 veneer 11:20 supposed 62:15 **Thank** 2:13,14 64:3 trust 40:16 versus 28:5,11 59:14 surge 24:21 26:1 65:10 **try** 5:4 8:8,10 13:18 59:17

II			
vetted 20:1	10:14 12:20 13:3,12	wouldn't 38:14 40:20	21:30:56 39:8
video 10:4	15:14 18:19 19:9,15	44:11 61:3	21:43:31 49:22
Vietnamese 43:9	21:4 23:1 26:3 28:3	wounds 42:2	21:59:27 64:7
view 18:1 29:9 44:8	30:7 34:15 35:18 36:2	writing 37:10	22 35:19
viewed 29:1 32:17	37:16,21 39:7 41:1	wrong 21:8 39:16	
52:10	44:16 45:10,20 46:3	wrote 35:10 37:5	3
vigorously 50:16	46:11 47:21 48:14		3161 10:14,16
villages 31:20 45:12	49:19 50:2,21 51:4	X	
violence 41:8	52:11 56:3,12 57:9,17	X 58:17 63:13	4
virtually 51:5	58:10,19 59:13 61:9		
vivendi 27:21	61:20 62:22 63:16,22	Y	5
volunteered 4:18	64:3,17 65:1,7,10	year 5:3 8:8 9:18 11:3	5,000 51:17
I	weighing 62:17	24:1,20 27:2,3,3	50 60:11
W	weights 62:18	33:10 40:16 62:14	
wait 26:11	went 3:21 5:12,12 6:7	years 22:11 25:9 28:1	6
wanted 16:9 25:4 39:2	8:21 16:13 24:5,10	33:3,15 36:21 39:18	
46:4	32:1 54:8 55:5	44:7 51:10 52:2 54:6	7
war 10:20 17:18 18:15	weren't 5:15 10:20 15:3	55:6	
33:6,17 44:2 45:11	15:4 17:8 39:21 42:13	yelling 27:16	8
warning 37:7	43:21 50:18 55:2 59:7	young 32:4,14	80 59:18
wars 27:1,1	west 17:11 30:15		80/20 47:2
Washington 7:1 10:1	western 11:20 17:3,12	<u>Z</u>	
23:22 25:1 34:9	whatnot 53:4	Zabul 50:10,11	
wasn't 15:12 16:15	White 41:13	Zakheim's 38:12	
18:12 39:13 42:16	whittle 13:18		
43:4 44:15 50:17,19	wicked 36:3	0	
51:9 63:9	widely 52:9	1	
wasta 7:21	wife 3:21	<u> </u>	
watched 36:18	willing 2:17 29:18 47:10	10 10:12 25:9	
way 11:15 12:7,9 17:16	49:1 50:6,18,19 61:16	13 54:9	
19:12 20:6 21:15,16	65:6 win 8:14 27:1 40:6	15 33:3	
24:5 27:14 28:7 31:1	wins 46:18	17 43:19	
36:6 37:11 40:14 41:9 43:4,22 49:7 52:3	wise 33:12	18 43:19	
57:19 58:3 60:5,7	wishes 2:9	19 43:16,19	
61:10 62:13	withdraw 35:20	2	
Wayne 1:1 2:3,5,10,12	women 32:5	20 33:10 42:21 43:16	
3:9,16 7:7,11,14,22	wondering 53:21		
10:16 13:2,11 14:5	word 65:8	46:5 59:16 20:51:54 6:6	
16:11 19:7,11,16	work 2:10 5:5,18 6:8	2000 38:4	
21:16 23:9 26:5 29:3	8:5 17:21 26:7,8,21	2000 56.4 2002 5:2 6:5 38:5	
31:14 34:17 36:1,9	27:4 29:18 31:11 34:4	2002 5.2 6.5 38.5 2003 4:1 6:5	
37:20 39:1,12 41:20	39:4 40:18 47:10	2009 3:5,20 5:13 6:9 7:2	
44:21 45:14 46:1,9	48:12 57:22 64:5,9	13:1,21 34:16 37:21	
47:6 48:9 49:14,20	worked 3:21 5:3 6:20	38:16	
50:4 51:3,7 53:22	14:19 24:14,15 26:14	2010 3:7 30:11 34:18	
56:11,17 57:11 58:5	26:15 27:19,21	37:21 38:16	
58:18,21 60:6 61:14	working 4:16 6:4 9:2	2011 3:8,9,10,20,22	
61:20 62:1 63:15,19	12:15 18:16,17 25:11	37:22 43:15 45:3	
64:1,10,21 65:3,9,11	36:16 37:1 59:3 60:13	2012 38:1	
ways 24:10 29:22 57:14	works 2:12	2015 36:12 48:16	
weakness 11:17	world 4:16 18:6 19:22	2018 43:16	
wealth 58:9	27:20 32:17,18,19	2021 1:4	
wealthy 16:17	33:17 36:16 57:16	21 1:4	
week 10:2	worse 5:11 37:12 41:19	21:02:32 15:6	
weeks 36:14	worth 8:16	21:04:09 16:16	
WEGGELAND 1:2 2:2	would've 3:5 38:2 40:7	21:08:31 20:11	
2:14 3:10 7:5,9,13,21	53:14 60:22	21:14:13 25:1	
	I	1	I

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

MATTER: Interview of Earl Anthony Wayne

DATE: 12-21-21

I hereby certify that the attached transcription of pages 1 to 75 inclusive are to the best of my belief and ability a true, accurate, and complete record of the above referenced proceedings as contained on the provided audio recording.

near Nous &