

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE
Suite 200
1200 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3011

+ + + + +

PASSING THE BATON

FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES AND
OPPORTUNITIES FACING THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
JANUARY 8, 2009

+ + + + +

PANEL 3: 11:15-12:15 A.M.
STABILIZING WAR-TORN STATES:
GOALS AND GUIDANCE FOR A NEW ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

Room 202 A
Walter E. Washington Convention Center

801 Mount Vernon Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

PANELISTS:

BRIGADIER GENERAL ED CARDON

BETH ELLEN COLE

MODERATED BY JANINE DAVIDSON

This transcript done from audio provided
by the United States Institute of Peace.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Opening Remarks

Janine Davidson. 3

Stability Operations in the US Army

General Ed Cardon. 14

Challenges Presented by War Torn States

Beth Ellen Cole. 24

Comments, Questions and Answers 39

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

2 11:15 a.m.

3 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: If everyone
4 can go ahead and take your seats, we're going
5 to try to get started. We just have an hour,
6 and I want to make sure we have plenty of time
7 for all your -- well, as many questions as we
8 can take from this large crowd.

9 I'm absolutely thrilled to see
10 such a large crowd for this topic. I can't
11 imagine why everybody's so interested in our
12 topic.

13 First of all, I'd like to say my
14 name is Janine Davidson. I'm a professor at
15 George Mason, and I'm thrilled to be here on
16 this panel. Thank you so much to the U.S.
17 Institute of Peace for hosting this fabulous
18 event. I think we're going to have a pretty
19 vibrant debate today, or not debate, hopefully
20 dialogue and discussion on this topic. It
21 often turns into a debate in this crowd for
22 some reason.

1 On our panel today we have
2 Brigadier General Ed Cardon from the Combined
3 Arms Center at Fort Leveanworth, Kansas. He's
4 a deputy director there with General Caldwell.
5 And we have Beth Cole from the US Institute of
6 Peace. I won't go into their bios; they're
7 all in your packet.

8 It's been my pleasure for about
9 the past two years to work with the US
10 Institute of Peace and the Combined Arms
11 Center and the great people there to work on
12 these issues of stabilizing fragile states and
13 on doctrine. And we'll be talking about that
14 today.

15 These two organizations with this
16 leadership here that you see today have really
17 been the anchor for a broader civil military
18 community of practice. This community of
19 practitioners that have served together in the
20 field, that have fought together in the field,
21 that have worked together here in Washington
22 and beyond to try to hone in on some shared

1 principles for how to conduct these
2 operations. And one of the ways that they do
3 that is through what we call doctrine. And
4 I'm going to talk a little bit about that
5 today to sort of set the stage, but I would
6 like to give them most of the time to speak.

7 It's an interesting point here
8 today that the two civilians on the panel have
9 the PowerPoint slides, and the general is just
10 going to speak from the heart. So I think we
11 are sort of kind of merging our cultures here.

12 But what I wanted to do is start
13 off with the definition of doctrine, the
14 official definition. And I'm going to go
15 ahead and read this for you.

16 According to the DoD dictionary,
17 doctrine are fundamental principles that guide
18 the employment of US military forces in
19 coordinated action toward a common objective.
20 It includes terms, tactics, techniques and
21 procedures, and represents what is taught,
22 believed and advocated as what works best.

1 The purpose of doctrine is to
2 enhance the operational effectiveness of US
3 forces. Now this is military doctrine. It's
4 authoritative guidance, and will be followed
5 except when it's not, except when, in the
6 judgment of the commander, exceptional
7 circumstances dictate. So it's important to
8 understand that a lot of people are sort of
9 afraid of doctrine. You know, they don't want
10 to put the stuff down in writing because they
11 say everything is contextual, and as soon as
12 we start writing these handbooks for action,
13 it's going to tie the commander's hand. Well,
14 that is absolutely not true. This is about
15 having baseline guiding principles that we can
16 agree on.

17 And so where does it come from is
18 a good question. Well in this case, in both
19 the cases you're going to hear about today,
20 doctrine comes from practice and experience
21 over a long period of time where people decide
22 that these are the kinds of things that are

1 working. It's about experience, it's about
2 theory, it's about research. And at some
3 point, people decide they're going to put it
4 down in writing.

5 Now there's two types of doctrine,
6 actually. There's informal doctrine, which
7 you guys may not realize, but you all have
8 read books, articles, magazines, blogs, things
9 that we think about in order to frame our
10 practice and our thought and our theory. And
11 then formal doctrine, which is what the
12 government puts out, which is the formal
13 manuals. The general has one in front of him.

14 You want to hold that up there,
15 sir? Prop. That is the new Stability
16 Operations Manual.

17 Now what is not doctrine?
18 Doctrine is not, contrary to popular belief,
19 grand strategy. It's not policy, either. It
20 doesn't say when, where, or why the United
21 States of America or anybody else will engage
22 abroad, but it just says how. When they're

1 asked to do that, they will do that. And
2 that's important to keep in mind.

3 Despite, obviously, my enthusiasm
4 for doctrine, a lot of people don't share it.
5 The first two quotes up here by a Russian
6 admiral and Colonel Rommel both point out the
7 same thing, that Americans like to write a lot
8 of doctrine, or the British, lots of people
9 like to write a lot of doctrine, but not a lot
10 of people follow their doctrine. And then the
11 bottom one, by Sir Michael Howard, basically
12 says that, you know, it doesn't really matter
13 what the doctrine says. What matters is
14 whether they get it right in the field.

15 Well so, you know, how are they
16 going to do that? So if everybody loves to
17 hate doctrine, why do we write it anyway?
18 Well, there's three reasons.

19 One, the process of developing the
20 doctrine is really, really important. And
21 when you learn about how specifically these
22 products were developed, especially FM-307,

1 the process is in some ways as important if
2 not more important than the product. The
3 process brings together all these people where
4 they can debate what they learned in the
5 field, or they can debate what they think
6 needs to happen next time before they have to
7 go out and do it again. And that very process
8 helps to get people on the same sheet of music
9 before they get in the field.

10 And it's also not really the case
11 that nobody reads doctrine. People say, oh,
12 they write these manuals. They put them on
13 the shelf. Army doesn't even publish very
14 many, you know. But that's really not true.
15 The new Counter-Insurgency Field Manual for
16 instance has been published by the University
17 of Chicago, and it has millions of readers.
18 And this manual is going to be published by
19 the University of Michigan some time this year
20 as well, so you'll be able to buy it on Amazon
21 as well, if all goes.

22 But what's more important is that,

1 in the military itself, the doctrine is used
2 by scenario developers and trainers for the
3 exercises that the military does. So then it
4 becomes sort of like, one of my colleagues
5 calls it, sort of like the Bible. Not
6 everybody reads it, but everybody kind of
7 knows what's in it. And how does that happen?
8 Through scenario development and training and
9 education.

10 And finally, as one of my
11 colleagues says, doctrine saves lives, even
12 it's not quite perfect. If there are
13 fundamental principles on which you can sort
14 of leverage when you get into the field,
15 that's better than having to fly around,
16 figure things out on the fly, like they had to
17 do in Iraq, and then send teams out to make
18 sure that people understand what the new
19 doctrine is and what the new guiding
20 principles are. That's actually a very
21 dangerous process, and it does cost lives.

22 So I think if you aren't going to

1 share my enthusiasm for doctrine, you can
2 maybe at least share my enthusiasm for having
3 a guiding framework. A lot of people like to
4 say that all these environments are
5 contextual, and it just depends. But saying
6 it depends doesn't always help. You know, you
7 kind of have to have some sort of a framework,
8 or a handrail, as we call it. And if that
9 weren't the case, I don't think you all would
10 be sitting in here today trying to learn
11 something.

12 So what is it we're talking about
13 today? Stability operations. Some of you
14 have probably seen this slide; it floats
15 around. But this particular topic, weakened
16 failed states, you know, turning chaos into
17 stability in complex societies and war torn
18 states, we've been struggling with this for a
19 long, long time. This is not about Iraq and
20 Afghanistan. It goes back much farther than
21 that. Just the very terminology debate should
22 signal that we still don't have it right.

1 In America, we've been doing these
2 sorts of operations for as long as we can
3 remember, from the American frontier all the
4 way to today in the horn of Africa, Iraq,
5 Afghanistan and beyond. And they've always
6 been controversial sorts of missions. The
7 military has always said, yes, yes, yes, we're
8 going to do it, but it's not really our job.
9 But then they continue to do it anyway, and
10 they do it without a lot of doctrine. Only in
11 the '90s did they really start doing a lot
12 more doctrine on this, and today you see the
13 Counter-Insurgency and the Stability
14 Operations Manual becoming much more widely
15 read.

16 Another thing about these types of
17 missions, this is from the Defense Science
18 Board study from 2004. Take a look at this
19 graph a little bit closely. Sort of counter-
20 intuitive to think that major combat
21 operations are less costly in blood and
22 treasure, or have been historically, than

1 stability operations. You see this is
2 Somalia, Haiti, the Balkans and beyond. The
3 data for this study ends in 2004, so this does
4 not include Iraq mostly, and it doesn't
5 include a lot of Afghanistan, which you could
6 also categorize in the stability operations
7 phase.

8 And this is the casualty. This
9 will point out to you that these things are
10 dangerous. They're hard, they're messy, they
11 take a long time, but they're also dangerous.

12 Now this study came out in 2004
13 and people said, well, you know, are they
14 inherently protracted, and bloody, and costly
15 because they're just inherently protracted,
16 bloody, and costly, or is it because we're not
17 very good at them? And that's sort of an open
18 question. But the community of practice
19 decided that they should think about them a
20 little bit more, and that they should try to
21 get a little bit better at them.

22 And what you're going to hear

1 today are two attempts to sort of put down in
2 writing the latest thought, theory, best
3 practices for these types of missions. And
4 we'll start with General Cardon, who will talk
5 about the stability operations in the US Army.
6 Thank you.

7 GENERAL CARDON: Well, thank you
8 very much, Janine and Beth. And thanks to the
9 Institute for setting up such a relevant and
10 essential program. It's great to see some old
11 friends here.

12 I know some of you that know me
13 and have looked at the bio and then looked at
14 the title for this seminar may be questioning
15 why I'm here, because I've never been to
16 Afghanistan, but I have been to Iraq in 2003
17 and 2005, and in 2007 and 2008. I just
18 returned in June. And we have two great
19 documents here, the Stability Operations
20 Manual, which came out here recently. And if
21 you get one of those tri-folds in the back, it
22 tells you how to download it for free. And

1 the Guiding Principles for Peace Operations.
2 Both have been coordinated with multiple
3 agencies, and are based on our experience
4 since 9-11 and past operations. And I've seen
5 the power and experienced the power of the
6 ideas that these manuals capture. They are
7 bigger than the operations in Iraq and
8 Afghanistan because we've adapted and learned,
9 and we continue to adapt and learn.

10 I hope everyone has had a chance
11 to read them, but if not, I encourage you to
12 read them, because they both clearly recognize
13 and codify that stability operations or peace
14 operations are not exclusive to the Department
15 of Defense. It takes the whole of government
16 to have a sustainable peace. Clearly, the
17 passage of time and events has renewed the
18 importance of stability operations for
19 everyone, but we have struggled and continue
20 to struggle with the planning, preparation and
21 execution. And hence, the focus of these two
22 documents, how do we integrate our efforts?

1 Some may focus on the differences
2 and key in on definitions starting with the
3 titles; Stability Operations or Peace
4 Operations. I'd like to focus on the
5 similarities and the tremendous synergy that
6 these documents have. They provide a doctrine
7 and an overarching concept to guide both the
8 whole of government and what we call the
9 comprehensive, which is the international,
10 multinational, non-governmental
11 organizations, private organizations'
12 efforts. They provide a common language that
13 facilitates our effective communication,
14 planning, coordination, integration and
15 synchronization, all within a common framework
16 that we can use to focus our efforts.

17 Von Clausewitz once said, "War is
18 not a purely military endeavor, but rather a
19 continuation of political intercourse carried
20 on by other means. And at its core, the
21 principle of legitimacy impacts every aspect
22 of stability operations from every conceivable

1 perspective. This principle of legitimacy
2 includes many groups: the local populous, the
3 host nation government, neighboring states,
4 international community, and the American
5 government and public. And it's this quest
6 for legitimacy that brings politics into every
7 facet of both peace and stability operations.
8 This political intercourse, with all of its
9 components of national and international
10 power, requires the holistic approach in which
11 the military is only one tool. This means the
12 military cannot and should not go it alone to
13 obtain maximum effectiveness. Even when the
14 military may be in the lead for specific
15 situations, it's actions have to be part of a
16 harmonious whole. Therefore, for the success
17 of stability operations, it's important that
18 the overall operation first be examined in its
19 political light, with it's integral parts of
20 power and legitimacy, and this makes
21 information and words, combined with actions
22 and deeds, the main effort to win the struggle

1 of ideas, and to establish legitimacy.

2 This has created the challenge of
3 the strategic corporal and the strategic
4 civilian, where the actions or words have
5 impacts on a 24-hour information cycle with
6 local, national, and international
7 implications. These manuals provide the
8 guidance and direction using the same
9 framework to describe similar end states, safe
10 and secure environment, the rule of law,
11 stable governance, sustainable economy, and
12 social well being. Yet the lack of capacity
13 in the whole of government has forced the
14 military to assume roles normally reserved for
15 other agencies. At times, the lack of
16 education and experience within the military
17 to execute these tasks has been expensive in
18 terms of resources, time and legitimacy, and
19 in the results.

20 Let me be clear. The military has
21 recognized and acknowledged that stability
22 operations are one of its core missions. We

1 are performing our role, but in some areas,
2 we're also performing roles normally reserved
3 for other agencies. We can do better as a
4 government, and these documents are a great
5 step forward.

6 Someone once said, You're not
7 going to kill or capture your way to victory.
8 Stability and peace is not possible without a
9 government and comprehensive approach. The
10 challenge is how to integrate the whole of
11 government with itself, and the international
12 partners, humanitarian organizations, and the
13 private sector. Our capacity to conduct
14 stability operations is not going to be fixed
15 rapidly. The ongoing work with the project on
16 national security reform is very encouraging,
17 but it's still at the beginning. While our
18 organizations are still developing, such as
19 the Civilian Response Corps, the organization
20 processes and authorities are still in its
21 initial stages. While the selection,
22 education and training of our people is

1 improving every day for provincial
2 reconstruction teams, we're still building
3 this capacity. And while our authorizations
4 and appropriations are ad hoc vice programs,
5 and while we're extremely grateful for the
6 novel legislative provisions and authorities
7 that have been invaluable to conduct
8 operations such as Commander's Emergency
9 Response funds, Quick Reaction funds, reward
10 programs that increase thresholds for simple
11 acquisitions, it also points out how far we
12 are from having truly adequate authorities and
13 authorizations to conduct stability
14 operations.

15 And then the other laws and
16 regulations, how do we get ID cards when not
17 a government employee? Hiring authorities for
18 nine governmental organizations. How to work
19 through the insurance considerations. And the
20 list goes on. We need an effective inner-
21 agency construct for this century with an
22 established statutory foundation to support

1 the whole of government approach. We need
2 then to resource all agencies to foster inter-
3 agency expeditionary capacities. And then we
4 need to implement the education and training
5 programs required to realize the potential of
6 this approach.

7 Now, we're already incorporating
8 inter-agency and international students into
9 our schools. We have programs that allow
10 military officers to serve in different
11 agencies to allow leaders from those agencies
12 to attend our schools. We're doing more and
13 better foreign language training. We've
14 incorporated inter-agency leaders into our
15 training and readiness exercises. We have a
16 civil military course design underway with the
17 State Department that uses these documents as
18 a base line. We're moving forward, but it's
19 taking a tremendous amount of energy to make
20 small, and some would say very small, steps.
21 We can and we must do better.

22 These manuals are not solely

1 focused on Iraq or Afghanistan, but on
2 operations and activities all around the
3 globe, through the entire spectrum of peace
4 and conflict. Stability is not just after a
5 war; it's all-encompassing. Both documents
6 can help better prevent war, can help better
7 support host nation governments, can better
8 help shape interventions, can shape the
9 actions during conflict, and facilitate post-
10 conflict activities, and can shape our future
11 environment.

12 But for stability operations to
13 work, there must be a national interest,
14 theirs and ours, and an international interest
15 component. It must be in the interest of the
16 international community, or at a minimum, a
17 significant number of important players to
18 conduct major stability operations. We alone
19 may not always be the answer. In fact, going
20 alone may actually undermine our actions and
21 sap the operations' legitimacy. We've
22 relearned many past lessons, and we've spent

1 a lot of money and blood. We've learned some
2 new lessons, and we know that these operations
3 are critical to our collective futures. These
4 documents lay out the framework, but I would
5 argue they lay out the framework without the
6 resources. There's a quote I like, I'm not
7 sure where it comes from, but it goes like
8 this: The words are there, but do they sing?
9 Having these documents published is one thing,
10 but are we ready to work together with the
11 necessary trust, collaboration, cooperation,
12 coordination and communication necessary to
13 make it a reality? Is the chorus ready, and
14 are we ready to act? And this brings me back
15 to the beginning and my closing. Integration
16 is the mechanics of stability operations and
17 peacekeeping operations. It is what these
18 manuals provide. But until now, not all of
19 our political branches have agreed that we
20 need to resource all of the instruments to
21 perform these operations. All political
22 branches must agree that this is a legitimate

1 use of all of our instruments of power, and
2 then we must resource, build, and employ these
3 instruments of power accordingly for peace and
4 stability around the world.

5 Thank you very much. I look
6 forward to your questions.

7 MS. COLE: Thank you. Well, I
8 find that it is somewhat symbolic of our crazy
9 world today that I come with a PowerPoint and
10 the military does not. But I'm going to
11 abandon my PowerPoint and only present two
12 slides today.

13 I have had the honor and the
14 privilege for my career, the first 15 years,
15 to work on two vexing challenges facing this
16 country. First, the challenge presented by
17 nuclear weapons, which we heard about this
18 morning. And for the past 18 years, the
19 challenge presented by war torn states.

20 What I find so troubling 13 years
21 after US forces crossed the River Sava into
22 Bosnia, and seven years after we went into

1 Afghanistan with the host of civilian agencies
2 from the US Government, from other
3 governments, from the UN, and the non-
4 governmental organizations, that there is no
5 civilian doctrine. I'm going to use that
6 term. There is no document that brings
7 together the experience of all of these
8 civilians for the past three decades now in
9 one place. It is time that there should be
10 civilian doctrine. We know this because,
11 before we started on this effort, we went to
12 the UN in New York and its agencies in Geneva.
13 We've talked to the Brits, and the French, and
14 the Germans. We've talked to the African
15 Union, the European Union, NATO, the Dutch,
16 the Japanese. We have looked at the Afghan
17 country frameworks, Burundi, Sierra Leone.
18 And we know that there is no document that
19 gives civilians a picture of what it is that
20 we are trying to accomplish in these missions
21 today, three decades after being in these
22 missions. That is deeply and profoundly

1 troubling.

2 So when we ask ourselves, as an
3 SRSG, a Special Representative to the
4 Secretary General, did at USIP a year ago,
5 what are we trying to do in Afghanistan, it is
6 no wonder that we can't really answer that
7 question because we don't have the roadmap, we
8 don't have the document that is built on the
9 experience of others.

10 So let me talk a little bit about
11 what we did at USIP. We went to the Premiere
12 Center of Excellence in the US Military, the
13 Army's Peacekeeping and Stability Operations
14 Institute, who have been helping nations
15 around the world build their own peacekeeping
16 doctrine. We went to Dr. Janine Davidson, the
17 doctrine expert. We went to Colonel Steve
18 Leonard, the lead author of the Army's
19 Stability Operations Doctrine. We went to Ugo
20 Solinas, who's written the UN Peacekeeping
21 Guidelines, their doctrine. And we learned
22 about it. We learned about what doctrine is.

1 We went to doctrine school. And then we
2 decided, because it's not a comfortable term
3 for the civilian community, that we were going
4 to tweak it for the civilian community. And
5 so we went out and we said, as Janine said,
6 there is doctrine out there in the civilian
7 world. It exists in the tool kits, in the
8 white papers, in the policy papers, in the
9 official guidance of organizations as diverse
10 as the Japanese International Cooperation
11 Agency, the African Union, the EU, the
12 Organization for Cooperation and Development
13 Assistance Committee, the UN Department of
14 Peacekeeping Operations, the UN Development
15 Program, and on, and on, and on, and on. It
16 is rich. It is built on the experience of
17 thousands of people who have gone out and done
18 these operations. And we said, give us your
19 documents. And for one year, an all-woman
20 team. I'm very proud of that.

21 If there are some people in this
22 audience that have contributed, please stand

1 up. My women.

2 We have sat, and we have read 500
3 doctrinal documents from these organizations.
4 We brought in 1,000, but we've only had time
5 to read 500. And that is what this document
6 that we are about to give to the incoming
7 Obama Administration is built on. It's built
8 on the backs of all of these people who have
9 gone to all of these operations, and risked
10 their life and limb to build peace.

11 Now let me just say a bit about
12 this document. It is not about stability
13 operations. In fact, it's about peace
14 operations, and that's what we've called it.
15 As Janine pointed out, we're really confused
16 about what we call these operations, and we
17 have a huge number of terms for them. There
18 is no shared terminology among all of these
19 organizations that go into these missions.
20 There are no shared definitions, and up until
21 this time, there are no shared principles to
22 guide action.

1 But if you're the Secretary of
2 Agriculture, before you send out one civilian
3 expert to Afghanistan to create an alternative
4 livelihood program, you have to understand the
5 importance of freedom of movement. You have
6 to understand how goods are going to get to
7 market, and who's going to protect those
8 roads. You have to understand who's going to
9 build those roads. You have to understand
10 who's going to create microcredit programs,
11 and banks, and protect money supplies. If
12 you're the Secretary of Treasury, before
13 you're sending out your famed Treasury
14 advisors to help build a central bank, you
15 better understand how that money supply is
16 going to be protected, protected from those
17 who engage in illicit economies, organized
18 crime, terrorists, others who want to pick off
19 that money and use it to undermine peace. You
20 have to understand that. But to date, the
21 United States does not have any of that
22 doctrine.

1 So this doctrine is specifically
2 for those operations where there is the
3 presence of peacekeeping or peace enforcement
4 forces with the myriad of other civilian
5 agencies that are on the ground. It is not
6 for conflict prevention. It is not for
7 development. This doctrine is for the time
8 that these forces enter until about a
9 generation later. Because folks, we
10 understand after three decades that that's
11 what it takes. It takes about a decade to be
12 on the ground.

13 We have built this doctrine to be
14 focused not on tasks. There are so many good
15 task lists that say exactly how to run an
16 election, how to operate a checkpoint. This
17 is about what those tasks support. What we're
18 doing right now and scratching our head and
19 saying, what are we trying to do? What are
20 our end states in Afghanistan?

21 And the audience. This doctrine -
22 - hopefully we'll find a great publisher. I

1 mean, the US Institute of Peace will publish
2 it, but hopefully, you know, some -- Amazon
3 will pick it up, too. But this doctrine is
4 primarily for the United States Government,
5 because we don't have it, and because the
6 Obama Administration needs it. It is for the
7 Secretary of Agriculture, and the decision
8 makers that decide to deploy US civilians. It
9 is for the strategic planner that puts
10 together the plan. It is for the trainers and
11 the people who will help prepare those
12 civilians who will deploy. And actually, it
13 is for those people, both the victims of
14 conflict and others that are going out so they
15 understand the full scope of these missions.

16 This document -- finally, I'm
17 going to give some caveats, because it is
18 produced by the US Institute of Peace, and we
19 are with the Peacekeeping and Stability
20 Operations Institute, and we are not part of
21 the US Government. Our mission in life is to
22 offer tools for others to utilize. And so it

1 is not an official US document. We hope it
2 will be embraced by the Administration. It is
3 not intended to replace any agency's doctrinal
4 documents or mission statements. It is built
5 on those documents. And finally, like all
6 doctrine, it should be a living document. It
7 needs to be updated over time as we learn and
8 we gather the experience of people in the
9 field. They are the people that can teach us
10 and help us construct doctrine.

11 So I would like to go to our
12 slide, because here's how we've constructed
13 it.

14 We have found, if you look at
15 everybody's strategic frameworks, if you look
16 at all of the guidance out there, that people,
17 both the local woman who has endured a decade
18 of conflict, to the strategic planner, to the
19 decision maker, that there are really five
20 major end states that we are trying to achieve
21 in these operations. Some may call them
22 mission components, some might call them

1 elements, some might call them pillars, but
2 they are the purpose-based end states that we
3 are trying to achieve. A safe and secure
4 environment, rule of law, stable governance,
5 a sustainable economy, and social well being.

6 We then found, when we dug below
7 all these documents, that there are necessary
8 conditions that need to be established to
9 reach these end states. I hope that you have
10 that document in front of you, because those
11 conditions are described here. When you have
12 rule of law, you need to have the laws. And
13 then you need to be able to have some ability
14 to have law and order to enforce those laws.
15 You need to have systems that you can hold
16 people accountable to those laws, both the
17 public and their leaders. You have to address
18 the legacy of war crimes and past abuses. You
19 need to have the ability for people to have
20 access to justice. That means courts. That
21 means that, when a police officer goes out
22 there, he can arrest someone and he can have

1 a court and a humane detention or prison
2 system that's going to be able to handle the
3 accused so that they can receive justice.
4 That's what we call rule of law.

5 And finally in the rule of law you
6 need citizen participation. You need people
7 to be informed of the law, and to want to
8 adhere to that law, and to respect the law,
9 and to be part of making those laws. So
10 that's an example of the conditions under rule
11 of law.

12 I will not elaborate on this, but
13 this is what is in our forthcoming document.
14 Underneath all of these conditions, what we
15 have done is we have described the approaches,
16 the approaches based on lessons learned that
17 we have used to establish these conditions.
18 And when people say to me that we really don't
19 know what we're doing, I would beg to differ.
20 We just need to have extracted it and to put
21 it in one place, because there is a lot that
22 we do know. There is a lot that we don't

1 know, as well. And in this document, for the
2 first time in any doctrine, we have put up a
3 list of what we call megagaps. Those are the
4 things that we really don't know how to do.
5 It's a call to action. It's a research
6 agenda. We ask you to look at that, and if
7 you're in an academic institution, or if you
8 have the ability to study, we need you to look
9 at these megagaps.

10 I would just argue that today --
11 last week I talked to someone coming out of
12 Afghanistan who's running in a major academy
13 that's training police. He has no court still
14 in all of the provinces for the police to hand
15 the accused or people that are detained over
16 to any courts. I mean, that's seven years
17 later. So it's very important that we try to
18 fill these gaps.

19 We have also done, borrowing from
20 the US Agency for International Development,
21 we've highlighted major trade-offs. This is
22 something that every decision maker needs to

1 understand before they agree to put blood and
2 treasure of the United States on the ground in
3 any operation. If you empower a war lord, you
4 may calm down a particular province in a
5 particular place, but you may undermine the
6 legitimacy of the government as a whole. That
7 is a trade-off. They have to understand those
8 trade-offs, and we have enumerated those
9 throughout this document.

10 Finally, we have talked about
11 linkages. We don't know how to do this
12 technically, but if you, as we will be wont to
13 do, only read the rule of law section, we want
14 there to be some kind of stop sign where you
15 have to go and you have to read the
16 sustainable economy section, because you
17 really can't do your job, or you can't, as the
18 Attorney General deploy judges, unless you
19 understand how they're going to fit in and can
20 deal with an illicit economy.

21 So that is in an essence what this
22 document is. I offer it to you humbly. It is

1 still a draft. We have gone through a huge
2 vetting process. It is still open to comment.
3 It is still open to perfection, and it always
4 will be, actually, but we do have to publish
5 it soon and turn it over to the Obama
6 Administration. We've received comments and
7 gone before major US allies, NATO, the OECD,
8 the UN and others, gone through the US
9 Government, through all the agencies to
10 receive comments, and are undergoing a major
11 revision of this document at this time. But
12 if you call me, I'll give it to you, and you
13 can still have a chance to give us some
14 comments on it.

15 I just, I really believe that.
16 beginning with the Clinton administration.
17 when we tried to build US capacity - and
18 you'll learn about this this afternoon if you
19 go to that workshop - ending with this
20 administration where we have built a planning,
21 a training system, that it's time that people
22 be handed something that shows them all of the

1 experience of all the people that have gone
2 before them so they understand what this
3 mission is like.

4 So I thank you, and I look forward
5 to your comments.

6 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Thank you.
7 We have about 25 minutes for questions. I
8 just want to highlight a couple of themes that
9 I'm picking up.

10 I said earlier that doctrine is
11 neither policy nor strategy. But I think from
12 listening to our speakers today you can
13 probably glean that it can and should and does
14 inform both of those things. What I heard
15 from the general was kind of a cry for help.
16 The military is doing this stuff, and they
17 know how to do it, but they are messaging to
18 the policy community for more resources for
19 their civilian partners, more knowledge to
20 fill these gaps.

21 What I hear from Beth is that this
22 stuff isn't new. It's not a US problem. It's

1 not a military problem. Her document is
2 informed by people from all over the world
3 that are also struggling with this issue, and
4 have been out in the field trying to learn.
5 This stuff takes a long time, and it's really,
6 really hard. And oh, by the way, based on her
7 gaps, we don't have all the knowledge that we
8 need, which is why this community of practice
9 needs to continue to meet and to learn from
10 each other.

11 So with that, I would like to open
12 it up for your questions. We have some people
13 with microphones. If you want to raise your
14 hand, I'll point to you and we can start right
15 over there, the gentleman --

16 And go ahead and say your name and
17 where you're from, please.

18 MR. LUND: Hi, Michael Lund from
19 the Wilson Center.

20 Well, I think it's really
21 excellent that the practice community has come
22 up to a point where the goals are being sorted

1 out and put into a coherent framework like
2 this. But let me just jump a little further
3 ahead into the complexities of what this all
4 means and what you can do with it, and point
5 out, and examples have been given, that some
6 of those things are dependent on each other
7 causally. You gave a couple examples. Some
8 of them are intentioned with each other. You
9 also gave an example of a war lord versus
10 legitimacy and so on.

11 The next challenge, it seems to
12 me, is to operationalize them in some kind of
13 form, in some sort of mechanism in which
14 priorities are set, sequencing is foreseen,
15 implemented in particular places, each of
16 which differs in terms of the sources, drivers
17 of conflict, whether you've got governance
18 structures in some state of capability or not,
19 and so on.

20 So if you could comment on what
21 the state of the art of creating coherent
22 procedures, decision making mechanisms and so

1 on, in particular countries, not just Iraq and
2 Afghanistan, but lots of the other countries.
3 I was in Mindanao doing an assessment of the
4 efforts of the US Government in development
5 and security to deal with insurgencies there.
6 The mechanisms don't seem to be operating very
7 coherently, but that seems to me -- to make
8 this useful, that seems to be necessary.

9 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Thank you. On
10 priorities and operationalization, General,
11 Beth? I know Beth has a lot to say on this.

12 GENERAL CARDON: Well I think for
13 the operational side, and I just go back to
14 the experience I had in Iraq, when I look at
15 the difference between 2003, 2005, 2007, 2008,
16 I think it has been operationalized, but it's
17 more by hard work, accident, hard lessons,
18 than by deliberate design. Now that's
19 probably overstated, but there's a science and
20 an art to this for every country, and I think
21 this is where I talked about this importance
22 of education and development as we go forward

1 on this. I agree that we have to
2 operationalize this, but I think every
3 situation is so unique that we never had an
4 overarching framework by which to operate from
5 to begin with. And now that we have, to me it
6 appears to be a framework that we're all
7 using, or we could all use, then we could
8 actually get to this point where we could
9 operationalize it. Because before, in the
10 beginning, we always argued over what the
11 definitions were, and we never got past the
12 beginning of the document. And so therefore
13 nothing was ever operationalized because we
14 couldn't agree what framework we could operate
15 from.

16 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Beth?

17 MS. COLE: Well, the short answer
18 is if you give me a couple million dollars,
19 I'll gain this for Afghanistan. But the
20 longer answer, no honestly, we sat for an
21 hour-and-a-half with the deputy chairman of
22 NATO's Military Committee, Karl Eikenberry,

1 and he said, well, let's just take this and
2 let's just look at Afghanistan, and let's just
3 figure out where we are, where we need to go,
4 what our priorities are, how we should
5 sequence this stuff, and you know, that's what
6 we need to do. But of course these things
7 take money, and as Janine and the general
8 pointed out, we're not properly resourced to
9 do that kind of stuff. I mean, you know, a
10 couple million dollars is, I don't know, a
11 tenth of the USIP's budget.

12 Anyway, but we do in this document
13 talk about sequencing. We talk about
14 prioritization. We talk about that in terms
15 of the concept of operations, which is not
16 also a comfortable term for civilians, but
17 it's time that we talked about how we do these
18 things. And so I'd like to send this to you,
19 and you can look at that section. But we are
20 very cognizant that these things cannot all be
21 done at the same time. With the resources and
22 the time and the patience of the affected

1 community that we have at our disposal, we
2 have to pick and choose and sequence these
3 properly in order to have any mission success.

4 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: In other
5 doctrinal documents and other ways, these
6 similar pillars are listed in a line, and a
7 lot of people infer that that means that
8 that's the order in which they are done. Do
9 you want to speak to that little debate a bit,
10 Beth? You pointed it out to me earlier.

11 MS. COLE: We also say in this
12 document, and again, you know, this is
13 extracted from all of these other incredible
14 work of people and institutions, but we say
15 that, yes, you have to have security. You
16 have to have rule of law, and you have to
17 provide essential services to the population.
18 Some other of these things can wait. So we do
19 sketch out that there are indeed fundamental
20 priorities that must be achieved in order to
21 be able to get to a lot of these other things.

22 But as this diagram indicates, it

1 used to be a cylinder-like document, and we
2 did not imply any prioritization or sequencing
3 by it, but after we took this around the
4 world, people said, no. You know, you have
5 sequencing here. So we've gone to this ven
6 diagram to show that it is all interrelated.
7 But it is extremely important that, when the
8 peacekeeper arrives on the ground, that if
9 he's going to pick up someone, as we saw in
10 Iraq with Abu Ghraib and this detention
11 problem - and by the way, that's a big gap -
12 but he or she needs to be able to put that
13 person somewhere. And that place has to be
14 able to be a place that respects human rights
15 and abides by human rights laws and
16 conventions. And so there definitely are
17 priorities.

18 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Thank you.
19 Another question? Right there. Microphone.

20 MR. BING: Thanks. Andreas Bing
21 (phonetic), the University of Redding.

22 Can I ask you about the

1 relationship between all this and the field
2 manuals that the Army and the Marine Corps
3 have developed in terms of counterinsurgency?
4 Because I see that doesn't seem quite to fit.
5 The Army and the Marine Corps have in a sense
6 weaponized social sciences now with the
7 embedding of anthropologists and social
8 science expertise in order sort of to come to
9 the specificities of the enemy they fight.
10 They've come up with a great idea; if you
11 fight an enemy, know who your enemy actually
12 is. Radical insight. But it points to an
13 appreciation of the specificities of the,
14 shall we say theaters, within which they
15 operate. That's nice and fine.

16 When I look at this, however, I
17 see a long list of generalities where the
18 whole specificity is all of a sudden
19 apparently lost again.

20 In that sense then my question is,
21 is this not just sort of a usual check list of
22 fairly Western ideas what a proper society

1 should look like, rather than actually
2 something that should enable us to appreciate
3 how these societies work from the inside? You
4 mentioned Afghanistan. Well, Afghan legal
5 frameworks, Afghan law and order, who defines
6 the accountability of the leadership there,
7 are these our ideas we bring to the place, and
8 therefore they're doomed to fail, or are we
9 recognizing that we in a sense sort of have to
10 base these efforts on the respect of, shall we
11 say local, or, well, theater realities?

12 So what I'm skeptical about here
13 is that this long washing list of things to
14 check off, so to speak, this cookie cutter
15 approach, might actually end up being horribly
16 counterproductive because we sort of think we
17 have the solution for them. And if we only
18 sort of go through these things, then we'll
19 somehow succeed, and thereby in a sense only
20 reproduce an era that the Army and the Marine
21 Corps at least seem to be able to overcome.

22 GENERAL CARDON: Well, first the

1 Counterinsurgency Manual 3-24, which you can
2 also download off the same web site, was
3 actually the forerunner to what's been an
4 explosion of Army doctrine in just the last
5 two years. So first came another one about
6 operations, which put stability on equal par
7 with our war fighting, and now we have this
8 manual here to try and get after stability
9 operations.

10 The big change really in
11 counterinsurgency, in addition to know the
12 enemy, was this whole idea it's all about the
13 populations you're in. And a lot of that is
14 a function of the way that we were training
15 prior to that, which is we fight enemies, and
16 population was kind of this nebulous condition
17 that we didn't pay a lot of attention to,
18 whereas now, that's all reversed. It's all
19 about the population, and how do you root the
20 enemy out of the population. And I think
21 we've captured that pretty well.

22 But in terms of the framework,

1 even when I went into the -- I shouldn't say
2 I, I should say we, and the soldiers went into
3 like the roughest areas of Southern Baghdad,
4 for examples, that were Al Qaeda strongholds,
5 once you got the security, all of these
6 elements existed in some way. Once the
7 discussion became, am I going to survive until
8 the next day, immediately starts changing to
9 social well being, how do I get connected to
10 the government, I need a job, et cetera. But
11 the safe and secure environment underpins
12 this, and enables all these other things to
13 work. So there is a sequence and a
14 prioritization of this.

15 But I think the struggle we're
16 having is, a lot of this, and we have growing
17 capacity in the other agencies, but this
18 Stability Operations Manual recognizes we
19 can't do everything. And that's the problem
20 that resulted as a result of some of our
21 manuals is that we were trying to do
22 everything, and we just can't afford that.

1 First off, we're not very good at some of this
2 stuff. I mean, our idea of micro-economics is
3 to throw a lot of money at it, which
4 completely destroys the local economy. I've
5 watched this two or three times just on my
6 last tour. Even despite our efforts to
7 educate our own leaders.

8 MS. COLE: Well, I made a mistake
9 by not recognizing my boss, Vice-President of
10 Peace and Stability Operations, Daniel Serwer,
11 who provided a lot of the intellectual capital
12 and support for me to undertake this project.
13 But I will tell you that he took this
14 framework with USIP into Mahmudiya in what's
15 called the Triangle of Death in Southern
16 Baghdad, and used it as a basis for a
17 reconciliation program, an agreement, landmark
18 agreement among tribal leaders. And so they
19 found that this worked very well for them.

20 But I want to tell you that, in
21 these 500 documents that we looked at, many of
22 them originated from the effected countries

1 themselves. The UN Peace Building Support
2 Office, their work in creating country
3 frameworks by talking to people all throughout
4 the countries of Burundi and Sierra Leone came
5 up with very, very similar wants, needs,
6 objectives, goals and end states of people
7 that have been through decades of conflict.

8 In this document, we also say
9 that, in every single case, you must
10 culturally attune all of your goals and
11 objectives to the local population by doing an
12 assessment on the ground before you even go
13 in, by talking to the local population, and
14 constructing your plan from that. And so I
15 would submit that people around the world
16 really do want all of these things, and that
17 we have footnoted in fact in this document
18 where we get that from.

19 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Thank you.
20 And to your cultural point, the Army and the
21 Marine Corps Manual, these build on each
22 other. They're the same people who are

1 involved in writing all these manuals. But
2 your cultural point is a key to the debate
3 that goes on about this doctrine. If you look
4 at some of these things, the rule of law, for
5 instance, doesn't say what exactly kind of
6 law. It says rule of law. And then her point
7 about assessing the situation based on the
8 host government and the people on the ground,
9 that's where you shake out those other issues
10 that you're talking about. So it doesn't
11 necessarily have to be a certain westernized
12 way. That would be policy. Right?

13 Next question? Right here in
14 front.

15 MR. ROSSMAN: Thank you. John
16 Rossman, the Northrop Grumman Corporation.

17 You know, to monitor physical
18 objectives on the ground, we call it situation
19 awareness. For the military, we have about
20 \$28 billion of expenditures and airborne ISR,
21 intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance,
22 for the next seven years. Now that's for

1 physical objectives. Now these are non-
2 physical, but what I'm wondering, why can't
3 these conditions, metrics, qualitative
4 reporting, be done on a regional, provincial,
5 local basis, and put into our overall military
6 or intelligence surveillance and
7 reconnaissance thing? In other words, we're
8 spending tons of money to look at physical
9 objectives. Why can't we introduce metrics
10 and so forth to measure these qualitative
11 conditions, and then do plans of action, as we
12 would do mission planning on military things,
13 to accomplish a resolution?

14 MS. COLE: Excellent question.
15 We actually have a companion effort. I don't
16 know if Mike Dziejczak is here or not. It's
17 called Measuring Progress in Conflict
18 Environments, and it is something that we have
19 been working with the Army Corps of Engineers
20 on, and in fact, representatives from across
21 the US Government for several years now, and
22 it's going to come out this year, as well, but

1 we totally agree with you that we need a
2 system of how to measure progress. And I
3 would encourage you to get in touch with Mike
4 Dziedzic, but it specifically looks at and is
5 according to this framework. So these are
6 companion documents. Thanks for the opening
7 to advertise that.

8 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Question,
9 along the aisle there? Yes, you.

10 PARTICIPANT: This is a question
11 for the general.

12 You mentioned the fact that the
13 script is there, but the question now is
14 resources. Maybe you could comment a bit
15 about the willingness within the Pentagon to
16 request this money in the budget, and what
17 sort of reception you think such a request
18 might get on Capitol Hill from authorizers and
19 appropriators?

20 GENERAL CARDON: Well, I don't
21 work in the Pentagon, but I'll tell you that
22 Secretary Gates has been very up front that

1 the -- he's been supporting other agencies,
2 receiving more funding, absolutely pushing for
3 that. And it's essential.

4 Some people talked before it's a
5 matter of will. I don't think it is a matter
6 of will. That's not my experience on the
7 ground. There are a lot of dedicated officers
8 of all parts of the government that I've
9 worked with, and they're out there, but their
10 numbers are so small in comparison. I mean,
11 the civilian surge that accompanied the
12 50,000-plus troops was like 100 civilians.
13 That was a surge. And it took months to get
14 it on the ground, because there's no capacity.
15 It's not a question of will. There's no
16 capacity. And I think Secretary Gates has
17 been very forthright on this issue, and we
18 need larger support. This kind of goes back
19 to the metrics question. The real problem is
20 it's hard to measure this. And whereas we in
21 the military got this whole machine that
22 measures stuff, and we can say, if you want

1 this capability, we need X money. Normally it
2 starts with billions, I understand that. But
3 the point is it's very hard to measure, okay,
4 tell me how much money you need for rule of
5 law? I can't measure that, but I think we
6 need X. And that has been, I think, one of
7 the reasons why we've had struggles with
8 funding other agencies.

9 And the other thing is there's not
10 a lot of will inside of the Congress. When
11 you look at the restrictions that are put on
12 the monies and the authorizations, even when
13 I traveled -- the Indonesians knew more about
14 the Leahy Amendment than I did. You know, I
15 had to come back and read what they were
16 talking about when I was there, just as a two-
17 day program that was part of the capstone,
18 which they view as stifling their development.

19 Now, I'm not going to agree
20 whether it's right or wrong, but I just find
21 it interesting that a lot of these are written
22 so narrowly it doesn't function well in either

1 a stability or peace operation environment.

2 MS. COLE: Yes, just a brief
3 comment about that. I mean, we owe a debt of
4 gratitude to the military, both the flag
5 officers and Secretary Gates, for going up to
6 the Capitol Hill repeatedly and asking for the
7 funding of civilian agencies to wage peace.
8 And we have not been able to get that kind of
9 money. You know, if you've noticed, all the
10 civilian agencies are operating under what's
11 called a continuing resolution, and we have
12 been since 2006. These wars are being fought
13 or waged on supplemental appropriations bills.

14 The defense appropriators have
15 appropriately funded the Department of
16 Defense. The people that we need to talk to
17 are the State Department appropriators, the
18 foreign operations appropriators, the guys
19 that appropriate money for Agriculture, and
20 Treasury, and all these other agencies. They
21 need to understand that they are sending out
22 people to these very dangerous environments.

1 They are. But they are not appropriately
2 trained, or equipped, or resourced to do their
3 missions. This is a really critical challenge
4 facing the United States, and I hope that we
5 do something about it this year.

6 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Go ahead, in
7 the back.

8 MS. MOSER: I'm Marie Moser. I
9 work for the State Department on the Iraq
10 desk. Thank you. I manage the quick response
11 funds. So everything you say, and General
12 Cardon, I echo that. I agree with you. I
13 think that the State Department has the
14 Stabilization and Reconstruction Office, and
15 I think that they've been severely under-
16 funded. They're still gearing up, and they're
17 gearing up on a theoretical basis with the
18 exception of Iraq. To some extent they're
19 engaging in Iraq, but they're very much in a
20 theoretical stage, and I think that Treasury
21 and the other agencies of the government that
22 -- they do have technical expertise to lend.

1 You're absolutely correct, they're not
2 trained. But what I would see as working, and
3 when we're doing this at the State Department
4 now, you know, interagency committee meetings,
5 a lot of coordination, but that has to be
6 institutionalized, because it's only being
7 done in the context of Iraq and Afghanistan.
8 There isn't a standing institution where these
9 agencies can come and say, okay, let's train
10 with the military, let's understand what the
11 agricultural experts need to do, what the
12 treasury experts need to do, and let's
13 integrate. And we need to do that on the
14 federal government level in order to make
15 these missions work seamlessly.

16 I appreciate your framework very
17 much. To me, it looks like the end game. I
18 think that where you've got one of these broad
19 categories missing, we have to substitute in
20 some of these war torn -- substitute with the
21 military or whatever appropriate agency might
22 be so that we can basically give them a

1 prosthetic so that we can continue down this
2 road. And I'll end there. I could go on
3 forever. Thank you.

4 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Were you
5 looking for comment?

6 How about, you know, we have about
7 five more minutes. What I'd like to do is
8 take about three questions in a batch, and
9 then let the panelists comment on those.
10 Okay?

11 So we're going to start in the
12 back now, way in the back. That's you. Yes,
13 you. Stand up.

14 MR. GIOVINE: Thank you. Luigi
15 Giovine from the World Bank. I served as
16 Country Manager in Liberia between 2004 and
17 2007. This is a very comprehensive review
18 area. We recognize many of the documents
19 you've read, and one question concerning this
20 decentralization.

21 In our experience, at least in
22 West Africa, civilian military collaboration

1 worked best not only when there was will, and
2 that has been established, but when the
3 decision making authority, at both the
4 military level and the civilian, was such that
5 the path of least resistance and the
6 opportunities could be seized on the ground.

7 Now in this ambitious program of
8 interdisciplinary work on the whole of
9 government, speaking from the standpoint of
10 the US administration, would the Institute of
11 Peace comment on whether we have now an
12 appropriate division of labor and of
13 responsibility between US AID and the State
14 Department through diplomatic representations
15 to implement this based on the path of least
16 resistance in each country, or whether
17 doctrine or change will also need to be
18 implemented at that level in addition to
19 having stated and summarized these principles?

20 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Okay.

21 Another question right up here on the -- yes,
22 you. The woman -- I don't know, what color

1 shirt is that? Red? Pink? Okay. Great.

2 MS. SHANKLEMAN: Hi, I'm Jill
3 Shankleman from the Institute of Peace,
4 currently at the Wilson Center.

5 It's a related question. In terms
6 of passing the baton, are the basic building
7 blocks of the structures of USG appropriately
8 configured to deliver on these approaches?

9 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Wait for the
10 mic, please. Thank you.

11 MR. HABISS: John Habiss
12 (phonetic), the State University of New York
13 and Johns Hopkins SAIS.

14 It would seem that this framework
15 starts out as our framework, but in the end it
16 has to be their framework in terms of the host
17 country. And what I'm missing in this
18 discussion is how you make that dimension.
19 How this becomes their framework and
20 ultimately their priorities?

21 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Thank you.
22 Okay. So we have three questions.

1 Interesting that the doctrine has generated
2 policy questions. US AID and state resources,
3 the structure of the US Government, and the
4 perspective on the host nation.

5 Do you want to begin, General?

6 GENERAL CARDON: Okay. I'll be
7 fairly fast.

8 I'd start with doctrine before
9 organization. If you all understand the
10 frameworks, then you can adjust your doctrine
11 -- or view -- have the doctrine laid out, the
12 frameworks that you're going to operate, then
13 you organize accordingly.

14 As opposed to whether we have the
15 building blocks properly structured, I'm sort
16 of a realist, we are where we are today. I
17 would say, do we have what we want today? No,
18 we don't have what we want today.

19 Now, there's a lot of good work
20 going on in some places, but I would argue
21 much of it is in an ad hoc nature versus
22 institutional nature, and so there's a lot of

1 work to be done.

2 And the last piece, which I think
3 is very important, the transition from our
4 framework to their framework. To me, that's
5 all about the most important piece, which is
6 the education and training of host nation
7 leaders. And if that is not an integral
8 component of whatever we're doing here as part
9 of it, then it will all fall apart when we
10 leave. We didn't institutionalize what we
11 were doing on the ground.

12 MS. COLE: Yes, I don't think that
13 we should exaggerate the importance of this
14 doctrine; it's not the panacea. Things have
15 to be taken into the field, and you know, it's
16 kind of the cookbook, and the recipes have to
17 be cooked with the people that live in these
18 places.

19 I think the first question goes to
20 two things. One is is that this doctrine that
21 we've produced is strategic level doctrine.
22 It operates at the strategic level for

1 decision makers. It's about the big goals,
2 the big end states. I think what you're
3 talking about is more what happens on the
4 ground, and we don't have civilian tactical
5 doctrine, although the US Agency for National
6 Development and others, including the World
7 Bank, have produced incredible documents that
8 help people on the ground understand what does
9 it have to do at a tactical, task level.

10 In terms of the resources, I mean,
11 the US Agency for National Development has
12 been decimated over the last decade or so.
13 No, it needs a huge infusion of resources, and
14 so does the State Department needs to be
15 reconfigured to do these type of missions.
16 Some argue that we need a new agency.
17 Congress had the appetite for it. I'm not
18 quite sure. But you know, if you look at the
19 amount of money and the amount of time that we
20 spend in trying to stabilize these places, if
21 you agree that it is important, I would argue
22 that it's extremely important to the national

1 security of everyone sitting in this room
2 that, you know, we need to resource these
3 things appropriately, and they're not
4 resourced.

5 And third is this, you know, are
6 we configured correctly? I think there are
7 people working on that right now, and who are
8 looking at the current structures in the US
9 Government and trying to figure out how we can
10 put them on steroids.

11 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: I would say
12 there's two schools of thought on the
13 structure. There's keep the structure you
14 have, and it's really about quantity, and that
15 we just need more of similar things that we
16 have; we just haven't resourced them enough.
17 And then there's the school of thought that
18 says, no, really nobody actually does this
19 kind of stuff, and we need a different entity
20 somewhere somehow. And those are the
21 questions that are definitely being debated
22 right now.

1 And on the host country, Beth, I
2 thought you might want to -- the part of the
3 conflict assessment part is inherently about
4 assessing what's happening in that country and
5 what that host country needs and wants, what
6 their needs are. Is that --

7 MS. COLE: Yes, absolutely
8 correct.

9 MODERATOR DAVIDSON: Okay. So
10 that's what I would say about that.

11 Well, I think we're out of time,
12 and I'd just like to thank everyone for coming
13 and listening to the panel today. I hope you
14 enjoy the rest of the panels, and if we could
15 give our speakers a round of applause. Thank
16 you very much.

17 (Applause.)

18 (Whereupon, the panel was
19 concluded at 12:18 p.m.)

20

21

22

A				
abandon 24:11	admiral 8:6	alternative 29:3	Army's 26:13,18	basically 8:11 59:22
abides 45:15	advertise 54:7	Amazon 9:20 31:2	arrest 33:22	basis 50:16 53:5
ability 33:13,19	advisors 29:14	ambitious 61:7	arrives 45:8	58:17
35:8	advocated 5:22	Amendment 56:14	art 40:21 41:20	batch 60:8
able 9:20 33:13 34:2	afford 49:22	America 7:21 12:1	articles 7:8	baton 1:5 62:6
44:21 45:12,14	Afghan 25:16 47:4	American 12:3 17:4	asked 8:1	becoming 12:14
47:21 57:8	47:5	Americans 8:7	asking 57:6	beg 34:19
abroad 7:22	Afghanistan 11:20	amount 21:19 65:19	aspect 16:21	beginning 19:17
absolutely 3:9 6:14	12:5 13:5 14:16	65:19	assessing 52:7 67:4	23:15 37:16 42:10
55:2 59:1 67:7	15:8 22:1 25:1	anchor 4:17	assessment 41:3	42:12
Abu 45:10	26:5 29:3 30:20	Andreas 45:20	51:12 67:3	belief 7:18
abuses 33:18	35:12 41:2 42:19	answer 22:19 26:6	Assistance 27:13	believe 37:15
academic 35:7	43:2 47:4 59:7	42:17,20	assume 18:14	believed 5:22
academy 35:12	afraid 6:9	Answers 2:20	attempts 14:1	best 5:22 14:2 61:1
access 33:20	Africa 12:4 60:22	anthropologists	attend 21:12	Beth 1:20 2:18 4:5
accident 41:17	African 25:14 27:11	46:7	attention 48:17	14:8 38:21 41:11
accompanied 55:11	afternoon 37:18	anybody 7:21	Attorney 36:18	41:11 42:16 44:10
accomplish 25:20	agencies 15:3 18:15	anyway 8:17 12:9	attune 51:10	67:1
53:13	19:3 21:2,11,11	43:12	audience 27:22	better 10:15 13:21
accountability 47:6	25:1,12 30:5 37:9	apparently 46:19	30:21	19:3 21:13,21 22:6
accountable 33:16	49:17 55:1 56:8	appears 42:6	audio 1:22	22:6,7 29:15
accused 34:3 35:15	57:7,10,20 58:21	appetite 65:17	author 26:18	beyond 4:22 12:5
achieve 32:20 33:3	59:9	applause 67:15,17	authoritative 6:4	13:2
achieved 44:20	agency 20:21 21:3	appreciate 47:2	authorities 19:20	Bible 10:5
acknowledged	27:11 35:20 59:21	59:16	20:6,12,17	big 45:11 48:10
18:21	65:5,11,16	appreciation 46:13	authority 61:3	65:1,2
acquisitions 20:11	agency's 32:3	approach 17:10	authorizations 20:3	bigger 15:7
act 23:14	agenda 35:6	19:9 21:1,6 47:15	20:13 56:12	billion 52:20
action 5:19 6:12	ago 26:4	approaches 34:15	authorizers 54:18	billions 56:2
28:22 35:5 53:11	agree 6:16 23:22	34:16 62:8	awareness 52:19	bills 57:13
actions 17:15,21	36:1 42:1,14 54:1	appropriate 57:19	a.m 1:12 3:2	Bing 45:20,20
18:4 22:9,20	56:19 58:12 65:21	59:21 61:12		bio 14:13
activities 22:2,10	agreed 23:19	appropriately	B	bios 4:6
ad 20:4 63:21	agreement 50:17,18	57:15 58:1 62:7	back 11:20 14:21	bit 5:4 12:19 13:20
adapt 15:9	agricultural 59:11	66:3	23:14 41:13 55:18	13:21 26:10 28:11
adapted 15:8	Agriculture 29:2	appropriations	56:15 58:7 60:12	44:9 54:14
addition 48:11	31:7 57:19	20:4 57:13	60:12	blocks 62:7 63:15
61:18	ahead 3:4 5:15	appropriators	backs 28:8	blogs 7:8
address 33:17	39:16 40:3 58:6	54:19 57:14,17,18	Baghdad 49:3 50:16	blood 12:21 23:1
adequate 20:12	AID 61:13 63:2	area 60:18	Balkans 13:2	36:1
adhere 34:8	airborne 52:20	areas 19:1 49:3	bank 29:14 60:15	bloody 13:14,16
adjust 63:10	aisle 54:9	argue 23:5 35:10	65:7	Board 12:18
administration 1:6	Al 49:4	63:20 65:16,21	banks 29:11	books 7:8
1:13 28:7 31:6	allies 37:7	argued 42:10	base 21:18 47:10	borrowing 35:19
32:2 37:6,16,20	allow 21:9,11	Arms 4:3,10	based 15:3 34:16	Bosnia 24:22
61:10	all-encompassing	Army 2:14 9:13	39:6 52:7 61:15	boss 50:9
	22:5	14:5 46:2,5 47:20	baseline 6:15	bottom 8:11
	all-woman 27:19	48:4 51:20 53:19	basic 62:6	branches 23:19,22

brief 57:2	career 24:14	codify 15:13	component 22:15	27:10,12
Brigadier 1:19 4:2	carried 16:19	cognizant 43:20	64:8	coordinated 5:19
bring 47:7	case 6:18 9:10 11:9	coherent 40:1,21	components 17:9	15:2
brings 9:3 17:6	51:9	coherently 41:7	32:22	coordination 16:14
23:14 25:6	cases 6:19	Cole 1:20 2:18 4:5	comprehensive	23:12 59:5
British 8:8	casualty 13:8	24:7 42:17 44:11	16:9 19:9 60:17	core 16:20 18:22
Brits 25:13	categories 59:19	50:8 53:14 57:2	conceivable 16:22	corporal 18:3
broad 59:18	categorize 13:6	64:12 67:7	concept 16:7 43:15	Corporation 52:16
broader 4:17	causally 40:7	collaboration 23:11	concerning 60:19	Corps 19:19 46:2,5
brought 28:4	caveats 31:17	60:22	concluded 67:19	47:21 51:21 53:19
budget 43:11 54:16	Center 1:15 4:3,11	colleagues 10:4,11	condition 48:16	correct 59:1 67:8
build 24:2 26:15	26:12 39:19 62:4	collective 23:3	conditions 33:8,11	correctly 66:6
28:10 29:9,14	central 29:14	Colonel 8:6 26:17	34:10,14,17 53:3	cost 10:21
37:17 51:21	century 20:21	color 61:22	53:11	costly 12:21 13:14
building 20:2 51:1	certain 52:11	combat 12:20	conduct 5:1 19:13	13:16
62:6 63:15	cetera 49:10	combined 4:2,10	20:7,13 22:18	counter 12:19
built 26:8 27:16	chairman 42:21	17:21	configured 62:8	counterinsurgency
28:7,7 30:13 32:4	challenge 18:2	come 6:17 24:9	66:6	46:3 48:1,11
37:20	19:10 24:16,19	39:21 46:8,10	conflict 22:4,9,10	counterproductive
Burundi 25:17 51:4	40:11 58:3	53:22 56:15 59:9	30:6 31:14 32:18	47:16
buy 9:20	challenges 1:6 2:17	comes 6:20 23:7	40:17 51:7 53:17	Counter-Insurge...
	24:15	comfortable 27:2	67:3	9:15 12:13
	chance 15:10 37:13	43:16	confused 28:15	countries 41:1,2
C	change 48:10 61:17	coming 35:11 67:12	Congress 56:10	50:22 51:4
Caldwell 4:4	changing 49:8	commander 6:6	65:17	country 24:16 25:17
call 5:3 11:8 16:8	chaos 11:16	commander's 6:13	connected 49:9	41:20 51:2 60:16
28:16 32:21,22	check 46:21 47:14	Commander's 20:8	considerations	61:16 62:17 67:1,4
33:1 34:4 35:3,5	checkpoint 30:16	comment 37:2	20:19	67:5
37:12 52:18	Chicago 9:17	40:20 54:14 57:3	construct 20:21	couple 38:8 40:7
called 28:14 50:15	choose 44:2	60:5,9 61:11	32:10	42:18 43:10
53:17 57:11	chorus 23:13	comments 2:20 37:6	constructed 32:12	course 21:16 43:6
calls 10:5	circumstances 6:7	37:10,14 38:5	constructing 51:14	court 34:1 35:13
calm 36:4	citizen 34:6	committee 27:13	context 59:7	courts 33:20 35:16
capability 40:18	civil 4:17 21:16	42:22 59:4	contextual 6:11	crazy 24:8
56:1	civilian 18:4 19:19	common 5:19 16:12	11:5	create 29:3,10
capacities 21:3	25:1,5,10 27:3,4,6	16:15	continuation 16:19	created 18:2
capacity 18:12	29:2 30:4 38:19	communication	continue 12:9 15:9	creating 40:21 51:2
19:13 20:3 37:17	55:11 57:7,10	16:13 23:12	15:19 39:9 60:1	crime 29:18
49:17 55:14,16	60:22 61:4 65:4	community 4:18,18	continuing 57:11	crimes 33:18
capital 50:11	civilians 5:8 25:8,19	13:18 17:4 22:16	contrary 7:18	critical 23:3 58:3
Capitol 54:18 57:6	31:8,12 43:16	27:3,4 38:18 39:8	contributed 27:22	crossed 24:21
capstone 56:17	55:12	39:21 44:1	controversial 12:6	crowd 3:8,10,21
capture 15:6 19:7	Clausewitz 16:17	companion 53:15	Convention 1:15	cry 38:15
captured 48:21	clear 18:20	54:6	conventions 45:16	cultural 51:20 52:2
Cardon 1:19 2:15	clearly 15:12,16	comparison 55:10	cookbook 64:16	culturally 51:10
4:2 14:4,7 41:12	Clinton 37:16	completely 50:4	cooked 64:17	cultures 5:11
47:22 54:20 58:12	closely 12:19	complex 11:17	cookie 47:14	current 66:8
63:6	closing 23:15	complexities 40:3	cooperation 23:11	currently 62:4
cards 20:16				

cutter 47:14	28:20 42:11	division 61:12	echo 58:12	Engineers 53:19
cycle 18:5	deliberate 41:18	doctrinal 28:3 32:3	economies 29:17	enhance 6:2
cylinder-like 45:1	deliver 62:8	44:5	economy 18:11 33:5	enjoy 67:14
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	Department 15:14	doctrine 4:13 5:3,13	36:16,20 50:4	enter 30:8
2:8	21:17 27:13 57:15	5:17 6:1,3,9,20 7:5	Ed 1:19 2:15 4:2	enthusiasm 8:3 11:1
	57:17 58:9,13 59:3	7:6,11,17,18 8:4,8	educate 50:7	11:2
	61:14 65:14	8:9,10,13,17,20	education 10:9	entire 22:3
D	dependent 40:6	9:11 10:1,11,19	18:16 19:22 21:4	entity 66:19
dangerous 10:21	depends 11:5,6	11:1 12:10,12 16:6	41:22 64:6	enumerated 36:8
13:10,11 57:22	deploy 31:8,12	25:5,10 26:16,17	effected 50:22	environment 18:10
Daniel 50:10	36:18	26:19,21,22 27:1,6	effective 16:13	22:11 33:4 49:11
data 13:3	deputy 4:4 42:21	29:22 30:1,7,13,21	20:20	57:1
date 29:20	describe 18:9	31:3 32:6,10 35:2	effectiveness 6:2	environments 11:4
Davidson 1:21 2:11	described 33:11	38:10 48:4 52:3	17:13	53:18 57:22
3:3,14 26:16 38:6	34:15	61:17 63:1,8,10,11	effort 17:22 25:11	equal 48:6
41:9 42:16 44:4	design 21:16 41:18	64:14,20,21 65:5	53:15	equipped 58:2
45:18 51:19 54:8	desk 58:10	document 25:6,18	efforts 15:22 16:12	era 47:20
58:6 60:4 61:20	despite 8:3 50:6	26:8 28:5,12 31:16	16:16 41:4 47:10	especially 8:22
62:9,21 66:11 67:9	destroys 50:4	32:1,6 33:10 34:13	50:6	essence 36:21
day 20:1 49:8 56:17	detained 35:15	35:1 36:9,22 37:11	Eikenberry 42:22	essential 14:10
deal 36:20 41:5	detention 34:1	39:1 42:12 43:12	either 7:19 56:22	44:17 55:3
Death 50:15	45:10	44:12 45:1 51:8,17	elaborate 34:12	establish 18:1 34:17
debate 3:19,19,21	developed 8:22 46:3	documents 14:19	election 30:16	established 20:22
9:4,5 11:21 44:9	developers 10:2	15:22 16:6 19:4	elements 33:1 49:6	33:8 61:2
52:2	developing 8:19	21:17 22:5 23:4,9	Ellen 1:20 2:18	et 49:10
debated 66:21	19:18	27:19 28:3 32:4,5	embedding 46:7	EU 27:11
debt 57:3	development 10:8	33:7 44:5 50:21	embraced 32:2	European 25:15
decade 30:11 32:17	27:12,14 30:7	54:6 60:18 65:7	Emergency 20:8	event 3:18
65:12	35:20 41:4,22	DoD 5:16	employ 24:2	events 15:17
decades 25:8,21	56:18 65:6,11	doing 12:1,11 21:12	employee 20:17	everybody 8:16
30:10 51:7	diagram 44:22 45:6	30:18 34:19 38:16	employment 5:18	10:6,6
decentralization	dialogue 3:20	41:3 51:11 59:3	empower 36:3	everybody's 3:11
60:20	dictate 6:7	64:8,11	enable 47:2	32:15
decide 6:21 7:3 31:8	dictionary 5:16	dollars 42:18 43:10	enables 49:12	exactly 30:15 52:5
decided 13:19 27:2	differ 34:19	doomed 47:8	encourage 15:11	64:13
decimated 65:12	difference 41:15	download 14:22	54:3	examined 17:18
decision 31:7 32:19	differences 16:1	48:2	encouraging 19:16	example 34:10 40:9
35:22 40:22 61:3	different 21:10	Dr 26:16	endeavor 16:18	examples 40:5,7
65:1	66:19	draft 37:1	ends 13:3	49:4
dedicated 55:7	differs 40:16	drivers 40:16	endured 32:17	Excellence 26:12
deeds 17:22	dimension 62:18	dug 33:6	enemies 48:15	excellent 39:21
deeply 25:22	diplomatic 61:14	Dutch 25:15	enemy 46:9,11,11	53:14
defense 12:17 15:15	direction 18:8	Dziedzic 53:16 54:4	48:12,20	exception 58:18
57:14,16	director 4:4	D.C 1:2,17	energy 21:19	exceptional 6:6
defines 47:5	discussion 3:20 49:7		enforce 33:14	exclusive 15:14
definitely 45:16	62:18	E	enforcement 30:3	execute 18:17
66:21	disposal 44:1	E 1:15	engage 7:21 29:17	execution 15:21
definition 5:13,14	diverse 27:9	earlier 38:10 44:10	engaging 58:19	exercises 10:3 21:15
definitions 16:2				

existed 49:6	finally 10:10 31:16 32:5 34:5 36:10	40:1 42:4,6,14	George 3:15	20:18 25:4
exists 27:7	find 24:8,20 30:22 56:20	48:22 50:14 54:5	Germans 25:14	governments 22:7 25:3
expeditionary 21:3	fine 46:15	59:16 62:14,15,16	Ghraib 45:10	grand 7:19
expenditures 52:20	first 3:13 8:5 17:18 24:14,16 35:2	62:19 64:4,4	Giovine 60:14,15	graph 12:19
expensive 18:17	fixed 19:14	frameworks 25:17 32:15 47:5 51:3	give 5:6 27:18 28:6 31:17 37:12,13	grateful 20:5
experience 6:20 7:1 15:3 18:16 25:7	flag 57:4	63:10,12	42:18 59:22 67:15	gratitude 57:4
26:9 27:16 32:8	floats 11:14	free 14:22	given 40:5	great 4:11 14:10,18 19:4 30:22 46:10
38:1 41:14 55:6	fly 10:15,16	freedom 29:5	gives 25:19	62:1
60:21	FM-307 8:22	French 25:13	glean 38:13	ground 30:5,12 36:2 45:8 51:12
experienced 15:5	focus 15:21 16:1,4 16:16	friends 14:11	globe 22:3	52:8,18 55:7,14
expert 26:17 29:3	focused 22:1 30:14	front 7:13 33:10 52:14 54:22	go 3:4 4:6 5:14 9:7 17:12 28:19 32:11	61:6 64:11 65:4,8
expertise 46:8 58:22	folks 30:9	frontier 12:3	36:15 37:19 39:16	groups 17:2
experts 59:11,12	follow 8:10	full 31:15	41:13,22 43:3	growing 49:16
explosion 48:4	followed 6:4	function 48:14 56:22	47:18 51:12 58:6 60:2	Grumman 52:16
extent 58:18	footnoted 51:17	fundamental 5:17 10:13 44:19	goals 1:13 39:22 51:6,10 65:1	guidance 1:13 6:4 18:8 27:9 32:16
extracted 34:20 44:13	forced 18:13	funded 57:15 58:16	goes 9:21 11:20 20:20 23:7 33:21	guide 5:17 16:7 28:22
extremely 20:5 45:7 65:22	forces 5:18 6:3 24:21 30:4,8	fundings 55:2 56:8 57:7	52:3 55:18 64:19	Guidelines 26:21
	foreign 1:6 21:13 57:18	funds 20:9,9 58:11	going 3:4,18 5:4,10 5:14 6:13,19 7:3	guiding 6:15 10:19 11:3 15:1
F	forerunner 48:3	further 40:2	8:16 9:18 10:22	guys 7:7 57:18
fabulous 3:17	foreseen 40:14	future 22:10	12:8 13:22 19:7,14	
facet 17:7	forever 60:3	futures 23:3	22:19 24:10 25:5	H
facilitate 22:9	form 40:13		27:3 29:6,7,8,10	Habiss 62:11,11
facilitates 16:13	formal 7:11,12	gain 42:19	29:16 31:14,17	Haiti 13:2
facing 1:6 24:15 58:4	Fort 4:3	game 59:17	34:2 36:19 45:9	hand 6:13 35:14 39:14
fact 22:19 28:13 51:17 53:20 54:12	forth 53:10	gap 45:11	49:7 53:22 56:19	handbooks 6:12
fail 47:8	forthcoming 34:13	gaps 35:18 38:20 39:7	57:5 60:11 63:12 63:20	handed 37:22
failed 11:16	forthright 55:17	Gates 54:22 55:16 57:5	good 6:18 13:17 30:14 50:1 63:19	handle 34:2
fairly 46:22 63:7	forward 19:5 21:18 24:6 38:4 41:22	gather 32:8	goods 29:6	handrail 11:8
fall 64:9	foster 21:2	gearing 58:16,17	governance 18:11 33:4 40:17	happen 9:6 10:7
famed 29:13	fought 4:20 57:12	general 1:19 2:15 4:2,4 5:9 7:13	government 7:12 15:15 16:8 17:3,5	happening 67:4
far 20:11	found 32:14 33:6 50:19	14:4,7 26:4 36:18	18:13 19:4,9,11	happens 65:3
farther 11:20	foundation 20:22	38:15 41:10,12	20:17 21:1 25:2	hard 13:10 39:6 41:17,17 55:20
fast 63:7	fragile 4:12	43:7 47:22 54:11	31:4,21 36:6 37:9	56:3
fatal 59:14	frame 7:9	54:20 58:11 63:5,6	41:4 49:10 52:8	harmonious 17:16
field 4:20,20 8:14 9:5,9,15 10:14	framework 11:3,7 16:15 18:9 23:4,5	generalities 46:17	53:21 55:8 58:21	hate 8:17
32:9 39:4 46:1		generated 63:1	59:14 61:9 63:3	head 30:18
64:15		generation 30:9	66:9	hear 6:19 13:22 38:21
fight 46:9,11 48:15		Geneva 25:12	governmental	heard 24:17 38:14
fighting 48:7		gentleman 39:15		heart 5:10
figure 10:16 43:3 66:9				
fill 35:18 38:20				

help 11:6 22:6,6,8 29:14 31:11 32:10 38:15 65:8	immediately 49:8	institutionalize 64:10	issues 4:12 52:9	knows 10:7
helping 26:14	impacts 16:21 18:5	institutionalized 59:6	J	L
helps 9:8	implement 21:4 61:15	institutions 44:14	Janine 1:21 2:11 3:14 14:8 26:16 27:5 28:15 43:7	labor 61:12
Hi 39:18 62:2	implemented 40:15 61:18	instruments 23:20 24:1,3	JANUARY 1:9	lack 18:12,15
highlight 38:8	implications 18:7	insurance 20:19	Japanese 25:16 27:10	laid 63:11
highlighted 35:21	imply 45:2	insurgencies 41:5	Jill 62:2	landmark 50:17
Hill 54:18 57:6	importance 15:18 29:5 41:21 64:13	integral 17:19 64:7	job 12:8 36:17 49:10	language 16:12 21:13
Hiring 20:17	important 6:7 8:2 8:20 9:1,2,22 17:17 22:17 35:17	integrate 15:22 19:10 59:13	John 52:15 62:11	large 3:8,10
historically 12:22	incorporated 21:14	integration 16:14 23:15	Johns 62:13	larger 55:18
hoc 20:4 63:21	incorporating 21:7	intellectual 50:11	judges 36:18	latest 14:2
hold 7:14 33:15	increase 20:10	intelligence 52:21 53:6	judgment 6:6	law 18:10 33:4,12 33:14 34:4,5,7,8,8 34:11 36:13 44:16 47:5 52:4,6,6 56:5
holistic 17:10	incredible 44:13 65:7	intended 32:3	jump 40:2	laws 20:15 33:12,14 33:16 34:9 45:15
hone 4:22	indicates 44:22	intentioned 40:8	June 14:18	lay 23:4,5
honestly 42:20	Indonesians 56:13	inter 21:2	justice 33:20 34:3	lead 17:14 26:18
honor 24:13	infer 44:7	interagency 59:4	K	leaders 21:11,14 33:17 50:7,18 64:7
hope 15:10 32:1 33:9 58:4 67:13	inform 38:14	intercourse 16:19 17:8	Kansas 4:3	leadership 4:16 47:6
hopefully 3:19 30:22 31:2	informal 7:6	interdisciplinary 61:8	Karl 42:22	Leahy 56:14
Hopkins 62:13	information 17:21 18:5	interest 22:13,14,15	keep 8:2 66:13	learn 8:21 11:10 15:9 32:7 37:18 39:4,9
horn 12:4	informed 34:7 39:2	interested 3:11	key 16:2 52:2	learned 9:4 15:8 23:1 26:21,22 34:16
horribly 47:15	infusion 65:13	interesting 5:7 56:21 63:1	kill 19:7	leave 64:10
host 17:3 22:7 25:1 52:8 62:16 63:4 64:6 67:1,5	inherently 13:14,15 67:3	international 16:9 17:4,9 18:6 19:11 21:8 22:14,16 27:10 35:20	kind 5:11 10:6 11:7 36:14 38:15 40:12 43:9 48:16 52:5 55:18 57:8 64:16 66:19	legacy 33:18
hosting 3:17	initial 19:21	interrelated 45:6	kinds 6:22	legal 47:4
hour 3:5	inner 20:20	interventions 22:8	kits 27:7	legislative 20:6
hour-and-a-half 42:21	inside 47:3 56:10	inter-agency 21:8 21:14	knew 56:13	legitimacy 16:21 17:1,6,20 18:1,18 22:21 36:6 40:10
Howard 8:11	insight 46:12	introduce 53:9	know 6:9 8:12,15 9:14 11:6,16 13:13 14:12,12 23:2 25:10,18 31:2 34:19,22 35:1,4 36:11 38:17 41:11 43:5,9,10 44:12 45:4 46:11 48:11 52:17 53:16 56:14 57:9 59:4 60:6 61:22 64:15 65:18 66:2,5	legitimate 23:22
huge 28:17 37:1 65:13	instance 9:16 52:5	intuitive 12:20	knowledge 38:19 39:7	lend 58:22
human 45:14,15	Institute 1:1,22 3:17 4:5,10 14:9 26:14 31:1,18,20 61:10 62:3	invaluable 20:7		Leonard 26:18
humane 34:1	institution 35:7 59:8	involved 52:1		Leone 25:17 51:4
humanitarian 19:12	institutional 63:22	Iraq 10:17 11:19 12:4 13:4 14:16 15:7 22:1 41:1,14 45:10 58:9,18,19 59:7		lessons 22:22 23:2 34:16 41:17
humbly 36:22		ISR 52:20		let's 43:1,2,2 59:9 59:10,12
I		issue 39:3 55:17		Leveanworth 4:3
ID 20:16				level 59:14 61:4,18
idea 46:10 48:12 50:2				
ideas 15:6 18:1 46:22 47:7				
illicit 29:17 36:20				
imagine 3:11				

64:21,22 65:9 leverage 10:14 Liberia 60:16 life 28:10 31:21 light 17:19 limb 28:10 line 21:18 44:6 linkages 36:11 list 20:20 35:3 46:17 46:21 47:13 listed 44:6 listening 38:12 67:13 lists 30:15 little 5:4 12:19 13:20,21 26:10 40:2 44:9 live 64:17 livelihood 29:4 lives 10:11,21 living 32:6 local 17:2 18:6 32:17 47:11 50:4 51:11,13 53:5 long 6:21 11:19,19 12:2 13:11 39:5 46:17 47:13 longer 42:20 look 12:18 24:5 32:14,15 35:6,8 38:4 41:14 43:2,19 46:16 47:1 52:3 53:8 56:11 65:18 looked 14:13,13 25:16 50:21 looking 60:5 66:8 looks 54:4 59:17 lord 36:3 40:9 lost 46:19 lot 6:8 8:4,7,9,9 11:3 12:10,11 13:5 23:1 34:21,22 41:11 44:7,21 48:13,17 49:16 50:3,11 55:7 56:10 56:21 59:5 63:19 63:22 lots 8:8 41:2	loves 8:16 Luigi 60:14 Lund 39:18,18 <hr/> M <hr/> machine 55:21 magazines 7:8 Mahmudiya 50:14 main 17:22 major 12:20 22:18 32:20 35:12,21 37:7,10 maker 32:19 35:22 makers 31:8 65:1 making 34:9 40:22 61:3 manage 58:10 Manager 60:16 manual 7:16 9:15 9:18 12:14 14:20 48:1,8 49:18 51:21 manuals 7:13 9:12 15:6 18:7 21:22 23:18 46:2 49:21 52:1 Marie 58:8 Marine 46:2,5 47:20 51:21 market 29:7 Mason 3:15 matter 8:12 55:5,5 matters 8:13 maximum 17:13 mean 31:1 35:16 43:9 50:2 55:10 57:3 65:10 means 16:20 17:11 33:20,21 40:4 44:7 measure 53:10 54:2 55:20 56:3,5 measures 55:22 Measuring 53:17 mechanics 23:16 mechanism 40:13 mechanisms 40:22 41:6 meet 39:9 meetings 59:4	megagaps 35:3,9 mentioned 47:4 54:12 merging 5:11 messaging 38:17 messy 13:10 metrics 53:3,9 55:19 mic 62:10 Michael 8:11 39:18 Michigan 9:19 microcredit 29:10 Microphone 45:19 microphones 39:13 micro-economics 50:2 Mike 53:16 54:3 military 4:17 5:18 6:3 10:1,3 12:7 16:18 17:11,12,14 18:14,16,20 21:10 21:16 24:10 26:12 38:16 39:1 42:22 52:19 53:5,12 55:21 57:4 59:10 59:21 60:22 61:4 million 42:18 43:10 millions 9:17 mind 8:2 Mindanao 41:3 minimum 22:16 minutes 38:7 60:7 missing 59:19 62:17 mission 31:21 32:4 32:22 38:3 44:3 53:12 missions 12:6,17 14:3 18:22 25:20 25:22 28:19 31:15 58:3 59:15 65:15 mistake 50:8 MODERATED 1:21 MODERATOR 3:3 38:6 41:9 42:16 44:4 45:18 51:19 54:8 58:6 60:4 61:20 62:9,21	66:11 67:9 money 23:1 29:11 29:15,19 43:7 50:3 53:8 54:16 56:1,4 57:9,19 65:19 monies 56:12 monitor 52:17 months 55:13 morning 24:18 Moser 58:8,8 Mount 1:16 movement 29:5 moving 21:18 multinational 16:10 multiple 15:2 music 9:8 myriad 30:4 <hr/> N <hr/> name 3:14 39:16 narrowly 56:22 nation 17:3 22:7 63:4 64:6 national 17:9 18:6 19:16 22:13 65:5 65:11,22 nations 26:14 NATO 25:15 37:7 NATO's 42:22 nature 63:21,22 nebulous 48:16 necessarily 52:11 necessary 23:11,12 33:7 41:8 need 20:20 21:1,4 23:20 33:8,12,13 33:15,19 34:6,6,20 35:8 39:8 43:3,6 49:10 54:1 55:18 56:1,4,6 57:16,21 59:11,12,13 61:17 65:16 66:2,15,19 needs 9:6 31:6 32:7 35:22 39:9 45:12 51:5 65:13,14 67:5 67:6 neighboring 17:3 neither 38:11	never 14:15 42:3,11 new 1:6,13 7:15 9:15 10:18,19 23:2 25:12 38:22 62:12 65:16 nice 46:15 nine 20:18 non 25:3 53:1 non-governmental 16:10 normally 18:14 19:2 56:1 Northrop 52:16 noticed 57:9 novel 20:6 nuclear 24:17 number 22:17 28:17 numbers 55:10 N.W 1:2,16 <hr/> O <hr/> Obama 28:7 31:6 37:5 objective 5:19 objectives 51:6,11 52:18 53:1,9 obtain 17:13 obviously 8:3 OECD 37:7 offer 31:22 36:22 Office 51:2 58:14 officer 33:21 officers 21:10 55:7 57:5 official 5:14 27:9 32:1 oh 9:11 39:6 okay 56:3 59:9 60:10 61:20 62:1 62:22 63:6 67:9 old 14:10 once 16:17 19:6 49:5,6 ongoing 19:15 open 13:17 37:2,3 39:11 opening 2:10 54:6
---	---	--	--	---

operate 30:16 42:4 42:14 46:15 63:12	42:4	31:13 32:8,9,16	points 20:11 46:12	private 16:11 19:13
operates 64:22	overcome 47:21	33:16,19 34:6,18	police 33:21 35:13	privilege 24:14
operating 41:6	overstated 41:19	35:15 37:21 38:1	35:14	probably 11:14
57:10	owe 57:3	39:2,12 44:7,14	policy 1:6 7:19 27:8	38:13 41:19
operation 17:18	O-F 2:8	45:4 51:3,6,15,22	38:11,18 52:12	problem 38:22 39:1
36:3 57:1	P	52:8 55:4 57:16,22	63:2	45:11 49:19 55:19
operational 6:2	packet 4:7	64:17 65:8 66:7	political 16:19 17:8	procedures 5:21
41:13	panacea 64:14	perfect 10:12	17:19 23:19,21	40:22
operationalization	panel 1:12 3:16 4:1	perfection 37:3	politics 17:6	process 8:19 9:1,3,7
41:10	5:8 67:13,18	perform 23:21	popular 7:18	10:21 37:2
operationalize	panelists 1:18 60:9	performing 19:1,2	population 44:17	processes 19:20
40:12 42:2,9	panels 67:14	period 6:21	48:16,19,20 51:11	produced 31:18
operationalized	papers 27:8,8	person 45:13	51:13	64:21 65:7
41:16 42:13	par 48:6	perspective 17:1	populations 48:13	product 9:2
operations 2:14 5:2	part 17:15 31:20	63:4	populous 17:2	products 8:22
7:16 11:13 12:2,14	34:9 56:17 64:8,9	phase 13:7	possible 19:8	professor 3:14
12:21 13:1,6 14:5	67:2,3	phonetic 45:21	post 22:9	profoundly 25:22
14:19 15:1,4,7,13	PARTICIPANT	62:12	potential 21:5	program 14:10
15:14,18 16:3,4,22	54:10	physical 52:17 53:1	power 15:5,5 17:10	27:15 29:4 50:17
17:7,17 18:22	participation 34:6	53:2,8	17:20 24:1,3	56:17 61:7
19:14 20:8,14 22:2	particular 11:15	pick 29:18 31:3	PowerPoint 5:9	programs 20:4,10
22:12,18,21 23:2	36:4,5 40:15 41:1	44:2 45:9	24:9,11	21:5,9 29:10
23:16,17,21 26:13	partners 19:12	picking 38:9	practice 4:18 6:20	progress 53:17 54:2
26:19 27:14,18	38:19	picture 25:19	7:10 13:18 39:8,21	project 19:15 50:12
28:9,13,14,16 30:2	parts 17:19 55:8	piece 64:2,5	practices 14:3	Prop 7:15
31:20 32:21 43:15	passage 15:17	pillars 33:1 44:6	practitioners 4:19	proper 46:22
48:6,9 49:18 50:10	passing 1:5 62:6	Pink 62:1	Premiere 26:11	properly 43:8 44:3
57:18	path 61:5,15	place 1:16 25:9	preparation 15:20	63:15
opportunities 1:6	patience 43:22	34:21 36:5 45:13	prepare 31:11	prosthetic 60:1
61:6	pay 48:17	45:14 47:7	presence 30:3	protect 29:7,11
opposed 63:14	peace 1:1,22 3:17	places 40:15 63:20	present 24:11	protected 29:16,16
order 7:9 33:14	4:6,10 15:1,13,16	64:18 65:20	presented 2:17	protracted 13:14,15
44:3,8,20 46:8	16:3 17:7 19:8	plan 31:10 51:14	24:16,19	proud 27:20
47:5 59:14	22:3 24:3 28:10,13	planner 31:9 32:18	pretty 3:18 48:21	provide 16:6,12
organization 19:19	29:19 30:3 31:1,18	planning 15:20	prevent 22:6	18:7 23:18 44:17
27:12 63:9	50:10 51:1 57:1,7	16:14 37:20 53:12	prevention 30:6	provided 1:22 50:11
organizations 4:15	61:11 62:3	plans 53:11	primarily 31:4	province 36:4
16:11 19:12,18	peacekeeper 45:8	players 22:17	principle 16:21 17:1	provinces 35:14
20:18 25:4 27:9	peacekeeping 23:17	please 27:22 39:17	principles 5:1,17	provincial 20:1 53:4
28:3,19	26:13,15,20 27:14	62:10	6:15 10:13,20 15:1	provisions 20:6
organizationsp	30:3 31:19	pleasure 4:8	28:21 61:19	public 17:5 33:17
16:11	Pentagon 54:15,21	plenty 3:6	prior 48:15	publish 9:13 31:1
organize 63:13	people 4:11 6:8,21	point 5:7 7:3 8:6	priorities 40:14	37:4
organized 29:17	7:3 8:4,8,10 9:3,8	13:9 39:14,22 40:4	41:10 43:4 44:20	published 9:16,18
originated 50:22	9:11 10:18 11:3	42:8 51:20 52:2,6	45:17 62:20	23:9
overall 17:18 53:5	13:13 19:22 27:17	56:3	prioritization 43:14	publisher 30:22
overarching 16:7	27:21 28:8 31:11	pointed 28:15 43:8	45:2 49:14	purely 16:18
		44:10	prison 34:1	purpose 6:1

<p>purpose-based 33:2 pushing 55:2 put 6:10 7:3 9:12 14:1 34:20 35:2 36:1 40:1 45:12 48:6 53:5 56:11 66:10 puts 7:12 31:9 P-R-O-C-E-E-D... 3:1 p.m 67:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>Qaeda 49:4 qualitative 53:3,10 quantity 66:14 quest 17:5 question 6:18 13:18 26:7 45:19 46:20 52:13 53:14 54:8 54:10,13 55:15,19 60:19 61:21 62:5 64:19 questioning 14:14 questions 2:20 3:7 24:6 38:7 39:12 60:8 62:22 63:2 66:21 quick 20:9 58:10 quite 10:12 46:4 65:18 quote 23:6 quotes 8:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>Radical 46:12 raise 39:13 rapidly 19:15 reach 33:9 Reaction 20:9 read 5:15 7:8 12:15 15:11,12 28:2,5 36:13,15 56:15 60:19 readers 9:17 readiness 21:15 reads 9:11 10:6 ready 23:10,13,14</p>	<p>real 55:19 realist 63:16 realities 47:11 reality 23:13 realize 7:7 21:5 really 4:16 8:12,20 8:20 9:10,14 12:8 12:11 26:6 28:15 32:19 34:18 35:4 36:17 37:15 39:5,6 39:20 48:10 51:16 58:3 66:14,18 reason 3:22 reasons 8:18 56:7 receive 34:3 37:10 received 37:6 receiving 55:2 reception 54:17 recipes 64:16 recognize 15:12 60:18 recognized 18:21 recognizes 49:18 recognizing 47:9 50:9 reconciliation 50:17 reconfigured 65:15 reconnaissance 52:21 53:7 reconstruction 20:2 58:14 Red 62:1 Redding 45:21 reform 19:16 regional 53:4 regulations 20:16 related 62:5 relationship 46:1 relearned 22:22 relevant 14:9 Remarks 2:10 remember 12:3 renewed 15:17 repeatedly 57:6 replace 32:3 reporting 53:4 representations 61:14</p>	<p>Representative 26:3 representatives 53:20 represents 5:21 reproduce 47:20 request 54:16,17 required 21:5 requires 17:10 research 7:2 35:5 reserved 18:14 19:2 resistance 61:5,16 resolution 53:13 57:11 resource 21:2 23:20 24:2 66:2 resourced 43:8 58:2 66:4,16 resources 18:18 23:6 38:18 43:21 54:14 63:2 65:10 65:13 respect 34:8 47:10 respects 45:14 response 19:19 20:9 58:10 responsibility 61:13 rest 67:14 restrictions 56:11 result 49:20 resulted 49:20 results 18:19 returned 14:18 reversed 48:18 review 60:17 revision 37:11 reward 20:9 rich 27:16 right 8:14 11:22 30:18 39:14 45:19 52:12,13 56:20 61:21 66:7,22 rights 45:14,15 risked 28:9 River 24:21 road 60:2 roadmap 26:7 roads 29:8,9</p>	<p>role 19:1 roles 18:14 19:2 Rommel 8:6 room 1:15 66:1 root 48:19 Rossman 52:15,16 roughest 49:3 round 67:15 rule 18:10 33:4,12 34:4,5,10 36:13 44:16 52:4,6 56:4 run 30:15 running 35:12 Russian 8:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>safe 18:9 33:3 49:11 SAIS 62:13 sap 22:21 sat 28:2 42:20 Sava 24:21 saves 10:11 saw 45:9 saying 11:5 30:19 says 7:22 8:12,13 10:11 52:6 66:18 scenario 10:2,8 school 27:1 66:17 schools 21:9,12 66:12 science 12:17 41:19 46:8 sciences 46:6 scope 31:15 scratching 30:18 script 54:13 seamlessly 59:15 seats 3:4 Secretary 26:4 29:1 29:12 31:7 54:22 55:16 57:5 section 36:13,16 43:19 sector 19:13 secure 18:10 33:3 49:11 security 19:16 41:5 44:15 49:5 66:1</p>	<p>see 3:9 4:16 12:12 13:1 14:10 46:4,17 59:2 seen 11:14 15:4 seized 61:6 selection 19:21 seminar 14:14 send 10:17 29:2 43:18 sending 29:13 57:21 sense 46:5,20 47:9 47:19 sequence 43:5 44:2 49:13 sequencing 40:14 43:13 45:2,5 serve 21:10 served 4:19 60:15 services 44:17 Serwer 50:10 set 5:5 40:14 setting 14:9 seven 24:22 35:16 52:22 severely 58:15 shake 52:9 Shankleman 62:2,3 shape 22:8,8,10 share 8:4 11:1,2 shared 4:22 28:18 28:20,21 sheet 9:8 shelf 9:13 shirt 62:1 short 42:17 show 45:6 shows 37:22 side 41:13 Sierra 25:17 51:4 sign 36:14 signal 11:22 significant 22:17 similar 18:9 44:6 51:5 66:15 similarities 16:5 simple 20:10 sing 23:8 single 51:9</p>
--	---	---	---	---

sir 7:15 8:11	SRS 26:3	strategic 18:3,3 31:9 32:15,18 64:21,22	synergy 16:5	62:10,21 67:12,15
site 48:2	stability 2:14 7:15 11:13,17 12:13 13:1,6 14:5,19 15:13,18 16:3,22 17:7,17 18:21 19:8 19:14 20:13 22:4 22:12,18 23:16 24:4 26:13,19 28:12 31:19 48:6,8 49:18 50:10 57:1	strategy 7:19 38:11	system 34:2 37:21 54:2	thanks 14:8 45:20 54:6
sitting 11:10 66:1	Stabilization 58:14	Street 1:2	systems 33:15	theater 47:11
situation 42:3 52:7 52:18	stabilize 65:20	strongholds 49:4	<hr/> T <hr/>	theaters 46:14
situations 17:15	stabilizing 1:12 4:12	structure 63:3 66:13,13	tactical 65:4,9	theirs 22:14
skeptical 47:12	stable 18:11 33:4	structured 63:15	tactics 5:20	themes 38:8
sketch 44:19	stage 5:5 58:20	structures 40:18 62:7 66:8	take 3:4,8 12:18 13:11 43:1,7 60:8	theoretical 58:17,20
slide 11:14 32:12	stages 19:21	struggle 15:20 17:22 49:15	taken 64:15	theory 7:2,10 14:2
slides 5:9 24:12	stand 27:22 60:13	struggled 15:19	takes 15:15 30:11 30:11 39:5	thing 8:7 12:16 23:9 53:7 56:9
small 21:20,20 55:10	standing 59:8	struggles 56:7	talk 5:4 14:4 26:10 43:13,13,14 57:16	things 6:22 7:8 10:16 13:9 35:4 38:14 40:6 43:6,18 43:20 44:18,21 47:13,18 49:12 51:16 52:4 53:12 64:14,20 66:3,15
social 18:12 33:5 46:6,7 49:9	standpoint 61:9	struggling 11:18 39:3	talked 25:13,14 35:11 36:10 41:21 43:17 55:4	think 3:18 5:10 7:9 9:5 10:22 11:9 12:20 13:19 38:11 39:20 41:12,16,20 42:2 47:16 48:20 49:15 54:17 55:5 55:16 56:5,6 58:13 58:15,20 59:18 64:2,12,19 65:2 66:6 67:11
societies 11:17 47:3	start 5:12 6:12 12:11 14:4 39:14 60:11 63:8	students 21:8	talking 4:13 11:12 51:3,13 52:10 56:16 65:3	third 66:5
society 46:22	started 3:5 25:11	study 12:18 13:3,12 35:8	task 30:15 65:9	thought 7:10 14:2 66:12,17 67:2
soldiers 49:2	starting 16:2	stuff 6:10 38:16,22 39:5 43:5,9 50:2 55:22 66:19	tasks 18:17 30:14 30:17	thousands 27:17
solely 21:22	starts 49:8 56:2 62:15	submit 51:15	taught 5:21	three 8:18 25:8,21 30:10 50:5 60:8 62:22
Solinas 26:20	state 21:17 40:18,21 57:17 58:9,13 59:3 61:13 62:12 63:2 65:14	substitute 59:19,20	team 27:20	thresholds 20:10
solution 47:17	stated 61:19	success 17:16 44:3	teams 10:17 20:2	thrilled 3:9,15
Somalia 13:2	statements 32:4	sudden 46:18	technical 58:22	throw 50:3
somewhat 24:8	states 1:1,12,22 2:17 4:12 7:21 11:16,18 17:3 18:9 24:19 29:21 30:20 31:4 32:20 33:2,9 36:2 51:6 58:4 65:2	Suite 1:1	technically 36:12	THURSDAY 1:9
soon 6:11 37:5	statutory 20:22	summarized 61:19	techniques 5:20	tie 6:13
sort 5:5,11 6:8 10:4 10:5,13 11:7 12:19 13:17 14:1 40:13 46:8,21 47:9,16,18 54:17 63:15	step 19:5	supplemental 57:13	tell 50:13,20 54:21 56:4	time 3:6 5:6 6:21 9:6,19 11:19 13:11 15:17 18:18 25:9 28:4,21 30:7 32:7 35:2 37:11,21 39:5 43:17,21,22 65:19 67:11
sorted 39:22	steps 21:20	supplies 29:11	tells 14:22	times 18:15 50:5
sorts 12:2,6	steroids 66:10	supply 29:15	tenth 43:11	
sources 40:16	Steve 26:17	support 20:22 22:7 30:17 50:12 51:1 55:18	term 25:6 27:2 43:16	
Southern 49:3 50:15	stifling 56:18	supporting 55:1	terminology 11:21 28:18	
speak 5:6,10 44:9 47:14	stop 36:14	sure 3:6 10:18 23:7 65:18	terms 5:20 18:18 28:17 40:16 43:14 46:3 48:22 62:5,16 65:10	
speakers 38:12 67:15		surge 55:11,13	terrorists 29:18	
speaking 61:9		surveillance 52:21 53:6	thank 3:16 14:6,7 24:5,7 38:4,6 41:9 45:18 51:19 52:15 58:10 60:3,14	
Special 26:3		survive 49:7		
specific 17:14		sustainable 15:16 18:11 33:5 36:16		
specifically 8:21 30:1 54:4		symbolic 24:8		
specificities 46:9,13		synchronization 16:15		
specificity 46:18				
spectrum 22:3				
spend 65:20				
spending 53:8				
spent 22:22				

title 14:14	26:5 30:19 32:20	USIP's 43:11	web 48:2	59:2 66:7
titles 16:3	33:3 39:4 49:21	usual 46:21	week 35:11	works 5:22
today 3:19 4:1,14	65:20 66:9	utilize 31:22	went 24:22 25:11	workshop 37:19
4:16 5:5,8 6:19	turn 37:5	U.S 3:16	26:11,16,17,19	world 24:4,9 26:15
11:10,13 12:4,12	turning 11:16	<hr/>	27:1,5 49:1,2	27:7 39:2 45:4
14:1 24:9,12 25:21	turns 3:21	V	weren't 11:9	51:15 60:15 65:6
35:10 38:12 63:16	tweak 27:4	<hr/>	West 60:22	write 8:7,9,17 9:12
63:17,18 67:13	two 4:9,15 5:8 7:5	ven 45:5	Western 46:22	writing 6:10,12 7:4
tons 53:8	8:5 14:1,18 15:21	Vernon 1:16	westernized 52:11	14:2 52:1
tool 17:11 27:7	24:11,15 48:5 50:5	versus 40:9 63:21	we'll 4:13 14:4	written 26:20 56:21
tools 31:22	56:16 64:20 66:12	vetting 37:2	47:18	wrong 56:20
topic 3:10,12,20	type 65:15	vexing 24:15	we're 3:4,18 11:12	<hr/>
11:15	types 7:5 12:16 14:3	vibrant 3:19	12:7 13:16 19:2	X
torn 2:17 11:17	T-A-B-L-E 2:8	vice 20:4	20:2,5 21:7,12,18	X 56:1,6
24:19 59:20	<hr/>	Vice-President 50:9	28:15 30:17 34:19	<hr/>
totally 54:1	U	victims 31:13	42:6 43:8 49:15	Y
touch 54:3	<hr/>	victory 19:7	50:1 53:7 59:3	year 9:19 26:4
tour 50:6	Ugo 26:19	view 56:18 63:11	60:11 64:8 67:11	27:19 53:22 58:5
trade-off 36:7	ultimately 62:20	Von 16:17	we've 11:18 12:1	years 4:9 24:14,18
trade-offs 35:21	UN 25:3,12 26:20	<hr/>	15:8 21:13 22:21	24:20,22 35:16
36:8	27:13,14 37:8 51:1	W	22:22 23:1 25:13	48:5 52:22 53:21
train 59:9	undergoing 37:10	wage 57:7	25:14 28:4,14	York 25:12 62:12
trained 58:2 59:2	undermine 22:20	wait 44:18 62:9	32:12 35:21 37:6	<hr/>
trainers 10:2 31:10	29:19 36:5	Walter 1:15	45:5 48:21 56:7	\$
training 10:8 19:22	Underneath 34:14	want 3:6 6:9 7:14	64:21	\$28 52:20
21:4,13,15 35:13	underpins 49:11	29:18 34:7 36:13	wepll 30:22	<hr/>
37:21 48:14 64:6	understand 6:8	38:8 39:13 44:9	white 27:8	1
transcript 1:22	10:18 29:4,6,8,9	50:20 51:16 55:22	whops 26:20	1,000 28:4
transition 64:3	29:15,20 30:10	63:5,17,18 67:2	widely 12:14	100 55:12
traveled 56:13	31:15 36:1,7,19	wanted 5:12	willingness 54:15	11:15 3:2
treasure 12:22 36:2	38:2 56:2 57:21	wants 51:5 67:5	Wilson 39:19 62:4	11:15-12:15 1:12
treasury 29:12,13	59:10 63:9 65:8	war 2:17 11:17	win 17:22	12:18 67:19
57:20 58:20 59:12	undertake 50:12	16:17 22:5,6 24:19	woman 32:17 61:22	1200 1:2
tremendous 16:5	underway 21:16	33:18 36:3 40:9	women 28:1	13 24:20
21:19	Union 25:15,15	48:7 59:20	wonder 26:6	14 2:15
Triangle 50:15	27:11	wars 57:12	wondering 53:2	15 24:14
tribal 50:18	unique 42:3	WAR-TORN 1:12	wont 36:12	17th 1:2
tried 37:17	United 1:1,22 7:20	washing 47:13	words 17:21 18:4	18 24:18
tri-folds 14:21	29:21 31:4 36:2	Washington 1:2,15	23:8 53:7	<hr/>
troops 55:12	58:4	1:17 4:21	work 4:9,11 19:15	2
troubling 24:20	University 9:16,19	watched 50:5	20:18 22:13 23:10	200 1:1
26:1	45:21 62:12	way 12:4 19:7 39:6	24:15 41:17 44:14	20001 1:17
true 6:14 9:14	updated 32:7	45:11 48:14 49:6	47:3 49:13 51:2	2003 14:16 41:15
truly 20:12	use 16:16 24:1 25:5	52:12 60:12	54:21 58:9 59:15	20036-3011 1:2
trust 23:11	29:19 42:7	ways 5:2 9:1 44:5	61:8 63:19 64:1	2004 12:18 13:3,12
try 3:5 4:22 13:20	useful 41:8	weakened 11:15	worked 4:21 50:19	60:16
35:17 48:8	uses 21:17	weaponized 46:6	55:9 61:1	2005 14:17 41:15
trying 11:10 25:20	USG 62:7	weapons 24:17	working 7:1 53:19	2006 57:12
	USIP 26:4,11 50:14			

2007 14:17 41:15
60:17
2008 14:17 41:15
2009 1:9
202 1:15
24 2:18
24-hour 18:5
25 38:7

3

3 1:12 2:11
3-24 48:1
39 2:20

5

50,000-plus 55:12
500 28:2,5 50:21

8

8 1:9
801 1:16

9

9-11 15:4
90s 12:11