

UNCLASSIFIED

# **A CRISIS OF TRUST AND CULTURAL INCOMPATIBILITY:**

**A Red Team Study of Mutual Perceptions of Afghan  
National Security Force Personnel and U.S. Soldiers in  
Understanding and Mitigating the Phenomena of  
ANSF-Committed Fratricide-Murders**

May 12, 2011

Jeffrey Bordin, Ph.D.

N2KL Red Team Political and Military Behavioral Scientist

[jeffrey.bordin@afghan.swa.army.mil](mailto:jeffrey.bordin@afghan.swa.army.mil)

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary   | 3  |
| Introduction  | 4  |
| Murders Committed by ANSF Members Against Westerners  | 4  |
| Research Methodology  | 6  |
| Analysis  | 9  |
| Results – ANSF Participants   | 12 |
| Results – U.S. Soldier Participants   | 24 |
| Results – U.S. Soldiers’ Responses to Questionnaire   | 29 |
| Discussion – ANSF Personnel’s Perspectives  | 32 |
| Discussion – U.S. Soldiers’ Perspectives  | 41 |
| Recommendations   | 47 |
| Conclusion  | 52 |
| Appendix A: Known Fratricide-Murder and Attempted Murder Incidents Committed<br>By ANSF Members Against ISAF and UNAMA Personnel: 2007-2011 | 55 |
| Appendix B: Comparative Line-of-Duty Murder Risks Between U.S. Police<br>Officers and N2KL Westerners Who Work With ANSF Personnel          | 59 |
| Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire for U.S. Soldiers  | 60 |
| Appendix D: Quotes and Paraphrases from HTT Groups  | 63 |

**TABLES**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Red Team Survey Results of U.S. Soldiers’ Ratings of ANSF | 30 |
| Table 2: Comparison Results of U.S. Soldiers’ Mean Ratings of ANSF | 31 |

## UNCLASSIFIED

**A CRISIS OF TRUST AND CULTURAL INCOMPATIBILITY: A Red Team Study of Mutual Perceptions of ANSF Personnel and U.S. Soldiers in Understanding and Mitigating the Phenomena of ANSF-Committed Fratricide-Murders – Jeffrey Bordin, Ph.D., N2KL Red Team**

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Since May, 2007 there have been at least 26 murder/attempted murder incidents by ANSF or ASG members against ISAF/UNAMA members, resulting in the killings of at least 58 Western personnel. Most of these incidents have occurred since Oct. 2009, representing 6% of all hostile deaths by ISAF during this period. Such fratricide-murder incidents are no longer isolated; they reflect a growing systemic threat. They are also provoking a crisis of confidence and trust among Westerners training and working with ANSFs. Rather than just a result of insurgent infiltration into ANSF, indicators exist that many of these fratricide incidents resulted from personal clashes. Therefore, a field study was undertaken to assess ANSF members' and U.S. Soldiers' perceptions of each other; specifically, to identify those behaviors that upset them or cause anger. Sixty-eight focus groups were conducted on 613 ANSF personnel throughout three provinces at 19 locations. Their reported negative views, experiences and observations of U.S. Soldiers' social behaviors were recorded. ANSF members identified numerous social, cultural and operational grievances they have with U.S. Soldiers. Factors that created animosity were reviewed through a content analysis that measured frequency and intensity of the perceived grievances. Factors that fueled the most animosity included U.S. convoys not allowing traffic to pass, reportedly indiscriminant return U.S. fire that causes civilian casualties, naively using flawed intelligence sources, U.S. Forces conducting night raids/home searches, violating female privacy during searches, U.S. road blocks, publicly searching/disarming ANSF members as an SOP when they enter bases, and past massacres of civilians by U.S. Forces (i.e., the Wedding Party Massacre, the Shinwar Massacre, etc.). Other issues that led to altercations or near-altercations (including many self-reported near-fratricide incidents) included urinating in public, their cursing at, insulting and being rude and vulgar to ANSF members, and unnecessarily shooting animals. They found many U.S. Soldiers to be extremely arrogant, bullying, unwilling to listen to their advice, and were often seen as lacking concern for civilian and ANSF safety during combat. CAT 1 interpreters' (n=30) views were similar to the ANSF's. U.S. Soldiers' (n=215) views of ANSF, particularly of the ANA, were also collected; they were extremely negative. They reported pervasive illicit drug use, massive thievery, personal instability, dishonesty, no integrity, incompetence, unsafe weapons handling, corrupt officers, no real NCO corps, covert alliances/informal treaties with insurgents, high AWOL rates, bad morale, laziness, repulsive hygiene and the torture of dogs. Perceptions of civilians were also negative stemming from their insurgent sympathies and cruelty towards women and children.

**Recommendations** (n=58) included ensuring improved convoy driving practices, explaining need for roadblocks, vetting/training special ANSF search teams (including more females), reviewing base security SOPs, monitoring religious radicalism in ANSF, reforming various dysfunctional ANSF practices, improving ANSF evaluation metrics, conducting more research in local patterns of life, and developing improved cultural and human relations trainings and behavior standards.

## INTRODUCTION

This N2KL Red Team study has four primary purposes:

1. Inform key decision-makers that the murders of ISAF members committed by Afghan National Security Force (ANSF) personnel do not represent “rare and isolated events” as currently being proclaimed.
2. Explore why this tragic phenomenon is occurring by extensively canvassing ANSF members on their perceptions of U.S. Soldiers and identifying what behaviors, characteristics and/or situations provoke them towards anger and possible violence.
3. Examine U.S. Soldiers experiences with ANSF personnel and what perceptions they have.
4. Based on both ANSF members’ and U.S. Soldiers’ perceptions develop recommendations to counter the growing fratricide-murder threat ANSF personnel pose to ISAF soldiers.

### MURDERS COMMITTED BY ANSF MEMBERS AGAINST WESTERNERS

Since mid-Sept. 2009, there have been at least 21 fratricide-murder incidents where bona fide Afghanistan National Security Force (ANSF) members (n=20) or an Afghan Security Guard (ASG) (n=1) have murdered or attempted to murder ISAF or UNAMA personnel, leading to the known deliberate fratricide killings of 50 ISAF and 1 UNAMA personnel (49 by ANSF members and 2 by an ASG), with a similar number of wounded (See APPENDIX A, pgs. 55-58). As of May 12, 2011, this represents 6% of all hostile deaths ISAF has suffered in Afghanistan during this time period. (This increases to well over 10% of all ISAF combat deaths if IED attacks are discounted.) To put this into perspective, **this averages one murdered ISAF or UNAMA member by an ANSF or ASG member every 12 days during the last 20 months and one attack per month.**

**But this trend is worsening.** Since mid-July, 2010, there have been at least 15 incidents that have led to 39 ISAF members being murdered; 32 were U.S. **This averages one murdered ISAF member every week over the last 10 months; one every 6 days over the last 6 months (30-40% of all small arms caused KIA).** During the last 5 ½ month period from Nov. 29, 2010 and May 12, 2011, 16% of all hostile ISAF deaths in Afghanistan have been at the intentional hands of ANSF/ASG personnel. (This increases to an astounding 33% of all ISAF combat deaths if IED-related attacks are discounted.) Six more U.S. Soldiers were killed in ANSF committed fratricide cases that occurred prior to Sept. 2009. In all, at least 58 ISAF and UNAMA members have been murdered by ANSF (n=55) or ASG (n=3) personnel since 2007. There have also been several near-fratricide murder incidents where ISAF members were only wounded. The lack of intervention by armed ANSF bystanders in almost all of these fratricide events (thereby allowing at least eight of the murderers to escape) is also cause for concern. **Of note, during the last six month period (November, 2010 through April, 2011) Westerners stationed within Afghanistan’s N2KL region (Nangarhar, Nuristan, Kunar and Laghman provinces) who regularly interact and/or train with ANSFs have been over 150 times more likely to be murdered by an ANSF member than a U.S. police officer is to be murdered in the line of**

## UNCLASSIFIED

**duty by any perpetrator** (see Appendix B, pg. 59 for calculation); **this excludes the additional risks associated with regular combat for these coalition personnel.** Further, such ANSF fratricide-murders represent 30% of all U.S. field grade officer hostile deaths in Afghanistan (7 of 23), 25% of all hostile U.S. female military deaths (4 of 16) and over 50% of all hostile U.S.A.F. officer deaths (7 of 13). There are also indicators, as well as pervasive sentiments among certain ISAF members, that some ANSF personnel have facilitated insurgent ambushes on ISAF units and often turn a blind eye while insurgents plant IEDs (the primary killer of ISAF troops) fully within their view. ANSFs have also been widely criticized for exceptionally slow response times when responding to attacks, most notably their incredibly poor reaction time to the Kabul attack on UNAMA's safe house in Kabul in Oct. 2009 (that also saw the ANP murder a wounded U.S. security guard who had just heroically defended the compound from insurgents), as well as their inept response to dealing with a brutal mob that eventually seized and murdered seven UNAMA workers in Mazar-e-Sharif (and without any ANSF casualties). Additionally, the actions surrounding the embarrassing Kandahar prison escape of some 500 insurgent inmates on April 25, 2011 sets new ANSF standards for both incompetence and treasonous duplicity given the performance of the prison's Afghan security forces. These additional considerations are not included in the above statistics and risk factors, but do represent additional second and third order effects greatly contributing to ISAF and UNAMA security threats and casualty rates.

Green-on-Blue fratricide has been a part of Afghan history. As an example, in March 1979 Ismail Khan, then a captain in the Afghan Army (and now the Afghan government's Minister of Energy), orchestrated the murder of 50 Soviet military advisors and 300 of their family members in Herat Province, beheading many and parading the severed head on spikes through the city. This atrocity served as a *jus ad bellum* for the December 1979 Soviet invasion.

However, the common refrain from many ISAF political and military officials has been that such murder incidents between ANSF and ISAF are "isolated" and "extremely rare." Such proclamations seem disingenuous, if not profoundly intellectually dishonest. Also, the common assumptions widely espoused after each murder event are that the ANSF perpetrator was an insurgent infiltrator, was psychologically unbalanced, or was a rare radical Islamic extremist amongst the ANSF. Ironically, while the international community is alarmed about the prospects of Islamic terror and its effect, ISAF has largely refused to acknowledge the ongoing threat stemming from our ANSF allies, nor devoted resources to conduct scholarly social atmospheric research on the actual reasons and motivations of the perpetrators. Such volitional cognitive dissonance perpetrates an ongoing blindness towards acknowledging this murder problem, determining the causes, and identifying counter-measures to deter such tragedies. However, as reflected in the murder chronology and statistics outlined above, such lethal altercations are clearly not rare or isolated; they reflect a rapidly growing systemic homicide threat (a magnitude of which may be unprecedented between 'allies' in modern military history). They have also provoked a crisis of confidence and trust among many ISAF soldiers and civilians 'partnering' with ANSF personnel, adversely effecting ANSF training and operations. This is also having

## UNCLASSIFIED

deleterious effects on some ISAF member state's willingness to continue providing trainers for ANSF let alone continue the war effort, particularly Germany given public uproar over recent murders. Following the murder of 6 U.S. Soldiers during a joint operation in Nangarhar Province by an ABP member on Nov. 29, 2010, (one of the worse mass-murder incidents ever suffered by U.S. military forces) approval was given for this investigative field study.

While some of these fratricide-murder incidents involved insurgent sleepers/infiltrators (quite obvious with the April 16, 2011 incident on FOB Gamberi), the researcher hypothesized that many, if not most, resulted from deep seated animosity, often stimulated by social and personal conflicts, as well as perceived cultural and theological affronts that led to these murders. And as seen in Appendix A, some sort of verbal altercation preceded at least 10 of the 25 fratricide-murder events described (there is a lack of information available for most of the remaining incidents). Therefore, the approach taken for this portion of the study was to interview groups of ANSF members on what angers them about U.S. Soldiers from social, behavioral, psychological, organizational, religious and operational perspectives. Its central purpose was to examine ANSF members' country-wide perceptions of U.S. Soldiers' behaviors that they deem offensive and/or provocative. A group interview approach, as well as a few personal interviews with ANSF mullahs and religious education officers, was selected as the means of data collection instead of survey questionnaires due to the 90% illiteracy rate among ANSF members.

Although this study was conducted in just three provinces, all within RC-East, a robust number of the ANSF participants were recruited for group interviews (N=613). Many of these participants reported having been previously stationed in a wide variety of other provinces country-wide. They were instructed to base their answers on their total experiences, including those regions as well. In their responses they often reported locations in Southern, Western, Central and Northern Afghanistan. Therefore, this study's findings should in many respects be quite generalizeable to the rest of the country.

During preparations to conduct the study the researcher briefed several senior ANSF officials. Their responses and cooperation were quite positive, even enthusiastic. **(Quote from an ANA general: "Why didn't the U.S. Army do this study eight years ago!?")**

## METHODOLOGY

Three distinct research approaches were taken in this research. For ANSF personnel focus groups were utilized. The original intention was to concurrently conduct focus groups with U.S. Soldiers while on the same base assessing their perceptions and experiences with ANSF personnel. However, decisions and events precluded such an opportunity. Therefore, when time and opportunity permitted, the researcher informally talked to individual and small groups of U.S. Soldiers (up to three at a time) about their experiences and perceptions of ANSF members, distinguishing between the ANA, the ANP and the ABP. Further, as a validity check,

## UNCLASSIFIED

five groups of CAT 1 interpreters (Afghan nationals) were recruited to compare their perspectives and observations with the ANSF members'. (Admittedly, as with any field research conducted on or near the frontlines of a war zone, certain academic niceties were not feasible.)

### **ANSF Participants**

Sixty-eight focus groups made up of ANA (n=50; 471 soldiers), ANP (n=12; 89 police) and ABP (n=6; 53 border police) were conducted in order to assess ANSF perceptions of U.S. Soldiers country-wide. ANSF officers and NCOs were targeted as much as possible due to their greater experience and field knowledge. Police were generally the most difficult to recruit due to operational conditions as well as a lack of cooperation by some local ANP officials at times. In all, 613 ANSF personnel participated. Focus groups were segregated by rank as much as feasible. However, many predominately enlisted groups also included some NCOs. All focus groups were conducted by the Red Team scientist (unarmed and in civilian clothes), aided by an Afghan interpreter provided by each U.S. base. Participants were assured that their responses would be confidential (no names were recorded). All ANSF personnel were briefed that the purpose of this research was to better train U.S. Soldiers in Afghan customs and courtesies during pre-mobilization so that past social mistakes are not repeated. They were informed that the researcher had been working in Afghanistan for almost four years and was aware of many social difficulties between the two groups, so they were not to sugar-coat their comments. It was emphasized that improvements could not occur without their candor. Participants were generally very forthcoming, particularly if one had recognized the researcher from past field work. (Quote from an ANA NCO: *"O.K., we won't give you the regular 'Smiley Face' answers; we will tell you the truth."*)

Concerted efforts were made to ensure that all ANSF participants had an opportunity to voice their opinions, although most groups did have 2-3 dominant members (usually NCOs). The researcher did not directly challenge dominant members during their discourse; however, after their contribution it was explained that it was necessary to hear from all others and guidance was directed to ensure that the other participants were not interrupted. Alternate views were encouraged, but were seldom expressed. In any case, generally about half the participants were basically observers and made no significant contribution to the discussion. During group discussions the researcher introduced multiple topics so that groups addressed a variety of subjects rather than just being focused on one or two issues. And although the emphasis was on what ANSF members found disagreeable with U.S. Soldiers, groups were asked for any positive comments they had to make. As with any cross-cultural social research involving translation, there are limits on the precision in the information that was recorded and assessed. However, concerted efforts were made to use only the most capable interpreters assigned to each base for this research. Interpreters were also consulted with after each focus group to go over the researcher's notes for accuracy. Also, the researcher's nearly four years experience living in Afghanistan, including among certain ANSF units for extended periods of time, was useful with such data analysis.

## UNCLASSIFIED

Focus groups ranged in size from 3 to 15, with most being from 8-10 ANSF members (the preferred size). Almost all focus groups met in private settings where confidentiality could be maintained. Interpreters were also cautioned not to censor any remarks. Groups were conducted on 12 military bases, at 2 district centers and at 5 local police headquarters and stations. These included some of the most kinetic areas in Afghanistan, including all the bases in the Pech Valley. (One ANA soldier was KIA there the day following his participation.) The duration for most focus groups was 60-75 minutes, although larger groups generally required slightly more time. One group was terminated after only 30 minutes due to an insurgent attack. Another focus group was completely cancelled by the researcher after just ten minutes when a U.S. soldier intruded to obviously eavesdrop on the proceeding (this occurred in a local Afghan-run café on the only U.S. base where a private setting was refused; only 4 focus groups were completed from there). Focus groups were conducted throughout the three provinces of Laghman (8-15 DEC 2010), Kunar (1-12 and 18-20 JAN 2011), and Nangarhar (13-17 and 23-28 JAN 2011). Private interviews were further conducted with one ANSF mullah and two religious education officers.

Statements were written as they were made. The time spent during the translation process allowed for such. The credibility of participants' statements was not challenged, only noted. But clear distinctions were made between what participants reported as first-hand experiences and what they said they had been told by third parties. As with any perception study completed here involving Afghan self-reports, social scientists should acknowledge possible validity limitations of what is reported given the Islamic Principle of Taqiyya (i.e., Hadith 5.59.369).

Although many ANSF groups said that at least half to most U.S. Soldiers were friendly, polite, helpful and brave, and acknowledged that many of their problems were not due to the U.S. Army, but to their own corrupt government in Kabul, **the primary purpose of this study was to examine the causes for the rapidly increasing fratricide-murder phenomena, identifying the behaviors and situations that anger or provoke ANSF members to violence. Therefore, a decidedly negative orientation was taken in the data gathering process for this portion of the study.** 'Smiley Face' answers were not what were being sought.

### **CAT 1 Interpreter Participants**

Five groups of interpreters (n=30) were recruited, one each for Laghman and Nangarhar provinces and three from Kunar Province. They were recruited from the same bases as were the ANSF members, and during the same time period. Groups were conducted in English and lasted 60-120 minutes. The Afghan interpreters displayed a great deal of interest in sharing their perspectives. Many also expressed surprise that they were being asked their opinions on such issues. Focus groups were conducted in a similar manner as were the ANSF groups, but with substantially less guidance needed.

## **U.S. Soldier Participants**

The original design of this study called for conducting concurrent focus groups with U.S. Soldiers co-located at the same bases with the ANSF participants. However, it proved necessary to utilize three different approaches in assessing U.S. Soldiers' perspectives.

The first approach involved personal discussions with U.S. Soldiers. These occurred during the period of the ANSF focus group proceedings. The researcher informally conversed with individual and small groups (2-3) of U.S. Soldiers (n=70). It was mentioned that the researcher was conducting a study on the ANSFs. Soldiers were very forthcoming in expressing their opinions and observations on the ANSFs. No notes were taken during the conversations; they were recorded shortly afterwards. Most of these conversations took place during the above dates and locations where the ANSF focus groups were held; a few others took place on FOB Fenty in March. They varied in length from 15 minutes to two hours.

For the second approach six focus groups (n=50) were conducted by two members of the Human Terrain Team (HTT-AF3), one serving as the facilitator, the other as the note taker. These focus groups took place from April 5-17, 2011. They were conducted on FOBs Connolly, Fenty, Finley-Shields and Huey in Nangarhar Province, and at FOB Bostick in Kunar Province. Focus groups generally lasted between 90 to 120 minutes. The focus group narratives were provided to the Red Team Scientist for analysis.

Additionally, U.S. Soldiers (n=136) completed a brief questionnaire that rated their opinions of the ANSF on various factors (see Appendix C, pages 60-62). The researcher recruited U.S. Soldiers (n=95) in March and early April 2011 to complete them. These included those soldiers based in the Pech Valley (n=73), those based in northern Kunar (n=15) and those based in Nangarhar (n=7). Similarly, the HTT had most (n=41) of their focus group participants complete the survey. Many U.S. Soldiers exclaimed that such a study as this was long overdue.

## **ANALYSES**

### **ANSF Participants**

A comparative weighting assessment on the issues raised by focus group members was completed. It measured the relative importance respondents placed on each issue qualitatively and quantitatively. Quantitative measures were based on the approximate number of times the issue was brought up within and across groups, as well as the approximate duration of time it was discussed. Admittedly subjective, qualitative measures were based on the emotions and intensity of how the issue was addressed as reflected by the Afghans' vocal volume and emotional displays (facial expressions, body language and gestures that distinguished casual beliefs from deeply held ones); as well as if they reported that a near-fratricide incident resulted from the specific example discussed. Both were combined into a comparative weighting scale.

## UNCLASSIFIED

**Four tiers of grievance types were developed** based on comparative importance and emphasis the ANSF placed on particular issues (see pages 12-21). They are not rank ordered within tiers. For Tier One, at least 33% (n=23) of groups mentioned the grievance. For Tier Two, 20-32% (n=14-19) mentioned the grievance. For Tier Three, 10-19% (n=7-13), and for Tier Four, 1-9% (n=1-6). But if a particular grievance type included any exhibition of anger or agitation, or if it involved outright threats or mentioned risk of fratricide when it was recalled, then this category was moved into the next higher tier. All grievances that involved threats of violence are also identified with an asterisk.

Grievance types that involved self-reported near-fratricide incidents with any ISAF personnel are marked with asterisks. Notable and representative quotes and paraphrases are presented under each grievance type identified. A validity indicator utilized was assessing the degree of honesty displayed with the participants' recounting of incidents. With those several specific cases participants recounted where the researcher had direct first-hand knowledge or experience, their responses (with a few important exceptions, which are noted) were reasonably honest, but very prone to a jaundiced interpretation of intentions. With civilian casualty events they were prone to blaming U.S. Forces when insurgents were culpable.

Besides fratricide-related information, several other social and operational issues were explored when time permitted. Almost all focus groups were asked about perspectives on the Reintegration Program and their views on females serving within the ANSF. Most groups were also examined for religious extremist thought. (To further assess extremism, several ANSF religious education officers and ANSF mullahs were also interviewed; two on an individual basis that lasted over an hour.) Views on constitutional rights and laws were also explored, especially among the ANP. Many groups were also asked to share their views on the other components of ANSF. Their assessments of the fighting spirit of U.S. Soldiers were also studied. Although not planned, so many focus groups brought up the unreliability of the M-16 rifle that this issue was also often discussed. Content analyses were completed on these additional issues as well.

### **CAT 1 Interpreter Participants**

With only one exception (*noted*), CAT 1 interpreter's data were not formally included in the results section. Their principle use was as a validity indicator when compared with the ANSF participants. Validity support was realized through a content analysis. **Interpreters' general perspectives, first-hand experiences and direct observations they reported were very much congruent with those of the ANSF participants.** The only real variance was that interpreters were much more moderate in their reported religious views.

## U.S. Soldier Participants

Due to the different methodologies that had to be employed and limited participant numbers available, a similar depth of comparative analysis was not feasible with the data gathered from U.S. Soldiers. Given this qualification, separate content analyses were administered on all the topics and issues that were mentioned during the Red Team conversations and the HTT focus group discussions, together with the frequencies for each. Trend analyses were then completed. In a comparison analysis it was found that the topics and issues between the two sets of data were identical. However, given the more limited number of participants, a two-tier category of complaints U.S. Soldiers have with ANA personnel was developed (see pages 24-28). Often mentioned issues (50+% of conversations or groups) were classified as Top Tier complaints; those mentioned less often were assigned to Second Tier complaints. Unless otherwise specified, U.S. Soldiers' perceptions were limited to the ANA who the large majority had far more experience with than any of the other ANSF components. Selected quotes and paraphrases from the Red Team data set are presented in the Results section on pages 24-28. Other selected quotes and paraphrases from the HTT focus group data set are presented in Appendix D, pages 63-70.

In contrast to the ANSF participants many of who had been stationed in many other regions of Afghanistan, the large majority of the U.S. Soldiers participating in this study had only been stationed within the eastern region of Afghanistan. Additionally, a large percentage of study participants were stationed in the Pech Valley, one of the most kinetic regions in all of Afghanistan. Thus, the generalizeability of the results from their research is much more geographically limited than is the ANSF data.

A quantitative analysis was also completed on the brief surveys the U.S. Soldiers completed (n=136). See Table 1 and 2 on pages 30-31. Two sub-groups were also initially assessed. Averages for soldiers stationed at OP Michigan in the Pech Valley (n=52), the most kinetic base in all of RC-East, and averages for officers and senior NCOs (n=11) (*given the small sample size this later group is pilot data only*) were also separately reported. The results on perceptions of rates of drug abuse and religious radicalism are reported within the narrative. A content analysis was also conducted on the comments section to the survey and integrated with the conversation data.

For the questionnaire data, comparisons were made between the original Red Team survey samples and the HTT samples. Comparison groups were sub-divided to match the degree of kinetic activity base personnel faced, based on KIA since June, 2010. Therefore, original Pech Valley groups (high kinetics) were matched with FOB Connelly's group, and non-Pech Valley groups (lower kinetics) were matched with all the other FOBs from the HTT groups.

UNCLASSIFIED

**RESULTS – ANSF Participants**

**TOP TIER GRIEVANCES ANSFs HAVE WITH U.S. SOLDIERS**

*\* Indicates that ANSF member reported serious altercations occurred between ANSF and U.S. Forces as a result of grievance or incident.*

**\*OFTEN CONDUCT NIGHT RAIDS AND HOME SEARCHES INSTEAD OF ANSF**

\* “Eight months ago in ... Province U.S. Soldiers insisted on searching a villager’s home, even after he took out a Koran and put it in the ANA’s face pleading for respect. Initially, the U.S. Soldiers ignored the ANA’s pleas to not search the home. It wasn’t until the ANA charged their weapons and a Canadian Captain intervened, that the U.S. Soldiers listened and changed their mind about doing the search. Two ANA searched the home instead. The Koran outranks orders.”

“Arrests should be made during the daytime.”

“The U.S. needs the ANA’s permission before they conduct home searches.”

“They get upset due to their casualties, so they take it out on civilians during their searches.”

**\*DON’T RESPECT WOMEN OR THEIR PRIVACY**

“While on patrol U.S. soldiers ignored us and climbed onto a roof and observed the women inside the yard.”

\* “A U.S. Soldier broke down a door to go into a female’s room. I told him he could not do that; we almost fought but he then relented. This could have turned into a firefight.”

\* “They take photos of women even when we tell them not to.”

\* “At COP ... nine months ago they tried to search a woman. We aimed our guns at them to stop it.”

**\*SET UP ROAD BLOCKS AND STOPPING TRAFFIC/REFUSE TO LET SICK PASS**

\* “When efforts were made to get three injured women to a clinic, the U.S. soldiers threatened us and called us ‘Mother Fuckers.’”

\* “When we tried to escort a civilian vehicle with a sick woman inside the U.S. Soldier said, ‘Fuck No.’ I put an RPG on my shoulder and he then let us pass.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **\*CONVOYS NOT ALLOWING TRAFFIC TO PASS, EVEN ANSF CONVOYS**

\* “When an ANA truck tried to pass a U.S. convoy a gunner pointed a .50 Caliber machine gun at it. The ANA then pointed an RPG at the gunner; they then allowed the ANA truck to pass.”

“They think that they own all the roads. It is shameful for us to have civilians see that we can’t pass U.S. convoys.”

“Civilians get very angry from being delayed by slow U.S. convoys that won’t let them pass.”

### **IF ATTACKED, THEY SHOOT INDISCRIMINANTLY**

“U.S. Soldiers kill many innocent civilians if attacked. They kill everyone around.”

“After a suicide bomber detonated, the U.S. Soldiers overreacted and destroyed many civilian cars nearby.”

“If ambushed U.S. Soldiers panic, spraying fire in all directions; they don’t care about civilian casualties.” *[Fact check: The researcher has conducted field studies here for four years (boots on ground) and has been in many combat engagements throughout some of the most kinetic regions in Afghanistan (i.e., the Korengal and Pech Valleys, Kamdesh, Nuristan, including COP Keating, etc.) and has never seen a U.S. Soldier panic during battle. In contrast, ANSF members, with a few exceptions, were seen to be fairly gutless in combat.]*

### **THEY CAUSE MANY CIVILIAN AND ANSF CASUALTIES**

“At ... last summer the U.S. Army killed many civilians. Just local people were killed; not insurgents.”

“In..., a U.S. MRAP killed six civilians traveling in a vehicle; it was intentional.”

“In..., after the U.S. Forces accidentally killed three civilians, they brought the survivors humanitarian aid. The family set fire to it. There was no investigation of the incident; there is no accountability. The entire village is now anti-GIRoA.”

“Our joint convoy was attacked and an ANA vehicle was disabled, but the U.S. continued on. They did not help us.”

“They cause many civilian casualties; they apologize, but they keep doing it. This isn’t acceptable.”

“In ... U.S. Soldiers killed two youths. Their mother then became a suicide bomber; she was provoked by this atrocity. She went to Paradise as a martyr.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **\*THEY CURSE CONSTANTLY**

\* “A U.S. Soldier told an interpreter to teach him Pashtu curse words. When the interpreter refused the soldier hit him. Another put a rifle to his forehead. The ANA then locked and loaded their guns... The U.S. Captain in-charge apologized... The interpreter quit.”  
(*Recounted by CAT 1 interpreters*)

\* “We (*the ANA*) once loaded and charged our weapons because we got tired of the U.S. Soldiers calling us ‘Mother Fuckers.’”

“They always shout and yell ‘Mother Fuck!’ They are crazy.”

“U.S. soldiers swear at us constantly, saying ‘Fuck You!’ They didn’t do this at...; we were like brothers there; but not in ....”

### **\*EXTREMELY ARROGANT; FAIL TO LISTEN TO OR TAKE ADVICE FROM ANSF**

“U.S. Soldiers don’t listen; they are too arrogant.” (*very often repeated refrain*)

\* “They often fail to listen to or act on our intelligence, so we do not trust them. Their arrogance sickens us.”

“We try to warn them if the enemy is planning something, but they usually fail to listen and get shot up.”

### **\*PUBLICLY SEARCH ANSF WHEN THEY ENTER JOINT BASE-THIS IS INSULTING AND HUMILIATING**

\* “A U.S. Soldier insisted on searching our officer at the gate. When he refused the soldier said, ‘Fuck you.’ The officer got pissed and drew his gun. It was very wrong for him to swear at an officer.”

“The U.S. does this in front of Afghan civilians; civilians ridicule us for submitting to this. It is shameful.”

“They treat us like thieves.”

“They disarm us (*the ANP*) and take our cell phones at the ECP.”

**SECOND TIER GRIEVANCES ANSFs HAVE TOWARDS U.S. SOLDIERS**

**U.S. FORCES HAVE COMMITTED MANY WAR CRIMES AND ATROCITIES AND ALSO HAS FAILED TO PROSECUTE THOSE SOLDIERS RESPONSIBLE**

Shinwar Massacre (3/07)

Deh Bala Wedding Party Massacre (7/08)

*Other 'Wedding Party Massacres' were also mentioned, including 'Wech Baghtu' in Kandahar (11/08), and an attack in Uruzgan (2/10).*

... Funeral Party Massacre (10/10)

Massacre at..., ... District, ... Province

... Massacre (18 Dead)

"In Asadabad, Kunar they threw a hand grenade into a crowd of civilians." *(Fact check: There is public video of an insurgent literally throwing the hand grenade.)*

"We saw the U.S. shooting civilians running after bomb drop." *(Could not give further details.)*

"U.S. Soldiers killed a carload of civilians in front of OP..." (11/11/09)

"The U.S. has caused massive civilian casualties in the ... and ... provinces."

"A raid in ... Province killed nine students; they were a study group and had no weapons."

"U.S. Soldiers have never been held responsible and sent to prison for any of these crimes."

**\*URINATE IN PUBLIC; INDECENT EXPOSURE**

\* "They pee all over, right in front of civilians, including females. If we tell them not to they either don't listen or get angry at us."

"They pee in the water, polluting it. We told them to stop but they wouldn't listen."

\* "They peed in front of a house; they do not care if women see them. An ANA NCO got furious. He had to be transferred because he wanted to do violence."

"We do not like nudity."

"Two U.S. Soldiers even defecated within public view."

\* "A U.S. Soldier peed in a stream right in front of a woman. This greatly angered us."

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **\*SHOOT AND KILL ANIMALS NEEDLESSLY**

\* “A U.S. Soldier killed a dog that was tied in a yard for no reason (... Village 6/09); U.S. soldiers laughed; an ANA SGT wanted to fight the U.S. soldier; the ANA SGT was transferred; the U.S. commander apologized and offered the dog owner \$50; the owner refused; we (*the ANA*) believe the family is now supportive of the insurgents due to this.”

\* “In ... Village in ... District last year a U.S. Soldier shot a barking dog that was tied in his yard. The owner confronted the soldiers and a U.S. officer said that if he didn't go away “I'll kill the mother fucker!” The ANA then went up the hill and locked and loaded their weapons. When this happened the U.S. officer apologized and offered money for the dead dog.”

“U.S. Soldiers shoot cattle for no reason. At ... they fired on donkeys for no reason.”

### **\*U.S. SOLDIERS CAUSE PROBLEMS WHEN ANA ABUSE/TORTURE DOGS**

\* “A U.S. Soldier pushed an ANA NCO on his shoulder for kicking a stray dog. He had no right to do this. If he had a complaint over such a minor thing he should have reported it up the chain of command. An actual hit could have led to shooting.” (*Fact Check: The puppy's injuries were fatal; the ANA NCO had purposely gone out of his way just to kick the puppy. This also reflects the difference in viewpoints between a dog that is owned, i.e., is property, versus a stray dog that does not belong to anyone.*)

“How we treat dogs is no one's business; the Koran is very clear about the low status of dogs.”

### **YELL AT AND INSULT ANSF/ LACK OF RESPECT SHOWN TO ANSF**

“U.S. Soldiers often yell at and insult ANA soldiers, and do so in front of local workers.”

“They cuss us out for even the most minor mistakes.”

“We have been ordered not to react to their insults; but we very much want to.”

“They don't respect the ANA I.D. card; they search us anyway.”

“U.S. Soldiers once invaded our (ANP) compound and tied us up and left us lying on the ground for hours. When they realized their mistake they released us. Instead of apologizing to us, they gave us a (vehicle). This does not make up for such a great social offense. The civilians laughed at us.” (*True story; they still had deep anger from this 2008 incident.*)

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **LACK OF SUPPORT DURING BATTLE/LEAVE ANSF BEHIND WHILE RETREAT**

“U.S. Soldiers often retreat and leave us behind during firefights. This is not good behavior. They don’t care about us or our relationship.”

“We don’t get air support if we are alone in a battle.”

“We were in the back half of the convoy. When we were attacked and had a vehicle damaged they left us.”

### **NAIVELY ACT ON BAD INTELLIGENCE BASED ON PERSONAL FEUDS, NOT INS**

“Often the U.S. lets itself get involved in personal feuds by believing an unreliable source. These people use the U.S. to destroy their personal enemies, not the insurgents.”

“Civilians don’t respect U.S. Soldiers for letting themselves be so easily lied to and misled. As a result, they kill innocent people and drive villagers to the insurgents.”

### **POOR LOGISTICAL SUPPORT**

“U.S. Soldiers burned supplies during an operation instead of giving them to ANA.”

“They often refuse to allow us to fly out of the base when we go on leave. Ground travel is very dangerous.”

“An ANA Major’s wife died, but he had to wait weeks before being allowed on a flight out.”

### **OVER PROMISE, UNDER DELIVER**

“Such broken promises to civilians bring shame to the ANA.”

“They often allow development projects to be looted and shortchanged by contractors-we don’t respect this.”

“U.S. Soldiers will come into a village and make all sorts of promises about development projects. But then they never follow through. This causes the villagers to become very sad and angry.”

### **FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY OR FULLY PROTECT CIVILIANS**

“The U.S. Army consistently fails to protect civilians, so their hearts grow black towards them.”

“They don’t provide full-time security, leaving anyone who cooperates vulnerable to insurgents.”

**THIRD TIER GRIEVANCES ANSFs HAVE TOWARDS U.S. SOLDIERS**

**NOT SHARING INFORMATION PRIOR TO MISSION/NO PRE-MISSION BRIEF**

“Before, the ETT advisors briefed us on what to expect during the day’s operation; but now the U.S. Army doesn’t give us any information about the day’s operation.”

“They don’t trust us, so we don’t trust them.”

**LESS EMPHASIS ON PROVIDING TRAINING TO ANSF THAN BEFORE (Since 6/10)**

“We are disappointed because the U.S. Soldiers show much less interest in training us than before.”

“We liked the ETT system, but not the current training system.”

“U.S. Soldiers here are disengaging from our training.”

**CONDUCT PATROLS INDEPENDENT OF ANSF**

“U.S. Soldiers have no right to conduct independent operations; we should always be with them.”

“This causes the civilians to lose faith with us (the ANA). It is embarrassing.”

**MAKE LAST MINUTE CHANGES TO MISSION THAT CAN’T BE APPROVED BY HIGHER**

“After the mission plan has been approved by our leaders the U.S. Soldiers will make last minute changes. This prevents us from getting final approval from our commanders. This is a big problem because we cannot legally change our mission plan without their approval.”

“We can’t make last minute changes to our mission; our senior leaders do not allow this.”

**DURING SEARCHES U.S. SOLDIERS OFTEN BREAK THINGS UNNECESSARILY**

“They will break in doors before the people can answer. They will break up boxes instead of opening them.”

“These are poor people; they can’t afford to replace the things the U.S. Soldiers needlessly break.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **THEY DON'T PROVIDE QUALITY MEDICAL CARE TO ANSF WOUNDED**

“When ANA soldiers are taken to the U.S.’s hospitals they are not given good care; our soldiers often end up having their arms or legs amputated. When treated at ANA hospitals they are less likely to lose a limb.”

“ANA hospitals provide much better care to ANA wounded than do U.S. hospitals; they discriminate.”

“They often won’t airlift our wounded, only their own.”

### **CONVOYS DRIVING BELLIGERENTLY OR RECKLESSLY**

“They don’t care if they cause accidents.”

“For years U.S. military convoys sped through the streets of villages, running over small children, while shouting profanities and throwing water bottles at people.” (*Speaker admitted that U.S. convoys now mostly drive much more safely and more respectfully now than they did just a couple of years ago.*)

### **U.S. PROVIDES PAKISTAN MASSIVE ASSISTANCE DESPITE KNOWING THAT IT AIDS THE INSURGENTS IN KILLING BOTH AFGHANS AND AMERICANS**

*ANSF respondents said that while they did not hold U.S. Soldiers personally accountable for such an immoral policy, they did say that they found it more difficult to trust them because of it.*

“There is no explanation or excuse for such a stupid policy.”

“They are both our enemy. You know it, but still give them great amounts of money in aid.”

### **RUDENESS/LACK OF RESPECT SHOWN TO CIVILIANS, ESPECIALLY ELDERS**

“U.S. Soldiers throw gifts out of their vehicles for children; but such a way is insulting; it is not Islamic.”

“They even search senior officials; it is very insulting.”

“During the ... Mission six weeks ago the U.S. Soldiers broke doors, and physically hit kids and teenagers. The villagers were really pissed off.”

“Their rudeness provokes civilians to attack.”

**FOURTH TIER GRIEVANCES ANSFs HAVE TOWARDS U.S. SOLDIERS**

**THEY SHOULDN'T EAT OR DRINK IN PUBLIC OR IN FRONT OF ANSF DURING RAMADAN**

"It is very rude to drink in front of us during Ramadan while we are fasting."

"This is our country; they should fast too."

**ENTER MOSQUES**

"Infidels are not allowed inside Mosques."

"They often don't even take off their boots."

"We've heard from civilians that they have allowed their dogs (dog teams) into Mosques."

**DESECRATE KORAN**

"Friends said that U.S. Soldiers threw a Koran in the dirt. An infidel should not even touch it."

**ENCOURAGE ATTENTION OF CHILDREN (CANDY), MAKING THEM TARGETS**

"If they hand out candy to children, the children are at risk of getting hurt by being so close to the Americans if there is an attack. They put them in danger."

**LIMITED SOCIALIZATION WITH ANSF MEMBERS**

"Most U.S. Soldiers don't bother socializing with us."

"It is obvious they do not like us."

**CONSTANTLY PASS GAS IN FRONT OF ANSF, IN PUBLIC, IN FRONT OF ELDERS**

"They obviously were not raised right; what can we do with people like that? They are disgusting."

"They are a very low class of people."

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**DIMINISHED CONTACT WITH SHURA/ELDERS AND CIVILIAN POPULATION**

“They don’t meet with the elders very often now.”

“There seems to be much less interest now in meeting with village elders.”

**THEY WEAR SUNGLASSES WHEN MEETING WITH SHURA/ELDERS**

“It is rude for them to wear their sunglasses when meeting with elders; it is very disrespectful.”

“They hide their eyes; why should anyone believe what they say?”

**THEY SIT INAPPROPRIATELY, RUDELY AND CRUDELY WHEN MEETING ELDERS**

“They should sit with their legs crossed, but sometimes they sit in a vulgar way with their legs open.”

**INCIDENT WHERE U.S. SOLDIER REPORTEDLY THREW AN ARMED HAND GRENADE (WITHOUT PULLING THE PIN) INTO A GROUP OF CHILDREN**

“A U.S. Soldier deliberately threw a hand grenade at a group of children. They could have easily pulled the pin. Such bad behavior threatens our trust.”

“The U.S. Soldier threw his hand grenade with the candy he was throwing at the children.”

**DON’T LIKE HOW PERSONAL SEARCHES ARE CONDUCTED FROM THE BACK**

“They put their hands on our butts, so we refuse to share intelligence information with them.”

“We are very uncomfortable being searched from behind.”

**DURING BATTLES THEY GET TOO LOUD**

“During battles they get overly excited, yell, and reveal positions.”

## OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS WITH ANSF GROUPS

CAT 1 interpreters' perceptions were very similar to ANSF's, except for the Salvation Issue (see pg. 36). They especially emphasized extreme arrogance, cursing, bullying and crude behavior.

ANSFs were more likely to think a Suicide Bomber would see Salvation than a U.S. Soldier who is KIA here, although the large majority thought that both were Hell-Bound.

ANSFs were much more likely to think insurgents would see Salvation than a U.S. Soldier who is KIA here, especially if insurgents were theologically motivated.

Some ANSF Religious Education Officers and mullahs surveyed conveyed extremist theological beliefs (i.e., believing suicide bombing could be justified and/or that a suicide bomber will go to Paradise).

Many ANSFs (especially ANP members) lacked understanding and acceptance of many of the basic constitutional values and rights they were supposed to defend.

Several ANSF confided that a great many of their colleagues use illicit drugs, especially hashish. (Many U.S. Soldiers who directly work with ANSF reported similar observations.)

Many ANA members reported a strong dislike and distrust of the ANP, thinking they are corrupt and traitorous. But many admitted that if the ANP did not cooperate with the insurgents they would end up dead. Others also saw the ANP's primary role as extorting the public.

U.S. Marines were viewed as having better attitudes and being more respectful and respected.

U.S. ETTs were viewed as having better attitudes and being more respectful and respected.

U.S. female soldiers were viewed as having better attitudes and being more respectful and respected.

## UNCLASSIFIED

Canadian soldiers were viewed as having better attitudes and being more respectful and respected.

Previous units were viewed as having better attitudes and being more respectful and respected.

M-16s were strongly disliked. Complaints were that they jam constantly and are very unreliable. They resented that the U.S. supplied them with such an unreliable rifle. They want their AK-47s back. Some thought that the M-16 was an obsolete leftover from World War II.

Almost all participants who were aware of it supported the Reintegration Program. When it was described to those who were not familiar with it (many of those from the enlisted ranks), they were receptive to the idea as well. They explained that they were tired of the war.

Most ANSFs members were open for more female recruitment (mostly for searches). A common response was that females were better serving in the ANP than the ANA. ANP were the most resistant to females serving in any branch of ANSF.

ANP generally had the most conservative/exclusionary outlooks with regards to social issues and constitutional rights. Many were quite contemptuous of the very legal rights they were supposed to enforce, particularly as related to women's issues. All ANP were Pashtun.

### **SOME POSITIVE ANSF REMARKS MADE ABOUT U.S. SOLDIERS**

“We are happy with our ETTs.” (*Embedded Training Teams were very popular across ANSF focus groups.*)

“We are aware that many problems are not caused by U.S. Soldiers, but by our corrupt government in Kabul.”

Many groups said that at least half to most U.S. Soldiers were friendly, polite, helpful, brave and very hard workers.

**RESULTS-U.S. SOLDIERS' COMMON COMPLAINTS  
ABOUT ANA SOLDIERS FROM RED TEAM DATA**

**TOP TIER COMPLAINTS U.S. SOLDIERS HAVE WITH ANA SOLDIERS:**

**DRUG ABUSERS** (Estimated hashish use among ANA members averaged 74%; see pgs. 27, 40.)

“Almost all of them use hashish; at least 90%.”

“They are stoned all the time; some even while on patrol with us.”

“Drug use like never before seen.”

“At COP ... we found a large roomful of used needles in the ANA building. There were an astronomical number of needles just lying all over the floor. We thought maybe nearly half the ANA there were on heroin and we saw 90% use hashish.”

“They had a HORRIBLE problem with heroin and other drugs.”

**THIEVES**

“We can't leave anything out; they steal it all.”

“I know they're poor; if they'd just ask for it, if we can, we'd give it to them. But they'd rather just steal. Then they go into denial saying, 'We are Muslim, we don't steal.' Bullshit!”

“I even saw an ANA soldier steal a kid's bike. The kid just stood there looking while the ANA rode off. It was pathetic.”

“Our biggest issue was they stole everything, including our defibrillator! It was for them too!”

**TRAITOROUS**

“While on patrol.... I don't trust them.”

“It's funny how they tend not to get shot at when we are not with them.”

“I think it is pretty obvious that many have informal truces with the insurgents.”

“A reporter attached to my platoon said that during a conversation with ANA soldiers they said that if the Taliban began to win the war, they would switch sides and join the Taliban.”

“We know some of them are giving information to the insurgents about our planned operations.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **DANGEROUS/UNSTABLE**

“There were several occasions where the ANA made me fear for my life.”

“I wouldn’t trust the ANA with anything, never mind my life.”

“They shot one of my soldiers when he was walking up to the ECP; this was due to carelessness.”

“I was fired on by ANA personnel multiple times during my deployment.”

“They seem to act on emotion rather than common sense.”

### **INCOMPETENT**

“We can’t even get rid of the worst ones; we have no authority to fire or transfer them.”

“They are just about useless; genuinely stupid.”

“ANA need a lot more training and discipline. From what I’ve seen the ANA are a joke.”

“They shot an RPG and a .50 Cal at our dismounted element; this was just careless negligence.”

“They are completely incompetent.”

“The overall quality of the ANA cannot be intelligently described. It would benefit Afghanistan to disband the ANA and start over again.”

“There are some good ones, but they tend to get killed off.”

“We are interfering with Darwinian Theory!”

### **POOR ANA LEADERSHIP**

“Their officers are just useless. They avoid going out.... They are rarely there anyway. Their one week vacation usually turns into a month.”

“They have no functional NCO Corps.”

“They follow a Soviet style where officers make every decision and NCOs are just overpaid privates.”

“They won’t cooperate with us such as having their troops turn in their cell phones....”

“One ANA officer embezzled food funds; he stole the food right out of the mouths of the soldiers he was responsible for.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **POOR/UNSAFE WEAPONS HANDLING DISCIPLINE**

“They are totally reckless when handling their weapons. I catch them all the time walking around the base with their weapon on semi-automatic instead of safe!”

“One idiot taped his RPG round to the tube and then failed to remove it when he fired it. He blew his hands off and badly wounded several others around him. This is what we have to work with!” (*Often mentioned incident; they were incongruous with such “stupidity.”*)

### **POOR FIRE CONTROL DURING FIRE FIGHTS**

“They fire off all their ammunition right away. They will burn out their gun barrels if we don’t stop them.”

“During battle they tend to spray their fire; some of these rounds just barely missed my soldiers on occasion.”

### **NO BUY-IN TO WAR EFFORT/GUTLESS**

“They are here to simply collect a paycheck; nothing else.”

“They are pretty much gutless in combat; we do most of the fighting.”

### **DYSFUNCTIONAL LOGISTICS/SUPPLY SYSTEMS**

“They don’t get anything from Kabul; we have to give it to them. But they tend to waste or steal a lot of what we do give them.”

“They are not supported by their government. They don’t even get the basics.”

### **BRUTAL TREATMENT OF DOGS**

“An ANA soldier on guard duty threw a dog off a cliff for no reason. The U.S. Soldier at the OP got livid and grabbed the ANA soldier to throw him off the cliff too, but decided it was not worth the trouble he’d get into.”

“If a stray dog comes onto the base and we feed it the ANA will kill it; maybe out of jealousy?”

“I think they tortured my dog to death, but I couldn’t prove it.”

“One of them kicked my dog. I grabbed him by the scruff of the neck and told him never to do that again. Later, my dog still ended up dead, but I don’t know who was responsible.”

**SECOND TIER COMPLAINTS U.S. SOLDIERS HAVE WITH ANA SOLDIERS:**

**POOR HYGIENE**

“They stink; they simply don’t wash themselves, except their feet-without soap, but with our bottled water. Nor do they change their clothes.”

“Terrible hygiene.”

“Take a look at their latrine. It’s obvious that it has never been cleaned. How can they live that way?”

**LAZY**

“They simply refuse to work very hard. If we give them a weapons training exercise that should be repeated twenty or thirty times to master it, they’ll stop after just two or three iterations claiming they don’t need to do it anymore.”

“They prefer to just lie around all day and do nothing.”

“We are always sensitive to their religious practices, but if there’s a work project that needs to be done you can count on it also being their prayer time.”

“They are always late. They will leave their security shift even if their relief hasn’t arrived!”

**FASTING DESPITE BEING ON COMBAT PATROL**

“During Ramadan they fasted even when we were out on combat patrol; it endangered everyone because they were weak and light-headed.”

**BAD MORALE**

“They have no pride in their army.”

**SEARCHES**

“We can’t trust them to do house searches. They will say they searched a room when we know that they didn’t.”

“We allow the females to move in and out of the rooms before we search them to respect their culture, but they still complain.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **ANP and ABP**

U.S. Soldiers said that they were aware of the ANP and ABP reputation for being highly corrupt and of extorting civilians. They tended to rate them lower than the ANA.

“The ANP I saw did nothing the year I was in Afghanistan.”

“The ANP in the Pech Valley might as well be insurgents.”

“The ANP would constantly abandon their post.”

“The ANP never got shot at; we knew they had an alliance with the insurgents.”

### **OTHER OBSERVATIONS:**

#### **MINIMAL SOCIAL CONTACT**

“They are just a bunch of pot heads and I didn’t want my soldiers mixing with them.”

“They spent enough time with each other--in bed.”

“One of them crapped in our sink; why would we socialize?”

“You never know when one of them is going to turn around and shoot us; I keep my distance.”

#### **RELIGION**

In the survey on average, U.S. Soldiers perceived that 50% of ANA were Islamic radicals (pg. 38).

#### **PARTNERING**

Many troops said there was a lack of Command emphasis/directive in how to partner with ANSF.

#### **AFGHAN CIVILIANS**

Many U.S. Soldiers had quite negative attitudes towards them. They did not like or trust them and thought many were insurgent sympathizers and informants. They were repulsed by how women and children are treated.

#### **FEMALES and CHILDREN**

“How they treat their women and children is disgusting; they are just chattel to them.”

“I had one guy bring in his son who had a terrible hand injury that was obviously many days old; the kid’s fingers were falling off. I asked him if he had a car. He said yes. I then asked him why he didn’t take the kid to the hospital when the kid got hurt. He just couldn’t be bothered to do it and knew I’d treat him when I got back.”

## RESULTS-U.S. SOLDIERS' RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

U.S. Soldiers were very denigrating in their opinions of ANSF members. Ratings across issues generally fell into the 'Bad' and 'Very Bad' range. Particularly low ratings were found among U.S. officers' and senior NCOs' ratings as well as among those soldiers located in the most combat-intensive regions. The category that saw the lowest values across ANA, ANP and ABP were 'Honesty and Integrity' which fell into the 'Very Bad' range. (See Tables 1 and 2, pages 30-31.)

For the ANA specifically, the lowest ratings were for 'Honesty and Integrity,' 'Ability for ANA to Sustain,' and 'Drug Abuse Among ANA,' all falling within the 'Very Bad' range. 30% or more of all respondents rated each of these categories as 'Abysmal.' On average, U.S. Soldiers reported that they believed that 74% of ANA personnel engaged in illicit drug use, mostly hashish, but also exhibited high rates of heroin abuse. The highest rated category was 'Relationship With U.S. Troops' that at 3.7 fell between 'Bad' and 'Marginal.'

The ANP's ratings were mostly all lower than those for the ANA. All scores fell in between 'Very Bad' and 'Bad.'

The ABP ratings were the lowest of the three ANSF components evaluated. Their scores fell mostly into the 'Very Bad' range.

As a validity check, comparisons were made between Red Team and HTT survey results. **Very similar negative results were found between comparison groups for the questionnaire portion** of the study, especially as reflected in means and cumulative averages (see Table 2). Comparison groups were subdivided based on degree of kinetic activity. Thus, those soldiers based in the Pech Valley were matched with FOB Connelly. Non-Pech Valley soldiers were matched with all other HTT bases. The only minor differences noted were that the HTT groups from the less kinetic bases rated the ANA and ANP somewhat higher than their Red Team non-Pech Valley matched group (Marginal-to-Bad vs. Bad), but rated the ABP much lower (Very Bad-to-Bad vs. Marginal). The cumulative average ratings across the two sets of matched comparison groups were virtually identical (2.3 vs. 2.4 for the more kinetic bases, and 3.3 vs. 3.2 for the less kinetic bases), equating to 'Very Bad' and 'Bad.' Lowest averages for ANA were for 'Drug Abuse' and 'Sustainability.' For ANP 'Courage' was the worst rated category. And with the exception of the non-Pech Valley respondents, the ABP were generally rated in the 'Abysmal' to 'Very Bad' range.

Based on earlier findings another factor was included in the HTT survey. U.S. Soldiers rated the quality of the cultural training they received. This score averaged 3.1, equating to 'Bad.'

In sum, U.S. Soldiers in the follow-on HTT questionnaire (n=41), and matched on the basis of comparable kinetic activity within their sectors, conveyed the same deeply negative beliefs about ANSF members as were found in the original Red Team questionnaire (n=95).

UNCLASSIFIED

**TABLE 1**  
**RED TEAM SURVEY RESULTS: U.S. SOLDIERS' MEAN (M) RATINGS OF ANSF**

(1 = Abysmal; 2 = Very Bad; 3 = Bad; 4 = Marginal; 5 = Good; 6 = Very Good; 7 = Excellent)

| <b>RATINGS ON:</b>               | <b>M Overall</b> | <b>Percent Saying</b> | <b>M for Officers</b>    | <b>M for those at OP</b> |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>ANA Members:</b>              | <b>(n=95)</b>    | <b>Abysmal</b>        | <b>&amp; E-7+ (n=11)</b> | <b>Michigan (n=52)</b>   |
| Trustworthiness on patrol:       | 2.8              | 18%                   | 2.5                      | 2.6                      |
| Courage:                         | 3.1              | 14%                   | 2.9                      | 3.1                      |
| Honesty and Integrity:           | 2.3              | 33%                   | 1.5                      | 2.0                      |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops:     | 3.7              | 3%                    | 3.0                      | 3.6                      |
| Competence:                      | 2.9              | 14%                   | 2.4                      | 2.7                      |
| ANA Ability to Self-Sustain:     | 2.3              | 30%                   | 1.6                      | 2.2                      |
| Quality of ANA's NCOs:           | 3.1              | 14%                   | 1.8                      | 2.8                      |
| Quality of ANA's Officers:       | 3.2              | 12%                   | 2.6                      | 3.0                      |
| Drug Abuse Among ANA:            | 2.2              | 31%                   | 1.8                      | 1.9                      |
| <b><u>ANP Members (n=58)</u></b> |                  |                       |                          |                          |
| Trustworthiness on Patrol:       | 2.5              | 26%                   | 3.0                      | 2.3                      |
| Courage:                         | 2.4              | 31%                   | 2.3                      | 2.1                      |
| Honesty and Integrity:           | 2.3              | 29%                   | 1.7                      | 2.1                      |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops:     | 2.9              | 29%                   | 3.6                      | 3.0                      |
| Competence:                      | 2.7              | 29%                   | 3.1                      | 2.5                      |
| <b><u>ABP Members (n=15)</u></b> |                  |                       |                          |                          |
| Trustworthiness on Patrol:       | 2.3              | 33%                   | 3.0                      | 1.6                      |
| Courage:                         | 2.1              | 20%                   | 2.3                      | 1.9                      |
| Honesty and Integrity:           | 2.0              | 33%                   | 1.7                      | 1.5                      |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops:     | 2.7              | 33%                   | 3.6                      | 1.9                      |
| Competence:                      | 2.5              | 27%                   | 3.1                      | 1.7                      |

UNCLASSIFIED

**TABLE 2: COMPARISON RESULTS OF U.S. SOLDIERS' MEAN (M) RATINGS**

(1 = Abysmal; 2 = Very Bad; 3 = Bad; 4 = Marginal; 5 = Good; 6 = Very Good; 7 = Excellent)

| <b>RATINGS ON:</b>           | <b><u>M</u> for Connolly<br/>(n=14)</b> | <b><u>M</u> for Pech<br/>Valley (n=73)</b> | <b><u>M</u> for Other<br/>HTT FOBs (n=27)</b> | <b><u>M</u> for non-Pech<br/>Valley (n=22)</b> |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Trustworthiness on patrol:   | 3.0                                     | 2.8  | 4.2   | 2.8  |
| Courage:                     | 2.8                                     | 2.8  | 4.2   | 2.9  |
| Honesty and Integrity:       | 3.0                                     | 2.2  | 3.7   | 2.7  |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops: | 3.8                                     | 3.6  | 4.6   | 4.1  |
| Competence:                  | 3.2                                     | 2.8  | 3.9   | 3.2  |
| ANA Ability to Self-Sustain: | 1.4                                     | 2.2  | 2.7   | 2.4  |
| Quality of ANA's NCOs:       | 3.1                                     | 3.0  | 3.5   | 3.1  |
| Quality of ANA's Officers:   | 2.1                                     | 3.2  | 4.0   | 3.4  |
| Drug Abuse Among ANA:        | 1.6                                     | 2.1  | 2.6   | 2.6  |
| <b><u>ANP Members</u></b>    |   |  |   |  |
| Trustworthiness on Patrol:   | 2.2                                     | 2.3  | 3.7   | 2.9  |
| Courage:                     | 1.8                                     | 2.0  | 3.3   | 2.9  |
| Honesty and Integrity:       | 2.4                                     | 2.2  | 3.1   | 2.5  |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops: | 3.0                                     | 2.7  | 3.6   | 3.1  |
| Competence:                  | 2.3                                     | 2.6  | 3.7   | 2.9  |
| <b><u>ABP Members</u></b>    |   |  |   |  |
| Trustworthiness on Patrol:   | 1.2                                     | 1.6  | 2.4   | 3.2  |
| Courage:                     | 1.4                                     | 1.9  | 2.6   | 4.2  |
| Honesty and Integrity:       | 1.6                                     | 1.5  | 2.3   | 4.0  |
| Relationship W/ U.S. Troops: | 1.5                                     | 1.9  | 2.8   | 4.0  |
| Competence:                  | 1.6                                     | 1.7  | 2.6   | 3.6  |
| <b>CUMULATIVE AVERAGE:</b>   | <b>2.3</b>                              | <b>2.4</b>                                 | <b>3.3</b>                                    | <b>3.2</b>                                     |

## DISCUSSION

### ANSF PERSONNEL'S PERSPECTIVES

ANSF members recalled a rather large number of social altercations that they self-reported as near-fratricide murder incidents (N = 14). These often entailed perceptions of U.S. Soldiers disrespecting them or civilians (especially by cursing), where they deemed a home search as a theological violation, or where Afghan women were not perceived as being accorded privacy and/or proper respect (often, this meant not being seen at all). These findings add further credence to the concern that fratricide-murder risks have become fairly common within the last nineteen months, and often stem from personal and social altercations and cultural clashes rather than from insurgent infiltration. Also, similar to many ISAF members' sentiments towards ANSF, there are pervasive feelings of animosity and distrust ANSF personnel have towards U.S. Forces. (This may also help explain why so many of the ANSF murderers, at least seven, have been able to escape). This social atmospheric study revealed a large number of grievances ANSF members claimed to have with U.S. Soldiers. Focus group members often reported a strong and endemic dislike, anger and resentment towards many of the behaviors that they attribute to U.S. Soldiers. This is a disturbing finding that challenges the efficacy of ISAF's training mission with ANSF as well as its co-location 'partnering' strategy. Several behaviors and policies were identified that contributed to such negative perceptions of and anger towards U.S. Forces.

ANSF participants said that slow moving U.S. convoys that they are not allowed to pass, as well as U.S. roadblocks were infuriating. They reported great impatience when having their trips slowed down or delayed because of such activities. They saw no reason why they should not be allowed to pass slow moving convoys and often saw no reason for the roadblocks that occur. They especially disliked it when sick civilians were not permitted to pass, even when they offered to escort them. The general sentiment was that U.S. Soldiers show contempt towards both ANSF and the Afghan civilian population with such practices and behaviors, and this was deemed to be largely intolerable, an affront to their pride and dignity. While recent publicized changes in U.S. military convoy driving practices now permit civilian and ANSF traffic to pass, ensuring the enforcement of these changes is very important. Also, more needs to be done to educate Afghans on the reason for particular road blocks. U.S. Forces should be concerned with the growing impatience Afghans have with these delays and communicate the reason to those who are stopped at road blocks as much as possible. Special treatment of marked ANSF vehicles as well as those civilian vehicles transporting the sick or injured would also be prudent measures. Similarly, it should be acknowledged here that there were comparatively few complaints about current reckless driving by U.S. Forces, falling only within the third tier of grievance categories. This issue would definitely have been a top tier issue just two years ago. But recent ISAF efforts that reformed driving practices have greatly improved public perceptions of road safety and driving courtesies. (However, ANSF members themselves are in great need of improved driving instruction to include basic driving courtesies.)

**Night Raids often provoked great anger.** They explained that such transgressions are deeply disturbing to them. They often thought that any searches that needed to be done should be undertaken during the daytime. Many ANSF emphasized that U.S. Soldiers, being foreign infidels, should never even enter an Afghan's home. They explained that during the home searches females need to be allowed to move into one room while the search is conducted throughout the house. After all the other rooms are searched the females need to be moved into one of the cleared rooms so that the last one can be searched. Most ANSF were of the consensus that ANP should be the lead in home searches (despite largely perceiving them to be corrupt), and do so in the presence of the local community leaders. If police are not available, then the ANA should perform the searches, not U.S. Forces.

Most ANSF members interviewed were very open to utilizing female ANSF members for searches. Similarly, ANSF members were mostly accepting of recruiting more females into the ANSF, especially into the ANP. However, ANP members were generally the most resistant to accepting such a female recruitment program. Further, most ANSF participants thought that searches were primarily the only duties the female ANSF members would be appropriate for. They didn't see the possibility or value of ANSF women being out on regular patrols with them. In any case, it is imperative to revise current search procedures to make them more compatible with Afghan normative expectations and demands. These will include greater utilization of women to conduct searches.

**Civilian casualties were cited as critically important issues and were brought up across virtually all focus groups.** ANSF personnel often have a front row seat to witnessing the aftermath of civilian casualties. ANSF members' general perception was that U.S. Soldiers cause a large percentage of civilian casualties due to indifference and outright recklessness. A great many ANSF members reported that they believed U.S. Soldiers were overly aggressive and also prone to panicking and firing indiscriminately and excessively when attacked, killing anyone around. They often and bitterly mentioned incidents of mass civilian casualties inflicted by U.S. Forces such as the Shinwar Massacre and the Wedding Party Massacre. They also complained of the overreliance on air attacks that lead to many civilian casualties. They often claimed that such incidents resulted from a complete lack of concern for the safety of civilians. **Their general belief reported across focus groups was that U.S. Soldiers place zero interest in protecting civilians and one hundred percent interest in killing and in their own self-protection,** and that this attitude manifests itself especially during ambushes, leading to many Afghan civilian casualties. With such beliefs, the general reaction they conveyed seemed to be a strong sentiment of repugnance and alienation. ANSF members also complained of the lack of accountability of the U.S. Soldiers and Marines who were culpable for past massacres and other civilian casualty incidents. They said that they did not understand nor accept such a policy of immunity. While insurgents cause, often deliberately, the vast majority of civilian casualties, ANSF personnel, like their civilian counterparts, have exceptionally less tolerance for accidental ISAF-inflicted CIVCAS incidents and also often perceive that ISAF in fact causes a fairly high

percentage of all civilian casualties. This should serve as another red flag where ISAF-generated civilian casualties are concerned. Such not only breeds disillusionment and generates more insurgents from the civilian population; ISAF-caused civilian casualty incidents also greatly alienate ANSF members and likely contribute to the increasing fratricide murders being committed by them (either directly, or as second or third order effects). Additionally, while Afghans receive Solatia payments for civilian casualty events, they do not see justice taken against those ISAF soldiers and their commanders negligently responsible for the civilian deaths. This breeds further contempt and distrust, especially when they see the same military units continue to inflict additional civilian casualties with perceived impunity.

Similarly, **ANSF members were often quite prone to assuming, remembering and believing the worst of U.S. Forces, despite substantial evidence to the contrary, as well as historical reality.** ANSF participants repeatedly mentioned certain incidents where U.S. Forces were initially blamed for civilian casualties when there was clear evidence and investigatory findings that the casualties were inflicted by insurgent forces (survey studies and media coverage of Afghan civilians show that they also demonstrate such a tendency). One glaring example of this was the June 2009 explosion that occurred in Asadabad. A crowd had gathered around a U.S. military convoy to watch soldiers change a flat tire. An explosion then occurred that killed and injured many local civilians. The Afghans immediately blamed the U.S. Soldiers for the attack and rioted while chanting anti-U.S. hate speech. This was despite the fact that there was a video that clearly showed an Afghan in the crowd throwing a grenade. And this was also despite the tremendous amount of goodwill (i.e., socialistic) development assistance and even medical care that had been provided for several years to those very same residents by the local U.S. Forces. Yet several ANSF study participants emphasized that they were still convinced that the U.S. Soldiers had deliberately orchestrated this event to kill civilians. This reflexive propensity to believe the worst, to selectively process and remember information that is contrary to historical reality and pejorative to U.S. Forces reveals a serious conundrum in improving relations with the ANSF (let alone the civilian populace). **When a supposed 'ally' demonstrates that it perceives the other from an inherently 'bad-faith' model there are severe limitations with the utility of the relationship** (one representative of a temporary tolerance rather than a meaningful friendship). They simply do not trust us, and after all this time, it is highly unlikely that they ever will. This points to the minimal results one may expect from any IO campaigns (as well as ISAF's entire mission) that attempt to redress this. Still, there is a need for an extensive IO re-education program directed at both ANSF personnel and Afghan civilians on insurgent-caused civilian casualty incidents. But in any case, it is also quite apparent that ISAF has inflicted civilian casualties that could have and should have been avoided had there been greater knowledge of the patterns of life of the Afghan civilian population.

**Many ANSF members demonstrated a general loathing of U.S. Soldiers.** They often complained of the widespread cultural insensitivity and ignorance of U.S. Soldiers. They found many of them to be extremely arrogant, rude, bullying and prone to using profanities. They

## UNCLASSIFIED

reported that they found the term "mother-fucker" particularly offensive, even infuriating, but that it was a curse phrase constantly used by U.S. Soldiers. ANSF members further remarked that they thought U.S. Soldiers were uncouth and ignorant in the proper mannerism of Afghan cultural behaviors, particularly Pashtun (this study was completed in a largely Pashtun region). They found their lack of modesty infuriating. They often stated that when they tried to correct U.S. Soldiers' behaviors, they were reproached through verbal abuse, insults and shouted profanities, or were simply ignored, with the soldiers continuing with the same obnoxious behaviors. Participants often complained that they have had their fill with such abrasive personalities and offensive and vulgar behaviors and that only their orders not to take action has prevented more serious confrontations with U.S. Soldiers. Some said that retraining those that commit these offenses would do no good; that they were born with personality defects that lack decency. These numerous complaints across focus groups indicate that vastly improved cultural sensitivity and human relations (consideration of others) education programs need to be implemented for pre-deployment training as well as during regular ongoing training. Instruction should include how offensive arrogance, insults, bullying and profanity are to Afghans. Leadership at all levels must enforce these standards of conduct. It also seems quite obvious that certain personality types are not suitable for fulfilling the requirements of a counter-insurgency strategy. Those manifesting the abrasive characteristics cited in this study cause great harm with ANSF and Afghan civilian relations; they do not contribute to the mission, they jeopardize it. Therefore, **if satisfactory 'COIN attitude' adjustments (i.e., a civil demeanor) cannot be instilled during training, then such soldiers should not be deployed.** (Recruiting standards addressing such personality traits might also be implemented.) They will be and have been a liability. It only takes the actions of a very few of these types to completely negate everyone else's work. And according to the ANSF study participants, there are far more than just a few (most groups gave estimates in the range of 1 to 3 U.S. Soldiers out of every 10).

It would be advisable to encourage and assist senior Afghan MOI and MOD officials to accept the need for and implement their own form of cultural sensitivity and human relations training for their ANSF members as would pertain to dealing with U.S. and other ISAF troops. ANSF members should also have greater knowledge, tolerance and acceptance of the Westerners who are training them and sacrificing their lives to bring their country a better future.

How U.S. Soldiers answer nature's call while on patrol needs to be explicated in official military policy. Current practices are not working; they are actually infuriating Afghans who are deeply offended by some soldiers' lack of modesty. Provision of relief bottles inside MRAPs should be considered. Unfortunately, common sense in dealing with such daily living activities need to be incorporated into doctrine--and strictly enforced. This should include other bodily functions that were noted by respondents as well, at the very least while interacting with Afghans.

Efforts should be made to ensure that U.S. Soldiers demonstrate proper military bearing, respect and protocol when dealing with all ANSF members (especially officers and senior NCOs) as well as Afghan civilians. This includes strict controls on the use of profanity when interacting

with them. Currently, there is a near-absence of military courtesies and decorum extended to ANSF officers (admittedly difficult to practice when so many are corrupt and incompetent). Quite the contrary, many ANSF members noted the rudeness that U.S. Soldiers commonly demonstrated to their ANSF officers and NCOs, and they very much resented such behavior. Such indifference and lack of enforced military protocol challenges military discipline and fuels the arrogance currently being manifested by some U.S. Soldiers towards the ANSF no matter their rank. Such behaviors undermine the mission here and may endanger U.S. Soldier's lives. Therefore, there should be monitoring and supervision of U.S. Soldiers' behaviors towards ANSF personnel, ensuring that military courtesies are reasonably observed and civil behavior practiced.

Some current search SOPs pertaining to ANSF should be reconsidered, especially at bases where public searches of ANSF personnel occur. Such search practices humiliate ANSF members and cause animosity, even outrage to develop which contributes to further alienation. Such demeaning behavior also delegitimizes ANSF members in the eyes of Afghan civilians who witness such acts, and conveys a sense of ISAF being unwelcomed and oppressive occupiers (as was conveyed by many disgruntled ANSF participants).

Many ANA members believed that they were discriminated against when it comes to being MEDEVAC'd if wounded. Pejorative assertions were made that if ANA are wounded they are neglected and even ignored by U.S. Forces, and are often denied MEDEVAC services. They often thought that if ANA soldiers are treated in a U.S. medical facility they receive substandard care. Allegations were made that ANA soldiers are more likely to undergo amputations at U.S. hospitals versus ANA hospitals. An IO campaign to better inform ANA members on MEDEVAC policies and the quality care provided their wounded is indicated. Such a program should include the fact that more seriously injured ANA soldiers are usually directed to U.S. or other ISAF medical facilities, so that direct comparisons of mortality and amputation rates are not valid metrics (as was explained to several groups at the conclusion of the interview.)

Many ANSF respondents denigrated the personal integrity of U.S. Soldiers, and declared them to be cowards hiding behind their MRAPs, their close air support and overwhelming fire-power. Respondents often reported thinking that U.S. Soldiers would not be brave if they had to fight under the same operational conditions as the ANSF did, without body armor, with older weapons, light-skinned vehicles, poor logistical support, and no dedicated air cover. An IO effort should be developed to inform ANSF members of the courage U.S. Soldiers have shown in battle.

Many ANSF participants mentioned that if they were to be killed their families would be condemned to a life of poverty, whereas families of U.S. Soldiers KIA receive generous insurance settlements. Another claim made was that ANSF members who are maimed or otherwise incapacitated will lose their jobs and end up as street beggars, whereas U.S. Soldiers know that they will be taken care of by their government should they be badly wounded and handicapped for life. Given these concerns voiced, it would be advisable to do an assessment of what benefits are actually provided to ANSF members who are killed or maimed in combat and

## UNCLASSIFIED

what provisions are made for their families. Care should be taken when determining 'official policy' from 'actual reality' given the corruption endemic throughout the Afghan government. It would be naïve to believe that U.S. Forces will be able to instill a sense of warrior élan and commitment for ANSF personnel if they believe (and know) that their corrupt government will steal their benefits and turn them and/or their families out to the streets should they become casualties, condemning them to beggar status. This does help partly explain the ANSF's less than stellar combat performance in such operations as the Galuch Valley, and their predilection towards mass surrenders in battles that have claimed many U.S. and other ISAF members' lives (i.e., Bari Alai, Keating, etc.). Such reveals the severe constraints faced with attempts to instill a warrior ethos and psychological commitment among ANSF members (who have exceedingly high turnover rates). Thus, the profound difficulties inherent with meeting such professional development goals with ANSFs reflect second and third order effects of GIROA's pervasive kleptocracy and gross negligence in providing the most basic care and services to the Afghan populace, a situation fully expressed by many ANSF participants (and a conundrum long willfully ignored by ISAF).

Similarly, corruption within ANSF must be addressed. Many ANSF enlisted members have suffered greatly as a result of widespread organized and opportunistic theft of military equipment and supplies, and even of their own food and salaries by their officers and supervisors. (Similarly, the researcher is aware of some ANA officers' predilections to embezzle food funds from their own troops, and has witnessed instances of substandard food served to ANA personnel as a result.) Such has adversely effected operations, troop morale and retention. It is highly unlikely that a sustainable professional military and police force can be developed and sustained given the current degree of institutionalized corruption throughout the ANSFs as well as the rest of the Afghan government.

ANSF personnel often voiced disappointment that U.S. Soldiers seem less interested in providing training than they had in the past. Many ANSF participants thought this disinterest stemmed from a lack of commitment to the war effort (since the U.S. was seen to be planning to disengage starting next summer), as well as the perceived laziness and poor attitudes of some of the U.S. Soldiers. Many said that they very much wanted more training, but were not receiving it.

U.S. Marines, Special Operations Forces, female soldiers, Canadian soldiers and previous brigade units were often said to be more respectful and respected. ANSF personnel were especially impressed with embedded training teams (ETTs), and much preferred this mode of training and mentorship. Many ANSF members emphasized that they noticed a negative change in U.S. Soldiers' attitudes and general helpfulness starting last summer. This June, 2010 period correlates with many factors, including a substantial increase in kinetic activities and IED incidents, the replacement of GEN McChrystal with GEN Petraeus, a subsequent and substantial increase in ISAF-caused civilian casualties when compared to the preceding 12 months, a brigade RIP/TOA in the region, another failed Afghan election, and a rapid increase in fratricide-murder incidents involving the ANSFs.

## UNCLASSIFIED

ANSF personnel based in Kunar where the Short Corn Program was implemented were in agreement that it was a failure as far as local public perceptions were concerned. They claimed that many civilian farmers thought they were cheated. This important observation requires further investigation. It would be prudent to conduct a social atmospherics evaluation study of the after effects of the Short Corn Program before it is repeated (and perhaps to redress grievances), and before similar programs are initiated. The observations and comments made by the ANSF members with regards to the after-effects of the Short Corn Program require verification.

The establishment of a public relations team consisting of both ANSF mullahs and U.S. chaplains to work with improving interpersonal relations between the joint forces, as well as local community relations should be considered. U.S. military units quite often automatically exclude their chaplains from such social and key leader engagements with either the ANSFs or the civilian population. This is an error. Many Afghans place much respect towards clergymen and those they view to be religious, if not Islamic. Such a joint team may go far in repairing damaged relations between the forces as well as instilling a greater sense of tolerance of religious differences. Still, great care should be taken in selecting the appropriate personalities for such a program.

A theological survey study completed on civilians last year in RC-East by the researcher revealed a widespread level of extremist religious thought (many believed that suicide bombers were martyrs and were going to see Paradise). Stemming from this research, religious extremism among ANSF was assessed in the current study. The same religious concept about suicide bombers' souls were asked when time permitted. **Results indicated that ANSF members were more likely to think suicide bombers would see Salvation than U.S. Soldiers who are KIA here.** Although most ANSF members reported that they didn't know what would happen, or reported that the suicide bomber was likely to go to Hell, a large minority thought that a suicide bomber would go to Paradise. In contrast, **few ANSF members thought U.S. Soldiers who die fighting in Afghanistan will go to Heaven** or Paradise, that being infidels they are automatically condemned to Hell. Additionally, **some ANSF religious education officers interviewed by the researcher were radicals** (defined as believing a suicide bomber would see Paradise, and/or believing that suicide bombing can be justified). It seems extremely inappropriate, unethical and outright naïve to try to build '*trusted*' relations among ANSF members with such extremist religious beliefs and pejorative perspectives. It should also be of concern that there are extremist religious education officers and uniformed mullahs within ANSF ranks (to what degree requires further inquiry). [In the survey questionnaire U.S. Soldiers responded that they perceived that a mean of 50% of the ANA members they worked conveyed radical beliefs (this was a very subjective measure designed to assess U.S. Soldiers' perceptions, not actual radicalism).] More research, monitoring and intervention should be conducted on Islamic Radicalism within ANSFs (as well as the civilian populace). Senior MOD and MOI officials should be encouraged to develop and implement a non-extremist vetting process for religious education officers, uniformed mullahs, as well as for new recruits and existing ANSF members. ISAF's cognitive dissonance approach to this Islamic Radicalism issue, perhaps

## UNCLASSIFIED

stemming from political correctness, is allowing this threat ample opportunity to metastasize. It seems counter-productive to build up ANSF if it is to be populated by radical religious leaders, educators and followers. Similar security screenings of ASG personnel should also be initiated.

Of the three ANSF groups within this study, ANP members (all of who were Pashtu), and especially ANP who resided in rural areas, tended to demonstrate the most extreme religious sentiments, social beliefs and values, and generally manifested a severely limited interpretation of constitutional laws and rights, particularly with regards to Afghan women. Many conveyed a fundamental belief that women had no right to work, and that their only rightful place was in the home under her husband's complete control. The extremist beliefs found with many ANP are contradictory to some existing Afghan constitutional rights. Therefore, it is very unlikely that many ANP, at least those in Pashtun regions, will enforce existing civil rights laws (they often outright voiced this fact). As a minor example, during one visit to an ANP station the researcher witnessed a man and woman being arrested by the ANP because they were traveling in the same vehicle together and were unmarried. ISAF efforts to increase police numbers may be self-defeating without significant vetting, training, leadership and recruitment reform. Such findings indicate severe limitations in the proper enforcement of existing human rights laws, especially within Pashtun areas. More study on this issue among Pashtu and non-Pashtu ANP is called for. (Second and third order effects of this radicalism issue may be reflected in the ANP's often slow responses to aiding UNAMA and ISAF personnel under attack, most notably its slow response to the UNAMA Safe-House Attack in Kabul and its lack of response to the Mazar-e-Sharif riot.)

Many ANA members expressed a distrust of the ANP believing them to be very corrupt (even by prevailing Afghan standards), predatory towards civilians, prone to collaborate with the insurgents, and often tend to be drug addicts and/or traffickers. (Other recent studies show that many Afghan civilians have similar perceptions of the ANP. Their lack of community policing skills is also notorious.) However, many ANA also admitted that if the ANP did not collaborate with the insurgents then they would be murdered by them. They often acknowledged that ANP were poorly equipped and supported given the inherent dangers of their operational environment. In any case, many ANA saw the ANP less as a police agency, but more as an organized crime syndicate extorting civilians rather than serving and protecting them. It is no secret that rather than merit-based, many senior police positions are largely determined through bribes from \$150,000 to \$250,000 for placement in districts most lucrative for engaging in narcotics trafficking and other smuggling operations. This institutionalized corruption then rapidly spreads downhill throughout all the ranks. It seems unlikely that a legitimate police force can be created without a radical purging and reformation of the ANP at all levels. (Yet despite this pervasive corruption, ANSF participants reported that they would still rather an ANP member search a house than U.S. Soldiers who are seen as lowly infidels; this a large Red Flag that reflects just how negative their perceptions are of U.S. and other ISAF components.) Current ISAF strategic plans that call for a rapid and substantial expansion of the existing ANP bring to mind the old adage, "Be careful of what you wish for, you might get it."

## UNCLASSIFIED

ANSF members loathed U.S. foreign policy that provides significant support to Pakistan. They found it bizarre that the U.S. would knowingly support a country that is obviously a terrorist state that is actively engaged in assisting in the killing of both Afghan and U.S. Soldiers. They thought that the U.S. was duplicitous with such a despicable policy and while not holding U.S. Soldiers personally responsible for such decisions, they found it difficult to trust them due to this. Many thought the U.S. government was deceitful and was playing them; this was deeply resented.

There was widespread acceptance of the Reintegration Program for those ANSF familiar with it (many lower-level enlisted were unaware of the program, but they approved of it when it was explained to them). Most ANSF respondents actually seemed enthusiastic about the possible efficacy of this program. They often reiterated how utterly exhausted they were of the war and were well ready for a peace compromise (which does question the ANSF's 'staying power'). Most explained that while they would welcome Afghan insurgents into the ANSF, they would carefully monitor their behaviors for a period of time before actually trusting them. They would also want them to be vetted by their local communities. (One participant said that the insurgent's family should be identified so that if he betrayed the ANSF, then his family could be tracked down and killed.) However, one dissenting ANA officer said, "Sometimes you have to punch someone with a twisted mouth right in his face." He exclaimed he would never welcome or trust former insurgents given all the atrocities they have perpetrated and the repressive policies they espouse, and that the Reintegration Program was a desperate and naïve act of social and political appeasement doomed to failure. (The crass assumption that we can negotiate with and trust an entity that believes in recruiting children as suicide bombers and killing or throwing acid in little school girls' faces to prevent their being educated does seem absurd, if not outright immoral. It simply needs to be destroyed—admittedly difficult to achieve since President Karzai refers to them as "brothers" and has expressed his desire to join them. And the assumption that there are 'moderate' members that can be trusted to be recruited for reintegration is a cognitive oxymoron.)

The M-16 rifle was deemed as completely unreliable; something the U.S. Army stuck the ANA with. It is largely viewed as a junk rifle extremely prone to jamming and poorly designed for the operational conditions found in Afghanistan (reference was made to the many holes along the barrel that let dirt get in, especially while exiting a helicopter during landing with all the sand flying in the air). Many also thought it was of WWII vintage. ANA members invariably wanted their cherished and robust AK-47s returned (many mentioned that it rarely jams and that it can be dunked into water and still fire). Mitigation interventions that might be considered include improved maintenance and training standards, confidence building exercises, comparative field evaluations between the M-16 and AK-47 that include such factors as accuracy, range, lethality, weight, etc. These failing, an assessment of the human factor realities of the Afghan populace and culture, including a largely illiterate army and police force, together with the operational field conditions ANA confronts (including extremely austere logistics and maintenance capacities), may be cause for a reconsideration for what constitutes the most appropriate rifle for the ANA.

## U.S. SOLDIERS' PERSPECTIVES

**U.S. Soldiers' perceptions of ANA members were extremely negative across all categories.** Very few U.S. Soldiers (average enlisted rank = E-4/5; average age = 25; 45% had previously served one or more combat tours) gave any ratings above marginal for any of the categories they were asked to rate. Officers (O-2s/O-3s) and senior NCOs gave the lowest scores. U.S. Soldiers based in less kinetic areas tended to give higher although still marginal-to-bad scores. Several U.S. troops reported several near-fratricide incidents where they were threatened by ANSF members or were nearly killed due to their carelessness, incompetence or treachery. One incident was recounted where a U.S. Soldier was accidentally wounded by an ANA soldier. Problem issues they identified included: pervasive illicit drug use throughout the ANA; massive theft of both ANA and ISAF supplies; covert alliances and informal treaties with insurgent groups; a lack of battlefield competence; a lack of fighting spirit and patriotism that translates into cowardice during combat; extremely poor morale; laziness; unsafe weapons handling; poor fire control; incompetent and corrupt officers; poor leadership to include a virtually non-existent NCO Corps; alarming attrition rates stemming from exceedingly high AWOLs and desertions; poor logistics capacity; mass illiteracy; disgusting personal hygiene; the poor treatment of women and children, and the torture and killing of dogs. U.S. Soldiers reported what they perceived to be religious radicalism among half of the ANA they lived with. (Other soldiers the researcher has interviewed in the past have also reported narcotics trafficking, ethnic tensions, dysfunctional maintenance and pay systems, ANA recruits coming from the lowest and least desired strata of society, widespread medical issues, and cultural sexual practices that the rest of the international community brands as child rape and sex slavery.)

The average scores on the surveys they completed on ANA personnel indicated that they had no confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty and integrity, courage or competence of ANA soldiers. A few U.S. Soldiers noted that they had observed a few competent and dedicated ANA soldiers, but that they tended to get killed off, and in any case were not rewarded by the ANA system which is largely based on graft, tribalism and nepotism. A few soldiers also said that occasionally they had come across a decent and competent ANA unit. Other than these rare observations there was almost nothing positive mentioned about the ANA. U.S. Soldiers were in near-universal agreement that the ANA was not a competent fighting force and would quickly collapse without a strong U.S. presence. Many also indicated that they were repulsed to even be associated with it. **The lowest ratings they gave were for 'Honesty and Integrity,' 'Drug Abuse Situation,' and the 'ANA's Ability to Sustain Itself Without ISAF Support,' all falling in between 'abysmal' and 'very bad' with officer and senior NCO ratings (with over 30% of all respondents rating these categories as 'abysmal').** Officers and senior NCOs consistently gave the lowest scores across most categories (however, given their small sample size, this is pilot data only). Troops stationed in the turbulent Pech Valley, particularly soldiers from OP Michigan (the most kinetic base of all) gave lower scores relative to those stationed in less kinetic regions.

## UNCLASSIFIED

Although many U.S. Soldiers said they had little interaction with the ANP or ABP, they had heard that they were not engaged in policing activities; rather they were largely extorting the civilian population. U.S. troops generally had even worse opinions of the ANP and ABP members, particularly when rating their courage and their overall relationship with U.S. troops.

The degree of drug abuse among ANA personnel astonished U.S. Soldiers. Their overall estimate was that about 74% of ANA soldiers engage in hashish use, and a large percentage also use heroin. One U.S. Soldier even believed that hashish use must be legal for them since it was practiced so completely and openly. A senior NCO lamented on how impossible it was to create a functional army out of pot smokers. The use of heroin was also reported as being very common among the ANA soldiers (at least those who were stationed in the Pech Valley). An officer said that he didn't permit much socialization and ensured that the base was segregated. He didn't want his soldiers exposed to such behaviors. Although there is an obviously very serious drug problem throughout the ANA, the percentages reported above do seem to be at least somewhat unrepresentative for the ANA as a whole, particularly the rate of heroin use (e.g., one ANA SGM in a recent closed meeting with the MOI Minister estimated that nationally, about 55-60% of ANA soldiers use hashish). In any case, serious intervention efforts must be made to combat this pervasive drug abuse if the ANA is ever going to be an effective and sustainable military force.

**U.S. Soldiers were virtually unanimous in their condemnation of the massive thievery that they must confront when being co-located with ANA units.** The large majority of participants cited this as their number one grievance against their ANA counterparts. One officer said that he insisted that ANA soldiers stay on their side of the base and that if one had to enter the U.S. side, then he was escorted at all times due to the pervasive theft of equipment and personal property. Many U.S. Soldiers complained that ANA soldiers would literally destroy munitions so that they could sell the brass of the shell casings at the bazaar (often for drugs). A senior NCO commented that the ANA evidently does not have any formal disciplinary system so there is no real accountability when ANA soldiers steal. Several U.S. Soldiers also mentioned that such theft extended to the civilian population as well; that ANSF members were often predatory towards them. It seems unlikely that a disciplined ANA force can be developed without its own criminal justice system to deter such widespread criminal acts.

Most U.S. Soldiers who talked with the researcher had absolutely no trust of ANA soldiers with regards to the insurgent threat. They strongly suspected some of them of informing the insurgents of upcoming movements and of engaging in informal truces (some claimed that they outright knew this to be fact). Many noted that the ANA virtually never got attacked if it was operating without U.S. forces. The ANP was largely seen as allied with the insurgents. Some soldiers also complained that they had no ability to take action against those suspected of being traitors, and that the ANA leadership was unresponsive to such complaints of betrayal. If U.S. trainers are to be successful, they must be empowered to force such interventions through firing and arrests.

UNCLASSIFIED

Many U.S. Soldiers were highly critical of the fighting ability and commitment of ANA soldiers, especially those that were stationed in the most kinetic regions such as the Pech Valley. They were highly skeptical of the possibility that ANA soldiers would ever be able and willing to hold their own ground against insurgents. They often said that U.S. Soldiers had vastly more buy-in to the war effort than did the ANA soldiers who were perceived to be there just to collect a pay check. **U.S. Soldiers reported that only a very few ANSF members actually exhibited courage. Ratings for 'Courage' generally fell into the 'Bad' and 'Very Bad' range.** This reflects an additional limitation with ANSF's development, the lack of any fighting spirit or esprit de corps. Such factors should always have been included in Capabilities Milestone evaluations of ANSF development, but were instead long neglected variables. [Similarly, it is completely unrealistic to believe that ISAF can at this point instill a sense of *esprit de corps* and purpose onto ANSF if the Afghans themselves lack the commitment, will and moral fortitude to carry on with the war effort. ANSF personnel have consistently proven incapable and/or unwilling to hold territory on their own (witness the annual spring rescue ritual of Barg-e-Matal, Nuristan where ANSF personnel flee en mass when confronted by insurgents, or the ANA's pathetic independent operation in Laghman in August, 2010), nor even competently enforce law and order in regions purported to be peaceful and ready for full transition to Afghan authority (witness the April 2011 riot in Mazar-e-Sharif and the ANP's passive and reprehensible bystander role while seven UNAMA members were slaughtered—at least they didn't murder any of the pitifully few survivors like they did following the October, 2009 insurgent attack on a UNAMA safe house in Kabul).] Perspectives from U.S. Soldiers are that ANSF members are largely content to let them do the fighting instead. They generally had little respect for ANSF members as soldiers or police officers. Many in fact found them to be despicable.

Poor weapons handling on the part of ANA members greatly worried and angered many U.S. Soldiers. They often mentioned the risk of accidental discharges the danger of getting wounded through carelessness and a lack of discipline when handling firearms.

Similarly, U.S. Soldiers often commented on the ANA's propensity to fire off their ammunition too quickly and without any meaningful aim. They were also concerned about getting hit by such errant rounds from ANA soldiers during combat.

Many U.S. Soldiers noted how lazy they thought the ANA soldiers were. They said that they did not maintain their side of the base which quickly becomes littered with garbage. And that they quickly grew bored when they were undergoing instruction and would often prematurely terminate training classes, just walking off. Such lackadaisical attitudes and behaviors on the part of ANA members demonstrate a serious lack of institutional discipline (contributing to their poor and unsafe weapons handling) and are reflective of a failing and unsustainable force.

NCOs and officers often observed that the ANA seemed to be based on a Soviet-style institutional culture where officers were the only ones that made decisions. They thought that the ANA, with very few exceptions, lacked any meaningful NCO Corps and that this dearth of

## UNCLASSIFIED

mid-level leadership was extremely limiting in the ANA's ability to develop as a functional army. They also observed that ANA officers rarely went on foot patrols or operations, that they often went absent when kinetic activities were forthcoming. The average U.S. Soldier leadership ratings given for ANA officers and NCOs were in the 'Bad' range; the pilot data from U.S. officers and senior NCOs were even more negative. The leadership vacuum in many ANSF units must be addressed by implementing a complete paradigm shift in how Afghan officers and NCOs are selected and promoted such as by merit rather than through nepotism and graft.

Some U.S. Soldiers stated that the ANA had a high AWOL rate and that this interfered with training activities. They found such large scale absences to be a serious impediment to developing the competency and discipline of ANA soldiers. Extremely high attrition rates were also noted. Implementing enforced standards in retention for enlistments, such as is done in virtually all other armies, must be adapted into the ANA's institutional practices.

Suggestions were made that communications between the forces were limited by the number of interpreters assigned to units. Several soldiers suggested that a doubling of CAT 1 interpreters would be very beneficial. Others also mentioned that too many CAT 1 interpreters were from Kabul and not the local region they were operating in. They thought those that were from the local region were better in advising on local social and cultural matters.

U.S. Soldiers were not impressed with the literacy rate, education level, or intellectual aptitude of the typical ANA soldiers they were assigned to train and 'partner' with. Several soldiers commented that they believed that ANSF personnel had to come from the very lowest segment of Afghan society. These are second and third order effects in the emphasis in numbers over quality in the recruitment process.

U.S. Soldiers, even infantrymen who often have to go prolonged periods between showers, were highly critical of the personal hygiene and sanitary practices of ANA soldiers. They were repulsed by their pungent body odors. They complained that even during the rare times when they washed themselves that they didn't seem to use soap or change out of their soiled uniforms. They were fairly united in being disgusted by the extremely different sanitary standards and practices between the forces. ANSF officials should be encouraged to implement basic hygiene policies and enforce standards. Such joint living conditions are unhealthy for both forces' personnel.

Many U.S. Soldiers (as well as those from previous field research) were appalled by the rampant torture of dogs and puppies they witness while being based with ANSF units. Many ANSF members are prone to inflicting abuse onto the stray dogs they bring to the base for 'entertainment' purposes. Other ANSF members, while not condoning the torture, fail to see any importance in such behaviors given the standing of dogs in Islam. Dogs are often seen as vermin and many ANSF members find it inexplicable that anyone could be concerned about such 'trivial matters' and deeply resent any interference. (There is a dichotomy here; ANSF members reported

## UNCLASSIFIED

getting upset when U.S. Soldiers shoot dogs, but those dogs were viewed as personal property, security assets for their owners. Strays are seen in an entirely different manner.) This animal abuse is a substantial psychological stressor for many U.S. Soldiers and has been the cause of many serious social altercations with ANSF members. Senior Afghan MOI and MOD officials should be strongly encouraged to implement and enforce a non-torture policy for dogs, at least on joint bases. U.S. Soldiers should also be educated and psychologically prepared for the extreme abuse and torture of dogs many will inevitably witness while 'partnering' with ANSF.

Several U.S. Soldiers reported that they had observed many cases of child abuse and neglect that infuriated them and alienated them from the civilian populace. They made it very clear that they wanted nothing to do with people who treat children so cruelly. Although not reported by the U.S. Soldiers who participated in this study, there have been numerous accounts of Canadian troops in Kandahar complaining about the rampant sexual abuse of children they have witnessed ANSF personnel commit, including the cultural practice of bacha bazi, as well as the raping and sodomizing of little boys. (One reason some Afghan civilians prefer insurgents over the ANSF are the latter's propensity to seize their little boys at checkpoints and sexually assault them.) U.S. Soldiers witnessing such barbaric acts may likely lead to violent confrontations with the perpetrators.

Similarly, U.S. Soldiers sometimes mentioned the poor treatment and virtual slavery of women in Afghan society and how they found such practices repugnant. They found it unpalatable to befriend other men who had such primitive beliefs; the cultural gulf was too wide. They also were repulsed by the abuse and neglect they observed in how children are treated in Afghan society. U.S. Soldiers largely reported that they did not care for Afghan civilians due to these factors as well as their suspected sympathies for the insurgents. More research should be completed on U.S. Soldiers' attitudes and experiences with the Afghan civilian populace.

Other common themes expressed by U.S. Soldiers were that they were not specifically educated in how to actually train ANSF personnel, lacked command guidance in executing the 'partnering' concept, and were fairly unprepared for the many challenges associated with training a force composed of illiterates from an extremely different culture. They generally were not satisfied with the quality or comprehensiveness of the cultural training they received.

As found in the June, 2010 SIGAR (Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction) report 'Actions Needed to Improve the Reliability of Afghan Security Force Assessments' (Audit-10-11), the metrics that have long been used to evaluate the ANSFs' performance (the Capability Milestone, CM) have been completely inadequate and have consistently overstated ANSF capabilities and progress (ANSFs' lack of logistical capacity has become scandalous). The current research clearly supports this conclusion. It also demonstrates the need to develop metrics that objectively measure the human capacity of ANSF members. Such human factors metrics have long been inexplicably absent from ISAF evaluations of ANSF units and personnel (as has been mention of the predatory sexual behaviors towards the civilian

## UNCLASSIFIED

populace mentioned above). Reliance on euphemistic language, intuitive speculations and hopeful pronouncements has all too often replaced critical analysis, objective assessments and accurate reporting. Such neglect has seriously misled political and military authorities on the truthful progress, or lack thereof, of the development of the ANSFs. It is urgent to implement such human factors program evaluation metrics into ISAF evaluations of ANSF. Such measures should include the perspectives of the junior ISAF soldiers who are training and 'partnering' with these forces. (Sadly, many U.S. study participants expressed surprise that they were even being asked for their nearly year-long combat experienced-based views on such issues related to ANSFs' capacity and performance; that this had never happened before.)

Unfortunately, ISAF's almost unidimensional focus of quantity over quality with ANSF's buildup (including a recent reduction from ten weeks to eight weeks of basic training for ANA), and which is grossly unsustainable economically, has had some profoundly detrimental consequences with their overall efficacy, especially with the ANP (a great many of who never completed any formal police training). These factors, together with plans to develop home militia-type programs such as the Afghan Local Police (ALP) and the Afghan Public Protection Force (APPF) as well as the planned disbandment of private Afghan security companies could be disastrous, leading to organized well armed predatory thugs roving the countryside, not unlike the anarchical security conditions that led to the Taliban's rise in the first place. (And any legitimate ALP and APPF units are likely to be even more vulnerable to insurgents and other criminal organizations than the ANP is, which already has far higher casualty rates than the ANA.) Another conundrum involves the U.S. Defense Appropriations bill that prohibits the military assistance to units of the security forces of another country where there is credible evidence that such units have committed gross violations of human rights. Authorities who fail to see such with the ANSFs, particularly the ANP and ALP, are simply in denial.

Continuation with such research will enable a comparative analysis with the current study. Further, given the degree of negativity found within this study, it is advisable, even crucial to plan regular social atmospheric research with both ANSF and U.S. military units on a continuing longitudinal basis-perhaps quarterly, and across Task Forces throughout Afghanistan. The inclusion of other ISAF nationalities, both Muslim and non-Muslim would also be beneficial. Additionally, comparative studies of incidents of deliberate fratricide murders that have occurred here as well as between host nation soldiers and coalition soldiers in other wars should be pursued, especially the Iraq War.

The above findings point to the many key areas where key decision-makers, ISAF leaders, ground commanders, IO personnel and soldiers at all levels need to address and focus. These are fundamental areas of concern to the ANSF population and reflect serious threats towards additional fratricide incidents, a severe and rapidly metastasizing malignancy. More detailed recommendations from these results follow.

**RECOMENDATIONS BASED ON STUDY'S FINDINGS:**

1. **Avoid night searches when possible.**
2. Consider vetting and training select ANSFs to conduct home and personal searches.
3. Include ANSF females for searches, especially during night operations.
4. Encourage ANSF officials to implement an expanded ANSF female recruitment program.
5. Relying on airpower over manpower may not provide the COIN metrics sought, at least as far as the study's ANSF participants were concerned given the greater risks for civilian casualty incidents. Future CONOPs should consider this factor. Also, a review and revision of aerial ROEs to reduce CIVCAS incidents is a prudent measure to consider.
6. Review U.S. and other ISAF responses to ambushes and TICs in general, ensuring return fire is measured and accurate (ANSF members were united that it is not).
7. When planning and conducting operations emphasize and reemphasize the crucial importance in avoiding civilian casualties.
8. Establish a standing ISAF/ANSF QRF who are professionally qualified (i.e., are trained and experienced criminal justice professionals) to timely investigate all CIVCAS allegations; facilitate media coverage.
9. ANSF perceptions (often accurate) of the general lack of meaningful accountability for ISAF personnel/leadership who negligently cause civilian casualties should be addressed.
10. At road blocks make a diligent effort to fully explain the reasons for the roadblock to all those waiting. Consider coordinating public announcement efforts with the local police. As an SOP send an ANSF member down the row of vehicles to explain the reason for the road block and delay. If feasible, allow vehicles transporting sick or injured to pass.
11. Emphasize already publicized changes in U.S. military convoy driving practices that now permit civilian and ANSF traffic to pass. Ensure safe and courteous driving practices.
12. Reconsider the practices at U.S. bases where ANSF are publicly searched. If such searches must be performed, ensure that such searches are conducted by other vetted and trained ANSF members, particularly NCOs, and that they are not conducted by Afghan Security Guards (ASG). Conduct searches in private, outside of civilian view.
13. Ensure that U.S. and other ISAF soldiers demonstrate proper military bearing, respect and protocol when dealing with all ANSF members and Afghan civilians. Avoid insults and the use of profanity.

UNCLASSIFIED

14. Instruct all U.S. and other ISAF soldiers to ensure that when they relieve themselves while on patrol, that they do so only in a very private setting ensuring modesty. Consider developing an SOP involving relief bottles inside MRAPs and other vehicles.
15. Educate ANSF on equality of U.S. MEDEVAC and emergency medical care policies. During combat operations ensure they are kept informed of variances of battlefield decision-making on medical triage. Develop an IO campaign regarding the quality of the treatment ANSF wounded have received by ISAF field medics as well as at ISAF medical facilities.
16. Utilize more CAT 1 interpreters. Recruit more local residents for such assignments.
17. Conduct AARs following joint operations that include ANSF members of all ranks.
18. Consider greater emphasis in developing ANSFs' logistics and maintenances systems; include auditing.
19. Ensure that U.S. and other ISAF soldiers do not shoot animals unless there is a direct and immediate threat to their safety. If animals must be shot, make every effort to pass this action off to accompanying ANSF units.
20. Encourage ANSF officials to implement a non-torture policy with dogs. Condition U.S. and other ISAF soldiers to psychologically distance themselves from the rampant and extreme abuse, and sadistic torture of dogs many will likely witness while jointly based with ANSF units.
21. ANSF personnel should be included as a target audience in any ISAF IO Campaign. Their animosity towards U.S. Forces is high, and this must be addressed. Also, consider providing ANSF units with civilian radios to greater facilitate IO messaging. Consider establishing as an additional duty an ANSF relations monitor for military units partnering with ANSF.
22. Encourage ANSF leadership, to include MOI and MOD, to vet and train their religious education officers and uniformed mullahs away from radical theological sentiments.
23. Encourage ANSF officials to more carefully vet recruits and existing members for Islamic radicalism; assist with monitoring/intervention programs. Initiate such programs during the recruitment and vetting process to mitigate insurgent infiltrations.
24. Initiate surveillance programs to identify militant or high-rogue risk ANSF members.
25. Step back from the numbers game; focus on the qualitative factor during the recruitment, training and buildup process for the ANSFs.
26. Initiate an ethnographic study of the culture and living conditions within ANSF units.

## UNCLASSIFIED

27. Review the current recruitment contracts for ANSF components. The current ones seem to allow ANSF members to go AWOL or desert with near-impunity; there simply is no prosecution and imprisonment for such offenses. The ability for ANSF members to walk off the job in the middle of a war prevents any functional and disciplined security forces from being developed. Recruits should sign and take oaths rather than just sign contracts.
28. Encourage the ANSFs to implement improved drug screening and enforcement programs.
29. Encourage ANSF leaders to establish much improved hygiene standards for its members.
30. Investigate ANSF's internal legal process for disciplining its own personnel. Develop and implement needed reforms.
31. Integrate Afghan practice of fasting during Ramadan when planning joint operations.
32. Encourage ANSF officials to hold its officers fully accountable for their leadership, or lack thereof, during combat operations. Simply transferring them does not solve the problem.
33. Facilitate a program that is designed to instill a higher sense of purpose associated with serving in ANSF. Focus on more development of *élan* and *esprit de corps* within ANSF.
34. Investigate the ANSF's policies and actual practices regarding how disabled soldiers and police are cared for, and what benefits are provided to families of those who are KIA. Identify weaknesses and assist in developing interventions to correct them.
35. Investigate, fire and prosecute corrupt ANSF and GIRoA officials guilty of narcotics trafficking or stealing international funds. These entities must be reformed to be viable. The second and third order effects of their pervasive corruption are costing the lives of both ISAF and ANSF soldiers and completely undermines the war effort. Unless ISAF is empowered to execute such practices, its mission here is dead in the water.
36. Implement an anti-corruption program that includes all GIRoA and ANSF members publicly taking religious oaths that foreswear corruption and insurgent alliances. If the Afghan government declines, reconsider rationale for having ISAF troops deployed here.
37. Professionalize the program evaluation methodologies that are utilized in assessing ANSF units; include human factor elements that have been neglected with such flawed metrics.
38. Implement more extensive cultural knowledge and sensitivity training at JRTC, NTC as well as at other ISAF training and pre-deployment centers. **Include in the curriculum how offensive arrogance, insults, bullying and profanity are to Afghans.** (Consider banning the use of the term 'mother fucker' while in uniform that is so common in U.S. Army vernacular; its use threatens lives in this war zone.) **Enforce standards including relief for cause (current conduct reflects a failure of command to instill culturally acceptable behaviors in their troops) as well as UCMJ action** for repeated or egregious

## UNCLASSIFIED

- offenses. Include conflict resolution scenarios dealing with agitated ANSF members and civilians role played by actual Afghans. Continue with such training while deployed.
39. Implement a similar cultural sensitivity training program for all ANSF members and incoming recruits. Social and cultural violations are hardly one-sided. Include ethics.
  40. Better educate U.S. Soldiers in the central tenants of Islam as interpreted and practiced in Afghanistan. Ensure that this instruction is not a sanitized, politically correct training package, but rather includes an objective and comprehensive assessment of the totalitarian nature of the extreme theology practiced among Afghans.
  41. Those Westerners manifesting the abrasive personality characteristics cited in this study cause great harm with ANSF and civilian relations; they do not contribute to the mission, they in fact jeopardize it. Since ANSF members can and have reacted quite violently when they are bullied, cursed, or their dignity is taken from them, those personnel with such dysfunctional personalities should be profiled and excluded from deployment.
  42. Increase use of Muslim ISAF members as ANSF trainers; replace others when possible.
  43. Consider greater utilization of the ETT program and less use of the 'partnering' program.
  44. Implement programs to improve ANSF members' views of the M-16, including improved maintenance and training standards, confidence building exercises, and comparative field evaluations between the M-16 and AK-47. These failing, an assessment of the human factor realities of Afghan culture, the limitations of educational achievement, as well as ANSF's austere maintenance capacity and its operational conditions may be cause for a reconsideration for what constitutes the most appropriate rifle for ANSF personnel.
  45. U.S. leaders should be made aware that 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> order effects of ignoring Pakistan's duplicity breeds distrust among ANSF members and harms their relations with U.S. troops.
  46. Establish local public relations teams consisting of both ANSF mullahs and U.S. or other ISAF chaplains to work with improving interpersonal relations between the joint forces as well as with the civilian population. Include discussions on traditional morality/ethics.
  47. Include ASG forces in future studies; they also represent a threat to ISAF soldiers. ANCOP and ANA commando personnel would also be interesting groups to study.
  48. Further ethnographic research should be conducted on the ANP. It seems likely that much reform needs to take place before it becomes a legitimate or viable police force.
  49. Conduct more personal, social, tribal, cultural and theological research on the increasing hostility and Islamic radicalization of Afghan society. Include ANSF personnel. Not all riots and attacks are Taliban-manufactured; many stem from the indigenous civilian populace where anti-Western sentiments and intolerance are rapidly growing.

UNCLASSIFIED

50. Professionalize the IO field and fully empower its operations. Hire academically and experientially qualified experts to reformulate ISAF's current IO program in Afghanistan. Develop a new information distribution paradigm more attuned to culture and conditions.
51. Improve IO coverage and education of INS atrocities. Many have been grossly neglected; some have even been attributed to ISAF despite conclusive proof of INS culpability.
52. Examine the effects of multiple tours on ISAF soldiers' perceptions of ANSF members and of the Afghan civilian populace.
53. Have U.S. and other ISAF military units devote much more time, resources and effort to study and better understand their partnered ANSF unit's organizational climate, as well as of the local Afghan community's tribal culture and activities of daily living (ADL) patterns. This will likely enable better relations with both the ANSF unit and the local community. Such may also help deter ISAF- caused CIVCAS incidents that often stem from gross ignorance of Afghan ADL patterns (such utter negligence in acquiring such knowledge and distributing it to line units is inexcusable after more than 9 years of war).
54. Stemming from #53, much greater reliance and formal utilization of Human Terrain Team and Red Team assets should be officially mandated and enforced as a regular part of all ISAF personnel training, as well as their inclusion in future mission planning, ongoing operations and AAR assessments. (Their civilian status should not limit their input.) Improved understanding of potential second and third-order effects will likely also result.
55. Complete a comparative analysis of the various 15-6 investigations that have been completed on all the various ANSF/ASG fratricide-murder incidents that have occurred. Re-interview witnesses if necessary. Consider implementing a behavioral science research approach that will provide an in-depth analysis of the psycho-social aspects of those involved in the fratricide-murder incidents to include interpersonal relationships, leadership issues, living conditions, the tactical situation, ethnicity and tribal factors, and religious extremism. The impersonal nature of many existing reports does not provide such detailed information from which explanatory and causative factors may be better identified. (Also, consider reopening the 15-6 case involving the Jan. 26, 2008 fratricide.)
56. Conduct research on deliberate fratricide-murder incidents that occurred in other wars, especially the Iraq War. It is likely that the magnitude of murders of allied troops by the host nation's is unprecedented for Western forces in modern history.
57. Complete a similar study of U.S. and other ISAF soldiers' perceptions of Afghan civilians.
58. Stemming from the degree of negativity found with this study, conduct regular social atmospherics research with ANSF, ASG, U.S. and other ISAF military units on a continuing basis. Increase sample sizes, especially for officers and senior NCOs.

## CONCLUSION

Despite repeated official euphemistic pronouncements of “hopeful optimism” and “fragile progress” (pernicious intuitive-based rhetorical illusions that has fully ejected all critical analysis from deliberations), the war of perceptions is not going well in Afghanistan, and the results of the present study add to a litany of recent research reports, journalistic accounts and social atmospheric studies that sound this warning. However, rather than primarily being a result of any effective Taliban-sponsored propaganda (which remains quite impactful), much of this problem is of our own making. We have very often been our own worst enemy in winning the allegiance of the Afghans. Many of the policies and behaviors of ISAF have been and continue to be self-defeating (including the prolonged and gross neglect in dealing with GIRA’s pervasive corruption). As was mentioned by several ANSF members, for many years U.S. (and other ISAF) military convoys sped through the streets of local Afghan villages, running down small children who couldn’t get out of the way fast enough, while shouting profanities and throwing water bottles at people from their turrets. Even then the obtuse questions among many ISAF members included, “Why don’t they like us?” and “Why don’t they warn us about the IEDs planted in the road?” Although such driving SOPs have largely been reformed, bitter memories and hatred linger. (IEDs have long become the number one worst killer of ISAF soldiers, despite the tens of billions spent since 2006 in high technologies to counter them; a tragedy that simple common sense and decency had not been implemented much earlier into ISAF doctrinal driving practices.) And according to many of this study’s participants, as well as other recent research and journalistic accounts, there continue to be many ISAF policies, actions and behaviors that infuriate and alienate much of the Afghan populace, including *our armed* ANSF counterparts. We lack the luxury to continue to volitionally ignore such personal, social and cultural violations, or to be ignorant of them in the first place.

ISAF’s emphasis on quantity over quality with regard to the ANSF’s buildup has been self-destructive. Such an approach has placed U.S. and other ISAF soldiers in profoundly difficult circumstances by having to train Afghans who are illiterate, unmotivated (with an annual attrition rate of 25% mostly due to desertion), often drug-addicted, very often come from the least desired segments of Afghan society, and are somewhat prone to turning on and murdering their Western trainers (ISAF host nations should be fully aware of the magnitude of the dangers their sons and daughters face when assigned to train, mentor and work with ANSF personnel). ISAF personnel are then expected to transform them into legitimate functional soldiers and policemen, all while having no authority to hold any of them accountable for their criminal behaviors and/or incompetence. ISAF soldiers engaged in training and ‘partnering’ must also work with deeply flawed Afghan institutions that are little more than organized crime syndicates and where accountability is almost unheard of. Dealing with such organizational cultures and operational working conditions and limitations cause great stress and exasperation for ISAF troops. Unless fundamental changes are made to ISAF’s ability to institute reform on profoundly dysfunctional Afghan governmental systems and key leaders, then any efforts in

## UNCLASSIFIED

developing a legitimate, functional and **trustworthy** Afghan army and police force will continue to be futile.

**Unfortunately, the rapidly growing fratricide-murder trend committed by ANSF personnel against ISAF members is a valid COIN measure of the ineffectiveness in our efforts in stabilizing Afghanistan, developing a legitimate and effective government, battling the insurgency, gaining the loyalty, respect and friendship of the Afghans, building the ANSFs into legitimate and functional organizations, and challenges the efficacy of the 'partnering' concept.** This is all the more a paradox given ISAF's assumption of and planned reliance for the ANSFs to be able to take over the security burden before it can disengage from this grossly prolonged conflict. This study shows that certain behaviors and policies (such as night raids and home searches that directly involve U.S. Soldiers) have generated a great deal of animosity among much of the Afghan civilian populace as well as with many ANSF personnel that impedes the overall strategic effort. Such practices are simply unacceptable if ISAF is to be even marginally successful here. Regrettably, our ISAF troops in the field are bearing the consequences by being murdered in increasingly unprecedented numbers by the very ANSF members they are here to mentor, train and 'partner' with. Such fratricide is fast leading to a **crisis of trust between the two forces**, if it hasn't reached this point already.

This study's findings also challenge assumptions and official pronouncements that the continuing pattern of fratricide murders by ANSF personnel are "isolated" and largely being committed by insurgent infiltrators. The research completed here shows that there is a great deal of deep seated anger, distrust and cultural incompatibility between U.S. and ANSF personnel that is precluding further development of the ANSF as well as greatly endangering the lives of U.S. and other ISAF soldiers.

ISAF leaders must be willing to analyze and incorporate the second and third order effects of their policies, decisions, and actions as well as the training and behaviors of their soldiers as related to Afghan cultural sensitivities and expectations. Otherwise, the war of perceptions will continue to deteriorate towards an inevitable defeat. Actions that alienate and infuriate the Afghan populace will not contribute towards building a country that has either the capacity or willingness to challenge anti-Western extremism. Quite the opposite; such actions contribute to the metastasizing extremism, radicalism and theocratic tyranny being witnessed among much of Afghan society. (This should not be surprising given that a great many of the imams and mullahs emplaced by the Taliban government ten to fifteen years ago are the very same ones still preaching hatred today--nice of ISAF to refurbish their mosques and provide funds to GIROA to pay their salaries!)

However, this is not a call for appeasement to a highly toxic culture (such as the U.S. Army's 'encouragement' that its female soldiers wear a hijab instead of their Kevlar thus placating Afghan perceptions of women's lower social status as well as putting them at additional unnecessary risk). All too often, ISAF political and military officials as well as the

## UNCLASSIFIED

international media have prostrated themselves before the alters of multiculturalism, moral relativity and political correctness and have excused inexcusable behaviors on the part of the Afghans (witness one senior ISAF official who described a riot that included an Afghan mob's heinous murder of seven UNAMA workers, beheading two, in Mazar-e-Sharif in response to a copy of the Koran being burned in Florida as "understandable passions"). Such ethically challenged apologist perspectives hinder any movement towards advancing the Afghan culture beyond its toxic medieval mentality or curbing a violent and unquestioning ideology. Rather, this is a recommendation not to add fuel to the fire of cultural incompatibility by unnecessarily offending Afghans with various abrasive policies or coarse behaviors that most any people would find offensive.

As long as ISAF political and military leaders are committed to the 'partnering' program with ANSF, more decisive efforts towards developing procedures and protocols, and perhaps most importantly, cultivating appropriate attitudes and mindsets specifically tailored to meet and satisfy Afghan cultural and theological sensitivities and normative demands are vital components towards improving the safety of ISAF soldiers. This is admittedly an extremely difficult task given that the mutual feelings between ISAF and ANSF personnel is quite often one of a very strong dislike, even contempt. Namely one group generally sees the other as a bunch of violent, reckless, intrusive, arrogant, self-serving, profane, infidel bullies hiding behind high technology; and the other group generally views the former as a bunch of cowardly, incompetent, obtuse, thieving, complacent, lazy, pot-smoking, treacherous and murderous radicals. Such is the state of progress in the current 'partnering' program. Less this seem an exaggeration refer back to the first few pages of this report as well as Appendix A on the rate of deliberate fratricide-murders that are taking place.

Stemming from the severe negativity of perceptions found in much of this field study, it would be advisable to pursue regular comprehensive social atmospherics research and monitoring with ANSF units on a continuing basis, especially in light of the rapidly increasing fratricide-murder threat ISAF soldiers are confronted with. The current 'Ostrich Head in the Hole' cognitive dissonance approach to this lethal problem is not working.

Four years ago after the May 6, 2007 murder of two U.S. Soldiers (COL James Harrison, Jr., and MSG Wilberto Sabalu, Jr.) by an ANA soldier, an Afghan government official urged "patience" regarding ISAF's response to this killing. After an additional 54 murders of ISAF personnel since then the time for "patience" is long past. Decisive actions in countering this murder epidemic are called for.

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX A  
KNOWN FRATRICIDE-MURDER AND ATTEMPTED MURDER  
INCIDENTS COMMITTED BY ANSF/ASG MEMBERS AGAINST  
ISAF AND UNAMA PERSONNEL: 2007-11\*

May 12, 2011: **Two ISAF (believed to be U.S.) personnel were killed and two wounded** by a uniformed Afghanistan Civil Order Policeman inside a police compound of the 5<sup>th</sup> ANCOB Brigade in Helmand Province as they ate lunch. The ANCOB member was then wounded by other ISAF personnel and hospitalized.

Apr. 27, 2011: **Eight U.S. Air Force personnel and one U.S. civilian were killed** by an Afghan National Air Force pilot with 20 years of military service; *one ANA was wounded*. He **argued** with his U.S. advisors, pulled a gun, disarmed them and methodologically shot and killed them, then committed suicide. Five ANSF members were injured while fleeing, jumping out windows.

Apr. 16, 2011: **Six U.S. Soldiers and one MPRI member were killed** by an ANA soldier who detonated a suicide vest at FOB Gamberi, Laghman Province. *Seven other U.S. Soldiers were wounded. Four ANA soldiers were also killed and seven wounded. One CAT 1 interpreter was killed and two were wounded.* Of note, the senior ANSF officials who normally attend the meeting where this suicide attack occurred failed to show up at the last minute.

Apr. 4, 2011: **Two U.S. Soldiers were killed** by an Afghan Border Policeman in Meymaneh, Faryab Province. According to the ABP commander, one of his men shot the two U.S. trainers near the ABP HQ office and then dropped his rifle and **escaped**. He was killed three days later. He was reportedly motivated to commit these murders stemming from a Koran burning.

Mar. 19, 2011: **Two U.S. Soldiers were killed and four others wounded** in Shah Wali Kot District, Kandahar Province by an Afghan Security Guard (ASG). Shir Ahmad had been hired 10 days before by Tundra Security Group. He used his AK-47 and was killed by return U.S. fire.

\*According to [iCasualties.org](http://iCasualties.org), these deaths reflect nearly half of all small arms related KIA during the last 5 ½ months, between Nov. 29, 2010 and May 12, 2011. This list is not inclusive of all incidents committed by ANSF or ASG members. It does not include an incident where an ANA soldier killed a British soldier that was ruled accidental or an incident where two Dutch soldiers were killed due to a lack of information. It does not include cases where insurgents dressed up as ANSF members; it only includes murders by bona fide ANSF or ASG members. It does include a 2008 case of an ASG killing a U.S. Soldier that had been bizarrely ruled an accidental discharge. Death statistics also include Western national civilian personnel working in support of ISAF.

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX A (continued)

Feb. 18, 2011: **Three German soldiers were killed and six others wounded** (three severely) in Pul-e-Khumri, Baghlan Province by an ANA soldier (Mohammed Afzal, age 26) who was killed by return fire. One report claimed that Afzal had developed an **intense hatred** of German soldiers for having offended him; another report said that his colleagues did not consider him to be a particularly devout Muslim.

Jan. 15, 2011: **One Italian soldier was killed and another wounded** by an ANA soldier who had asked to borrow their cleaning supplies for his M-16. When they saw that the soldier's gun was loaded they told him to unload it, which led to an **argument**. The Afghan soldier then shot the two Italians and **escaped** from the base.

Jan. 13, 2011: A U.S. Marine shot and killed an Afghan policeman after an **argument** at a base in Sangin, Helmand Province. After the dispute, the policeman reportedly made threats and handled his weapon carelessly. The Marine reported this to his superiors. The policeman left his post but returned and pointed his gun at the Marine, who shouted at him to put the weapon down. When he didn't, the Marine fired two rounds, killing the Afghan policeman.

Dec. 28, 2010: A Canadian convoy was deliberately fired on by ANA personnel following a fender-bender traffic accident between the two force's vehicles. The ANA soldiers **argued** with the Canadians and demanded an immediate cash payment for a bent fender, but the Canadians followed proper procedure and completed an accident form that was angrily rejected. As they tried to leave several Canadian vehicles were hit by direct ANA gunfire, but did not sustain any casualties. The heavily armed Canadian troops refrained from returning fire.

Nov. 29, 2010: An Afghan border police officer shot **U.S. Soldiers** during a training mission in Nangarhar, **killing six of them** before he was killed when U.S. forces returned fire. A **verbal reprimand** was issued to the shooter by the U.S. platoon leader minutes prior to the shooting. He was also reportedly suffering from personal stress related to an impending forced marriage.

Nov. 4, 2010: An Afghan soldier shot and **killed two U.S. Marines** in Sangin District, Helmand Province. The ANA soldier was then able to **escape**.

Oct. 6, 2010: An ANA soldier fired an RPG at French troops at an outpost in Kapisa Province. No one was injured in the blast. The ANA soldier was able to **escape**.

Aug. 25, 2010: An Afghan police officer **killed two Spanish policemen** and a **Spanish National interpreter** during training in Badghis Province; he was then killed. An **argument** preceded the shooting. Local civilians then rioted to protest the ANP patrolman's killing by the Spanish Forces.

## APPENDIX A (continued)

July 20, 2010: An Afghan army NCO got into an **argument** and shot and **killed two U.S. civilian trainers** before being killed, in Balkh Province, near Mazar-e-Sharif. *An Afghan soldier was also killed in the crossfire.*

July 13, 2010: An Afghan soldier **killed three British troopers** and *wounded six others* with gunfire and a rocket-propelled grenade in Helmand Province. He then **escaped**. A man claiming to be this ANA soldier, Talib Hussein, later claimed that he committed these murders because 'the British had killed civilians' and that he had not previously been affiliated with the Taliban.

Dec. 29, 2009: A **U.S. Soldier** was **killed** and *two Italian troops were wounded* when an Afghan soldier opened fire on them at a joint Afghan/coalition base in Bala Morghab. The U.S. Soldier was downloading medical supplies from a helicopter when an ANA soldier approached the LZ. Two Italian soldiers waved the ANA off in an **angry confrontation**. A minute or two later, the ANA soldier opened fire and wounded the two Italian soldiers, while killing the U.S. soldier by shooting him in the back. The ANA soldier was wounded and captured by ISAF soldiers.

Nov. 2, 2009: An Afghan policeman **killed five British soldiers and wounded eight, two of who were ANP** in Helmand Province. He was then able to **escape**, possibly with the assistance of another policeman. There were reports that he was exhibiting '**animosity**' and had a '**serious dispute**' prior to the shootings. He had been with the ANP for three years. Two Afghans who knew him said that he had been brutally beaten, sodomized and sexually molested by a senior Afghan officer whom he regarded as being protected by the British.

Oct. 28, 2009: A **U.S. security guard serving with UNAMA** who heroically saved 17 colleagues by holding off Taliban attackers who stormed a UNAMA safe-house was **executed by Afghan police**. This murder was captured on video and shows the wounded UNAMA guard surrounded by a group of ANP one of whom then shot him four times; three shots were fired after he had collapsed to the ground. None of the other ANP reacted. The ANP gunman **escaped**.

Oct. 2, 2009: An Afghan policeman on patrol with **U.S. soldiers** fired on the Americans, **killing two**, and *wounding two*, in Wardak Province. The policeman **escaped**.

Sept. 12, 2009: An Afghan policeman opened fire on a group of U.S. Soldiers visiting an ANP station. **One U.S. Soldier was wounded** before the gunman was killed by U.S. return fire. Criticisms were made that the other ANP failed to intervene during the attack.

Sept. 12, 2009: An Afghan policeman **argued** with and then opened fire on a **U.S. Soldier, seriously wounding him**, for drinking water in front of the policeman during Ramadan. The policeman was then seriously wounded by return fire from other U.S. Soldiers.

Mar. 27, 2009: An ANA soldier fired on U.S. Naval officers from a guard tower **killing two** and *wounding one* at Camp Shaheen, Mazar-E-Sharif, Balkh Province.

**APPENDIX A (continued)**

Oct. 16, 2008: An Afghan policeman threw a hand grenade and fired on a **U.S. Army** foot patrol, **killing one soldier** in Paktika Province. The gunman was killed when U.S. troops returned fire.

Sept. 29, 2008: An Afghan policeman **killed one U.S. Soldier** and *wounded three* before he was fatally shot by U.S. troops at a Paktia police station. He was a cousin of a Taliban detainee there.

Jan. 26, 2008: An ASG member **killed a U.S. Soldier** at COP Bella, Kunar. U.S. Soldiers who witnessed the shooting thought it deliberate since the U.S. Soldier had announced he was approaching the OP manned by the ASG whereupon the ASG leaned out and shot him dead. (However, a 15-6 ruled it an accidental discharge; the researcher disputes this finding.)

May 6, 2007: **Two U.S. troops were killed and two others wounded** when an Afghan National Army soldier fired into their vehicle as it was leaving a Kabul prison which they had been visiting. The ANA gunman was killed by other ANA soldiers.

**SUMMARY:** Of the 25 fratricide-murder events above, evidence was found in 10 (underlined) that some sort of verbal altercation had preceded the shootings. There is a lack of open source details available regarding what specific social dynamics preceded the other 15 murder and attempted murder incidents. At least eight of the perpetrators were able to escape, despite some being among other ANSF personnel during the shootings and who then failed to intervene.

UNCLASSIFIED

## APPENDIX B

### COMPARATIVE LINE-OF-DUTY MURDER RISKS BETWEEN U.S. POLICE OFFICERS AND N2KL WESTERNERS WHO WORK WITH ANSF PERSONNEL

Reports from the U.S. Department of Justice (FBI, 2010) indicate that out of approximately one million law enforcement officers in the United States, 48 were feloniously killed in the line of duty during 2009. This represents a death rate of 4.8 per 100,000 per annum.

In the Nangarhar, Nuristan, Kunar and Laghman Provinces constituting the N2KL region of RC-East, the region of assignment for this Red Team since 2008, there are very roughly 3,500 Westerners who regularly and officially interact with Afghan National Security Force personnel (defined as routinely having one meeting a week or more with ANSF members). During the last six month period between November, 2010 through April, 2011 thirteen Westerners (made up of 12 U.S. Army and one U.S. civilian employee) have been murdered by actual members of ANSF. This death rate for the last six months is 370 per 100,000. Extrapolating this in per annum terms, this reflects a murder rate of 740 per 100,000 (this death rate is only for deaths caused by bona fide ANSF members; other factors related to combat service that significantly increase the overall death rate for these coalition personnel are not included).

Therefore, the N2KL Coalition Force's murder rate from ANSF personnel, at 740 per 100,000 is **154 times greater** than the line-of-duty murder rate of 4.8 per 100,000 for U.S. police officers.

<sup>1</sup> F.B.I. (2010). Law Enforcement Officers Feloniously Killed; in *Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted, 2009*. Uniform Crime Report, U.S. Department of Justice.

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR U.S. SOLDIERS

RANK: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ # of Tours in Afghanistan: \_\_\_\_\_ # of Tours in Iraq: \_\_\_\_\_ Base: \_\_\_\_\_

HOW DO YOU RATE:

1. ... the level of trust you have while on patrol with ANA soldiers in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

2. ... the overall courage of the ANA soldiers in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

3. ... the honesty and integrity of the ANA soldiers in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

4. ... the overall relationship of the ANA soldiers with U.S. Soldiers?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

5. ... the overall competence of the ANA soldiers in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

6. ... the ANA's ability to sustain itself without ISAF in the field with it?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

7. ... the overall quality of ANA's NCO leadership?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

8. ... the overall quality of ANA's Officer leadership?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

APPENDIX C (continued)

9. ... the drug abuse situation among ANA personnel?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

10. Based on your experience, what percent of ANA members do you think use illegal drugs? \_\_\_\_%

11. Based on your experience, what percent of ANA members have radical Islamic beliefs? \_\_\_\_%

IF YOU ALSO WORKED WITH THE ANP, HOW DO YOU RATE:

12. ... the level of trust you have while on patrol with ANP members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

13. ... the overall courage of the ANP members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

14. ... the honesty and integrity of the ANP members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

15. ... the overall relationship of the ANP members with U.S. Soldiers?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

16. ... the overall competence of the ANP members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

APPENDIX C (continued)

IF YOU ALSO WORKED WITH THE ABP, HOW DO YOU RATE:

17. ... the level of trust you have while on patrol with *ABP* members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

18. ... the overall courage of the *ABP* members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

19. ... the honesty and integrity of the *ABP* members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

20. ... the overall relationship of the *ABP* members with U.S. Soldiers?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

21. ... the overall competence of the *ABP* members in general?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

22. ... the quality of the cultural training you received prior to your deployment?

|         |          |     |          |      |           |           |            |
|---------|----------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3   | 4        | 5    | 6         | 7         | ?          |
| Abysmal | Very Bad | Bad | Marginal | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Don't Know |

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## UNCLASSIFIED

### APPENDIX D: QUOTES AND PARAPHRASES FROM HTT GROUPS- TOP TIER COMPLAINTS OF U.S. SOLDIERS ABOUT ANSF MEMBERS

\* Reflects fratricide or near-fatricide incidents recalled

#### DRUG ABUSERS

\*“At OP ... the ANA draw down on us almost every night! They are as high as fuck (on hash). Their eyes are always bloodshot. They are even smoking in the middle of a TIC.”

“One ANA shot himself in the chest twice and the leg once. He was high as shit.”

“There is a lot of hash smoking at Joyce. The ANA put their hash away when their officers come around, but otherwise smoke it all the time.”

“The ANP were high off their asses. The ANA were always high on hash.”

“An ANP CoP was shot...his tolerance for morphine was astronomically high due to heroin use.”

“Hashish and drug use are a huge problem... We were on patrol and they stopped the patrol so they could start smoking in front of us.”

“Our 1SGT wrote a memo excusing some of our guys if they ever tested hot in a piss test. They were stationed downwind of an ANA OP and the fumes from all their extreme hashish smoking poured into their OP. It was that bad.”

#### TRAITOROUS

“We were constantly worried in March that the ABP were going to turn on us. We put up C-wire and gates between our positions.”

\*“The ABP commander directed the insurgents to fire on us.”

\*“When the ABP member murdered our six U.S. Soldiers all the ANA present just stood there and didn't intervene.” (11/29/10 incident)

“They (the ANP) are totally infiltrated by insurgents.”

“You can't tell them anything about what you are going to do... you just could not trust them.”

“They have not gotten into contact at OP ....” (Meaning, the U.S. Soldiers thought that the ANA had cut a deal with the insurgents.)

\*“On a previous deployment a Taliban detainee was the cousin of one of the ANP who we were conducting the operation with. He turned on us and killed one and wounded three.”

“One of them at a base in the Pech got caught working for the Taliban.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### DANGEROUS AND UNSTABLE BEHAVIORS

- \*“The ANA at FOB ... drew down on U.S. Soldiers a few times.”
- \*“(An) ANA locked and loaded on a U.S. civilian contractor because he had accidentally bumped into him and even though he had apologized right away. A U.S. Soldier then locked and loaded against the ANA to emphasize the point of the apology.”
- \*“The ANA drew their weapons on a U.S. Soldier after the ANA tried to get him to move to the side of the ECP. They refused to go through the proper procedures to leave the FOB and when the ECP guards would not let them pass quickly, the ANA raised their weapons to them; they actually locked and loaded an RPG to threaten the convoy.”
- \*“The ANA came speeding up to the entrance and they started yelling at the U.S. Soldiers and both charged their weapons because the U.S. Soldiers wouldn't let them in fast enough.”
- \*“... (a) U.S. soldier working the ECP thought that the ANA were not securing their section or thoroughly searching the local nationals entering the COP. When confronted about this, the ANA got upset. During part of the incident the ANA soldier actually pointed his weapon at the U.S. Soldier. We thought that they were going to draw down on us.”

### LAZINESS

- \* “One guy drew down on our guys while refusing guard duty. We kicked him off the OP.”
- “We do everything for them. It's like a kid you have to spoon feed... but you have to put on an Afghan face.”
- “We even got training at JRTC (with roll-players) who acted like stupid and lazy ANA. That set us up for what we found here.”
- “You're talking about people who won't clean out their mortar tube that blows off their legs; they have no sort of discipline.”
- “This is a lazy ass culture; they won't do anything unless they have to.”
- “They don't wait for their relief, they just leave their posts. They are constantly showing up for duty or missions late, even 30 minutes late. They make excuses... but nothing changes.”
- “Our expectations were higher in the beginning. It is frustrating. At first we wanted to help a lot, but now they just seem lazy. They pay for their ranks. There is a lot of corruption.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### POOR ANA LEADERSHIP

“There is a great deal of favoritism and tribalism in appointments. An officer is not promoted for meritorious work but due to tribal affiliations and depth of pockets.”

“Their NCO and OC leadership was nonexistent.”

“The ANA platoon leader’s room is covered in CF woobies (poncho liners) while his men freeze in their barracks.”

“Their leadership is hot garbage. Many of their soldiers are much better than their leaders.”

“There is a tremendous gap between enlisted ANA and their officers. It is just not an NCO’s job to think in the ANA. Even the BDE SGM has no authority. He is about as competent as a lower enlisted U.S. Soldier.”

### NO BUY-IN TO WAR EFFORT/GUTLESS

“It’s like the commercial of the big Bulldog and the small yipping dog bouncing around, you take away the big Bulldog and the small dog hides tail and slinks away.”

“This is my third deployment and previous ANA were courageous and not scared of anything; they were disorganized but wanted to kick ass. But (during this deployment) this group doesn’t even want to leave the FOB.”

“Whenever we made contact they would just hide...”

“The Iraqi CLC were gung-ho. They would fight. They wanted to improve their own country. (Afghans) don’t at all. These guys only seem to care about their own tribes or families.”

“They need an ideological motivation as well. They need some reason to join other than personal gain.”

“Others refuse to patrol if it is at all dangerous. If they are afraid, they won’t do anything.”

“...tried to get them (the ABP) to go on dismounted patrols, but they would not go.”

“In a TIC, the ANP retreats back to the District Center. The ANA will take cover and not do anything. It is always all on us.”

“We have not seen much improvement among staff due to high turnover (AWOL) rates.”

“The few good ANA that we met would not last long.” (Their ANA colleagues would fail to support them and they’d get killed as a result.)

## UNCLASSIFIED

### THIEVES

“Theft among ABP is bad; they have local kids steal things for them. The ABP are garbage, shit.”

“They once stole a defibrillator from a truck that was blown up. We had to go back and demand that. They also stole fragmentation grenades, cut away the RPG netting from the trucks, and .50 CAL rounds that they would empty for the brass. We confront them and they act all offended saying “we are Muslims, we do not steal.” Then ten minutes later they “find” the missing thing. They just hide behind the cultural and religious shit. They are fucking thieves.”

“Their ANA OIC is very incompetent and steals from his BDE as well as us. He was apparently the Vice President’s chai boy (male adolescent concubine) so we can’t get him fired.”

“The ANA stole tools from a contractor who was fixing their water system. Then they asked us for support to fix it. We refused. When the water ran out they returned the tools.”

“These guys are not soldiers; they are a ragtag bunch of thugs and civilians dressed in uniforms.”

### INCOMPETENT

“I would never like to admit that Iraqis are smarter, but they are Einsteins compared to Afghans.”

“Before we deployed we were told that the ANA was better than the Iraqi Army. But the Iraqis were smarter than the Afghans. Partnering with the ANA is tougher. The original formations were mostly Tajik. Now they are not, and are much worse.”

“We do everything for them. It’s like a kid you have to spoon feed...”

“We constantly had to yell at them to stop chatting with the drivers and actually search the cars.”

“Disband the ANA and start all over again... It’s like going out on patrol with five year olds.”

“The ANA insist on peer-rank partnerships when they don’t even come close to the skill levels of our guys.”

“DynCorp’s and Blackwater only trained the ABP for two weeks.”

“They talk on their cell phones, yell into them, on missions. They use white light and light fires on missions! Any night mission with ANSF is completely worthless.”

“We did everything for them; resupply, etc. They learned to be helpless and that is partly why they are so fucking bad.”

“They scream into their radios and cell phones. They don’t ... conduct patrols very well.”

“They are always on their cell phones during patrols. They are worse than teenage girls.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### DYSFUNCTIONAL LOGISTICS/SUPPLY/MAINTENANCE SYSTEMS

“They are constantly asking for fuel. We have tried to teach them to PMCS their vehicles but they don’t care about their HUMVEEs or their equipment.”

“They need to get the right personnel and then we need to wean them off the tit. Stop giving them everything.”

“There are no medical supplies. When one of the ANA soldiers gets wounded, their medic just stands around watching our medics treat his soldiers.”

“We have to supply them with food and water and maintenance on every single patrol. Their logistics does not exist. They waste MREs and litter everywhere. They will rat-fuck an MRE, take out the snacks and toss the rest, and then ask us for more food later in the patrol. Obviously they don’t care about their country. They steal weed (hashish) and food from the locals all the time on (joint) operations.”

“They are completely dependent on the U.S.”

“They got a medical facility and treatment room but their supply officer outranked the medic and so he took it over and uses it for his shit. They threw everything, all their medical supplies into the back of the ambulance, all over the place in a pile.”

“When Blessing closed, they finally had to resupply themselves. They did not last long. The Pech has already fallen to the insurgents.”

“They can’t do contracting. E-8s and down are illiterate. This problem could be due to literacy. Maybe the second and third order effects of their illiteracy are the problems we/they face with supply. Officers can read and write.”

“Logistics are a huge problem. They fill out the paperwork but are totally reactionary. There is no forethought about needs that will obviously arise. They don’t plan ahead for fuel and water. We just give them shit so they will stop bothering us for it.”

### SECOND TIER COMPLAINTS

#### BAD MORALE

“They are turds. We are better off without them. This ‘Afghan Face’ strategy does not work. They should just disband the ANA and start over. We do not need more training. They need discipline.”

“ANA soldiers going AWOL is the biggest issue.”

“Fix their enlistment criteria and then fix their training. They need DISCIPLINE!!”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **POOR HYGIENE**

“They fucking stink.”

### **POOR FIRE CONTROL DURING FIRE FIGHTS**

“Whenever we made contact they would just hide and then expend all their ammunition in any direction. We all had to take cover while they were ‘returning fire.’ They would ‘spray and pray.’”

“They could not control their fires. We had to yell at them to get them to stop firing on us all the time and then we had to take cover. They would expend as much ammo as possible, like minute long bursts and then immediately police up their brass. They would trade this for food, cigarettes and drugs. They collected brass everywhere, in the pit, from our trucks, in a TIC, everywhere.”

### **EXTREMISM**

“They listened to local mullahs and were pretty radical... they had no other information source.”

“Their loyalty is to their religion.”

“The ABP would shit-talk all the time. They were uneducated. They listened to local mullahs and were pretty radical because they had no other information source.”

“The ANA use culture and religion as a shield to hide their incompetence.”

### **ANP and ABP**

“The ANP are locals. I don’t trust locals (nods of agreement). They can be sleepers. We spend (much) time (warily) watching the ANSF ... while on patrol (with them).”

“The ABP are terrible; they are all local boys. I despise working with them ... don’t trust them.”

### **SEARCHES**

“We always had to redo their house searches and then they would get upset when we would enter the local’s house. But they were just sitting around bullshitting with the house owner.”

### **FASTING DESPITE BEING ON COMBAT PATROL**

“We had a big clearing mission during Ramadan. They just laid down and fell asleep.”

### **POOR WEAPONS HANDLING DISCIPLINE**

“There were a lot of negligent discharges.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### **BRUTAL TREATMENT OF DOGS**

“The ABP killed a couple of our dogs. They were strays but we fed them... Slowly they started disappearing. They killed them.”

### **OTHER ISSUES**

#### **‘PARTNERSHIP’ TRAINING/LACK OF CF BDE SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE**

“We received no training or guidance on how to do our jobs. All products we use to train our counterparts we designed ourselves...”

“We got training at JRTC, one part-day cultural training. It was crap.”

“We received no training for trainers.”

“There is no guidance from higher on how to partner with ANSF. All on-the-job training.”

Everything we learned came from previous deployments (one cited prior deployments in P2K where the ANA were “even worse”). There has been no other real guidance.”

“We received NO guidance for partnering with these guys.”

“(Those assigned to ‘partner’ and train ANSF) believe they are viewed by (CF) BDE as a joke.”

“There was evidence of ISI penetration but the ANA CI would not take action, nor would BDE.”

#### **MINIMAL SOCIAL CONTACT**

“We do not socialize outside of operations.”

“I’d just as soon shoot them as work with them.”

“Interaction with ANA was minimal. The only time was (to go see) what they had stolen.”

#### **CIVILIANS**

“The people don’t want us here, and we don’t like them.”

#### **ANA and ANP RELATIONS**

“The ANA refused to work with the ANP... The ANA feel themselves far superior to the ANP.”

“ANSF do not get along well. The ANA and ABP shot directly at each other in Barg-e-Matal last Fall.”

“The ANP try to arrest ANA sometimes. They refuse their jurisdiction. They fight over detainees. They have unclear jurisdictions. They fight over whatever is inside a house that they search so they can steal it.”

## UNCLASSIFIED

### INACCURATE ANSF PERFORMANCE METRICS

“We expected more from them at first. We thought that there were different tiers of capacity and had heard that this unit was proficient. That was not the case.”

### THE PECH VALLEY

“The Pech has already fallen to the Taliban. The Taliban are already in their ranks (of the ANA). They are negotiating ceasefires. They are ill trained and ill equipped. They can't hold them off.”

“Kabul looks at the Pech and says it looks good but it is worse than when we first got there.”

### M-16

“They blame the transition to the M-16 for their poor aim.”

## POSITIVE OBSERVATIONS

“We have seen improvements. There is more discipline now. Time (punctuality) has gotten better. This was the result of a change in leadership. Now everything is done (on) time.”

“There were a lot of issues when we first arrived. They would show up for a mission with no fuel in their trucks. Now all of them show up with at least a half tank of gas. Their 1<sup>st</sup> SGT is responsible for these improvements.”

“There was one good one, a PLT SGT with eight years in who was shit-hot. But his platoon leader was seriously half retarded.”

“There was one good ANA guy. He was a SAW gunner and did pretty much every other job. He said that he was there to fight for his country. He said the others are there just for the money.”

“Naray ANP are alright. The reason they are better is mostly that ANP are trained by ... and their CoP ... is a decent guy. There is no theft; better leadership.”

“The ANA in Laghman were brave.”

“The ANA at Finley-Shields were shit hot; they went up to Kunar.”