

PAKPAC VIEWS ON POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES IN KERRY-LUGAR BILL VS BERMAN BILL

<i>SIMILARITIES</i>	<i>DIFFERENCES</i>	
	<i>Kerry-Lugar</i>	<i>Berman</i>
<p>-Triple non-military aid to 1.5 billion (total of 7.5 billion) for each of the next five years</p> <p>-Improve schools and democratic institutes (particular focus on strengthening democratic institutions, promoting economic development and improving Pakistan's public education system, with an emphasis on access for women and girls)</p> <p>-Create permanent fund to collect aid from several U.S. accounts and parcel it out where most needed (permanent Pakistan Democracy and Prosperity Fund for most non-military assistance, demonstrating America's long-term commitment to Pakistan's democratic future)</p> <p>-Authorize money for military training</p> <p>-Military financing focus on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency</p> <p>-Reorienting the substance of US aid to Pakistan from predominantly military assistance to economic and political assistance</p> <p>-Directs the Secretary of State (in consultation with other named officials) to develop a comprehensive strategy for the Afghan-Pakistan border area</p>	<p>-Does not include a military assistance component. There are, however, several conditions placed on military assistance with language similar to the House bill.</p> <p>-Bill takes no position on whether military aid will increase, decrease, or remain at current levels</p> <p>-Bill 'urges' oversight, does not include requirement restrictions</p> <p>-Puts the responsibility of certifying Pakistan's compliance with US counterterrorism / counterinsurgency expectations on the Secretary of State.</p> <p>-Includes a provision barring sales and exports of major defense equipment to Pakistan if Pakistan is not compliant with US counterterrorism / counterinsurgency expectations</p>	<p>-Restrict financing for F-16 fighters</p> <p>-Bill requires that all military assistance flow through the democratically elected Government of Pakistan</p> <p>-Legislation includes language and restrictions that requires rigorous oversight and auditing (" fully accountable, contingent upon Pakistan ending support for terrorist groups, and should meet India's national security needs ")</p> <p>-Puts the responsibility of certifying Pakistan's compliance with US Counterterrorism / counterinsurgency expectations on the President</p> <p>Creates Reconstruction Opportunity Zones (ROZs) in Afghanistan and Pakistan, in which textiles and other goods could be produced for duty-free export</p> <p>-Makes an exception for military assistance for the Pakistan Frontier Corps on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. Regardless of Pakistan's compliance with US counterterrorism / counterinsurgency expectations, military assistance is permitted for that purpose.</p>

Parts of the Bills written in GREEN are what PAKPAC believes should stay.

Parts of the Bills written in ORANGE, we believe need to be better worded with some minor changes

Part of the Bills written in RED, we believe are counter productive and result in going against the basic vision and purpose of the bill.

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

A: Includes a provision barring sales and exports of major defense equipment to Pakistan if Pakistan is not compliant with US Counterterrorism / counterinsurgency expectations:

This part in the Kerry Lugar bill could reduce the capacity of the military in Pakistan to continue to deal with the extremism challenge. The war may have times because of the ground political realities which may slow the efforts and should this happen for local short term strategic reason we would not weaken the capacity of the forces in future.

B: -Restrict financing for F-16 fighters

At this time, Pakistan has, is and will continue to use the air military assault on the extremists' hideouts in the remotest and most difficult terrain in the world. F16 based strategy allows Pakistan to do this. Restricting F 16 would reduce capacity to fight and would thus be counter productive.

C: -Legislation includes language and restrictions that requires rigorous oversight and auditing. ("Fully accountable, contingent upon Pakistan ending support for terrorist groups, and should meet India's national security needs")

The restrictive language written in the Berman Bill includes language which is not representative for a Country who has been deeply impacted by the war on terror, who has had more financial losses and deaths than any other Country. Moreover, this is a situation where we are investing into better relations with the people of Pakistan. Language which is more restrictive and insensitive to the strong views of people of Pakistan is counter-productive to what we are trying to achieve. We are investing in people of Pakistan for winning the hearts and minds and showing that US is a friend and is there for the long haul. Investment in the people would be necessary in the larger context irrespective the short term changes in the current war. We have recognized the price of disengagement and lack of investment in the people of Pakistan. Restrictions and limitations we are imposing on ourselves in this situation are making us to repeat the mistakes of the past. At this critical juncture in history, we MUST NOT repeat these mistakes as with respect to Pakistan, we don't have much more room for short term and long term error.

This law does begin to help develop a plan for stability within Pakistan. We must remain focused on the security and stability in Pakistan. Any instability in Pakistan clearly destabilizes Afghanistan and India. The parts of the bill which may confine us from stabilizing Pakistan would be counter productive from the objectives and support that is needed at this time.