

Contents:

1. Reproduction of the Nepal portion of the FY 2002 Foreign Operations
Emergency Supplemental Funding Justifications (along with other headings).....1
 - The entire PDF document is available at:
<<http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/aid/aidindex.htm>>
 - The original bill is available at:
<<http://w3.access.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2003/pdf/5usattack.pdf>>
2. Letters from Congressmen Dennis Kucinich and Ron Paul 5

FY 2002 Foreign Operations Emergency Supplemental Funding Justifications

(Request -- \$1,279,500,000)

South Asia

Afghanistan (\$250 million Total Request)

Pakistan (\$145 million Total Request)

Nepal (20 million-Foreign Military Financing (FMF))

A Maoist insurgency seeks the overthrow of Nepal's constitutional monarchy and the establishment of a republic. They have sought this end through increasingly violent means over the last six years. Maoists control at least five of Nepal's 75 districts, and have a presence in nearly all the rest. Some of the current Maoist leaders participated in the political process under various communist parties until 1994. That year a faction headed by the current Maoist leadership abandoned electoral politics after the Federal Election Commission failed to recognize the group in time for that year's elections. In early 1995 they renamed themselves Maoists and in 1994 they launched their armed struggle. Throughout the late 1990s the party conducted sporadic attacks, robbing banks and overrunning isolated police posts, while consolidating control in its base areas in the hills of Nepal's far west region. Its influence spread rapidly, largely because the government failed to provide adequate services or to punish corrupt and abusive local officials. Prime Minister Deuba offered negotiations as soon as he took office in July 2001. But three rounds of talks produced no agreements, and in late November the Maoists broke a four-month cease-fire and resumed attacks against military, police and government facilities. The latest round of attacks has raised the casualty figures of this struggle to over 3000 killed.

We currently do not have direct evidence of an al-Qaida presence in Nepal, but weak governance has already proved inviting to terrorists, criminals and intelligence services from surrounding countries. In 1999, terrorists hijacked a flight originating at Kathmandu's international airport and flew it first to Srinagar, Kashmir and then to Kandahar, Afghanistan, where the hijackers were welcomed by the Taliban. The security situation at the airport has improved, but continued instability in Nepal could create the conditions in which terrorists easily could establish operations, especially in remote areas in the far west of the country. In addition, Nepal has a substantial Muslim minority, located primarily along the Indian border. The combination of proximity, rugged terrain and a distracted government could well afford conditions that the al-Qaida would find favorable in its search for safe havens.

It is difficult to judge whether the Maoists ever had a genuine interest in compromise with the government. During the July-November cease-fire and negotiations, there were signs of splits between the political and military wings of the movement. A return to negotiations might exacerbate those tensions and perhaps lead less militant followers to renounce violence and seek a political solution. This might also create the space in which those who were forced to join the Maoists could leave the movement.

The goal of our military assistance is to help the GON [Government of Nepal] create a situation in which the Maoists decide that a military victory is not possible and that negotiations provide the best hope for realizing their goals. We are coordinating our assistance with the U.K. and have plans to expand that coordination to include other interested countries. The U.K. recruits 4% of its army (the Brigade of Gurkhas) from Nepal. The \$2 million we currently have in FMF for FY02 will enable us to establish a security assistance relationship and acquire some badly-needed equipment and training, but will not address Nepal's most pressing need, which is airlift capability. The RNA [Royal Nepal Army] cannot engage the Maoists effectively if it cannot get in the fight. Many of the Maoists attacks have occurred in areas where the nearest paved road is several days' march away, but that are readily accessible by helicopter. The \$20 million in supplemental FMF would be used both to purchase equipment and to lease helicopters that will permit the Royal Nepal Army (RNA) to rapidly deploy its forces to counter Maoist attacks. Equipment includes body armor, night vision devices and communications gear. We can lease rotary wing airlift services through a U.S. company for one year, and thereby provide quick, high-impact assistance, with the leasing firm providing pilots and operational support. The number of helicopters ultimately provided will depend on the platforms the RNA chooses.

There can be no purely military solution to this conflict. Ours is a two-pronged approach that combines military and development assistance. Both are required to effectively counter the insurgency: military aid to address the immediate threat, and development assistance to address the underlying grievances that the Maoists exploit. We are coordinating with the UK and others on development issues.

We remain cognizant of regional equities and sensitivities, and will consult widely to ensure that the countries bordering Nepal understand the goals of our assistance. India has provided two helicopters and has offered additional training to the RNA. China has not provided military assistance, but has provided development assistance in the past. There is no evidence that China supports the Maoists, and it has expressed strong diplomatic support for the government. A prolonged insurgency or Maoists victory would greatly destabilize the region, and stability along its borders is a fundamental Chinese policy goal.

Europe and Eurasia

Turkey (\$228 million Total Request)

Uzbekistan (\$45.5 million Total Request)

Kyrgyz Republic (\$42 million Total Request)

Tajikistan (\$40 million Total Request)

Turkmenistan (\$4 million Freedom Support Act Funds (FSA))

Kazakhstan (\$3.5 million Total Request)

Near East

Jordan (\$125 million Total Request)

Secretary's Economic Initiative for the Middle East (MEEI) \$50 million Economic Support Fund (ESF)

Bahrain (\$28 million Foreign Military Financing (FMF))

Oman (\$25 million Foreign Military Financing (FMF))

Yemen (\$25 million Total Request)

Africa

Ethiopia (\$12 million Total Request)

Kenya (\$22 million Total Request)

Djibouti (\$6 million Total Request)

Sudan (\$10 million Economic Support Fund (ESF))

Nigeria (\$2 million Economic Support Fund (ESF))

Mauritania (\$1 million Economic Support Fund (ESF))

Cote d'Ivoire (\$2 million Economic Support Fund (ESF))

Western Hemisphere

Colombia (\$35 million Total Request)

Mexico (\$25 million International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE))

Equator (\$3 million Foreign Military Financing (FMF))

WHA Regional Programs (\$5 million International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE))

Border Control Improvement Projects (\$3 million INCLE)

The Caribbean (\$2.5 million INCLE)

OAS Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism (CITCE) (\$1 million INCLE)

East Asia and the Pacific

Indonesia (\$16 million Total Request)

Philippines (\$40 million Total Request)

Additional Programs

Counterterrorism/Anti-terrorism Programs (\$40 million Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (NADR/ATA))

USAID Operating Expenses (\$7 million USAID/OE)

....

Due to significant increase in countries' FMF funding and the establishment of new programs under the Supplemental, additional personnel and SAO offices are required to support the expanded program. . . .

TWO LETTERS CIRCULATED BY CONGRESSMEN DENNIS KUCINICH AND RON PAUL

Letter 1

May 21, 2002

What would Thomas Jefferson say??

Dear Colleague,

According to the State Department's FY 2002 Foreign Operations Emergency Supplemental Funding Justifications, U.S. officials "do not have direct evidence of an al-Qaida presence in Nepal." Nevertheless, \$20 million of the more than \$370 million in emergency Foreign Military Financing included in the Supplemental Appropriations bill will go to Nepal, according to the document.

Why? Says the State Department:

"A Maoist insurgency seeks the overthrow of Nepal's constitutional monarchy and the establishment of a republic."

226 years after ousting King George III, the American republic is in the business of propping up monarchies!!!

VOTE YES ON THE KUCINICH/PAUL AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

which cuts \$147.5 million in FMF funds for countries that the State Department has not adequately demonstrated are in need of emergency military assistance from the United States. These countries include Nepal, Georgia, Jordan, Bahrain, Oman, Ethiopia, Kenya, Djibouti, Colombia, and Equador.

Sincerely,

Letter 2

May 21, 2002

VOTE YES ON THE KUCINICH/PAUL AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Dear Colleague,

The Kucinich/Paul Amendment would cut \$147.5 million in Foreign Military Financing funds for countries that the State Department has not adequately demonstrated are in need of emergency military assistance from the United States. These countries include Nepal, Georgia, Jordan, Bahrain, Oman, Ethiopia, Kenya, Djibouti, Colombia, and Equador.

The State Department's FY 2002 Foreign Operations Emergency Supplemental Funding Justifications list the various recipients of Foreign Military Financing (FMF) money included in the Supplemental bill, the amount each of these countries would be provided, and why.

But despite the emergency designation placed on all FMF funds, the State Department has supplied no evidence that the military assistance provided to each of the countries above is necessary now as opposed to four months from now, when FY 2003 begins:

Nepal (\$20 million): The justification document admits that "we currently do not have direct evidence of an al-Qaida presence in Nepal." Funds are being provided because a "Maoist insurgency seeks the overthrow of Nepal's constitutional monarchy and the establishment of a republic."

Georgia (\$20 million): No al-Qaida or other direct threat to Americans is cited; rather, "Georgia is facing its own internal insurgency and terrorist threats," says the State Department document, and faces "concerns about possible Russian threats to Georgian sovereignty and territorial integrity" (emphasis added).

Oman (\$25 million): The emergency in this case appears to be nothing more than the need to reward Oman for serving as an "indispensable ally" and a "key supporter of U.S. policies in the region." Again, though the infrastructure improvements and nightvision devices that American taxpayers will fund will surely help defend Omanis, the State Department cites no specific evidence that these funds will address an immediate terrorist threat to Americans.

The State Department justifies emergency FMF funding for the other countries listed in similarly generic ways: funds would be used to improve basic military and counter-terrorism capability, to facilitate interaction with U.S. military forces, to improve border security, etc. Among the countries cited, in no case does the State Department explain why these funds cannot be appropriated through the standard FY03 Foreign Operations bill.

IF THE STATE DEPARTMENT CAN'T ADEQUATELY JUSTIFY HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN EMERGENCY FMF FUNDING, CONGRESS SHOULDN'T APPROPRIATE IT!

Sincerely,

Dennis Kucinich Ron Paul
Member of Congress