

Johns Hopkins University Professor Michael Mandelbaum aptly describes NATO expansion as "the mother of all unfunded mandates." If expansion is not merely an exercise in empty political symbolism, even the CBO estimate could prove to be conservative. Moreover, none of the estimates takes into account the probable costs of subsequent rounds of expansion, yet administration leaders insist that they will occur.

In light of those troubling facts, the Senate should at least conduct a lengthy, comprehensive debate on NATO expansion, not rush through the proceedings as if the issue was akin to designating National Wildflower Week. After all, the decision may determine whether American troops someday have to fight and die in Eastern Europe.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 18, 1998]
SENATE RECKLESSNESS ON NATO?

The Senate is poised to make a serious mistake by ratifying a first stage of NATO expansion. The anticipated inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is a momentous decision, enlarging the treaty organization and the geopolitical area covered by the allies' mutual security guarantee. If ever a Senate vote deserved prudent deliberation, this is it.

Unfortunately, sensible requests from some senators to pause for careful consideration of this first round of enlargement have been rejected, and there are not enough votes to pass an amendment by Senators John Warner of Virginia and Patrick Moynihan of New York, who proposed a pause of three years before NATO admits a second flight of new members.

In a letter to the Senate minority leader, Tom Daschle, on Saturday, President Clinton argued that for the sake of enhanced security, "we must leave the door open to the addition of other qualified new members in the future. The 'open door' commitment made by all the allies has played a vital role in ensuring that the process of enlargement benefits the security of the entire region, not just these first three members."

But the administration has yet to make a convincing case that NATO enlargement at the present time is truly necessary to European or American security. With the disappearance of the Soviet Union, the states of Central and Eastern Europe face no imminent threat from an expansionist superpower. And if political upheavals in Russia raised the specter of such a threat in the future, there would be time to prepare for it and enlarge the alliance. NATO's expansion, rather than enhancing Europe's stability, could endanger it.

President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic has made a strong case for anchoring the former members of the Warsaw Pact in the West. But the commonality of values invoked by Havel need not mean immediate inclusion in a military alliance formed to keep Soviet forces from invading Western Europe.

There are other, wiser ways to pursue what Clinton calls "our strategic goal of building an undivided, democratic, and peaceful Europe."

[From the Newark (NJ) Star-Ledger]
UNDUE HASTE ON NATO EXPANSION
(By David Border)

This week the Senate, which counts among its major accomplishments this year renaming Washington National Airport for President Ronald Reagan and officially labeling Saddam Hussein a war criminal, takes up the matter of enlarging the 20th century's most successful military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Senate just spent two weeks arguing over how to slice up the pork in the \$214 bil-

lion highway and mass transit bill. It will, if plans hold, spend only a few days on moving the NATO shield hundreds of miles eastward to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

The reason is simple. As Sen. Connie Mack of Florida, the chairman of the Senate Republican Conference, told me while trying to herd reluctant senators into a closed-door discussion of the NATO issue one afternoon last week, "No one is interested in this at home," so few of his colleagues think it worth much of their time.

It is a cliché to observe that since the Cold War ended, foreign policy has dropped to the bottom of voters' concerns. But as two of the senators who question the wisdom of NATO's expansion, Democrat Daniel Moynihan of New York and Republican John Warner of Virginia, remarked in separate interviews, serious consideration of treaties and military alliances once was considered what the Senate was for. No longer.

Wrapping the three former Soviet satellites in the warm embrace of NATO is an appealing notion to many senators, notwithstanding the acknowledgement by advocates that the Czech Republic and Hungary have a long way to go to bring their military forces up to NATO standards. As the date for ratification has approached, estimates of the costs to NATO have been shrinking magically, but the latest NATO estimate of \$1.5 billion over the next decade is barely credible.

The administration, in the person of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, has refused to say what happens next if NATO starts moving eastward toward the border of Russia. "The door is open" to other countries with democratic governments and free markets, Albright says. The administration is fighting an effort by Warner and others to place a moratorium on admission of additional countries until it is known how well the first recruits are assimilated.

Moynihan points out that if the Baltic countries of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, which are panting for membership, are brought in, the United States and other signatories will have a solemn obligation to defend territory farther east than the westernmost border of Russia. He points to a Russian government strategy paper published last December saving the expansion of NATO inevitably means Russia will have to rely increasingly on nuclear weapons.

Moynihan and Warner are far from alone in raising alarms about the effect of NATO enlargement on U.S.-Russian relations. The Duma, Russia's parliament, on Jan. 23 passed a resolution calling NATO expansion the biggest threat to Russia since the end of World War II. The Duma has blocked ratification of the START II nuclear arms agreement signed in 1993 and approved by the Senate two years ago.

George Kennan, the elder statesman who half a century ago devised the fundamental strategy for "containment" of the Soviet Union, has called the enlargement of NATO a classic policy blunder. Former Sen. Sam Nunn of Georgia, until his retirement last year the Democrats' and the Senate's leading military authority, told me, "Russian cooperation in avoiding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is our most important national security objective, and this (NATO expansion) makes them more suspicious and less cooperative."

To the extent this momentous step has been debated at all, it has taken place outside the hearing of the American people. Too bad our busy Senate can't find time before it votes to let the public in on the argument.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. I know the Senator from Connecticut wishes to speak. I will just take 2 minutes here.

One, I want to make it clear, when I was making a case to my friends from Virginia and New York about the comparison of Turkey and Poland, it did not relate to whether there was merit in defending Turkey. There is. Not only merit, there is an obligation. I was making the larger point which goes to the serious issue the Senator from Virginia has raised honestly—and the only one who has done it forthrightly so far—and that is, is there a consensus in America to defend any European country?

Whatever commitment we make, we must keep. And he is right in raising the issue: Are the American people—do you all understand, all America, that if we expand, we are committing our sacred honor to defend Poland as we have Germany, to defend the Czech Republic as we have England, to defend the country of Hungary as we have Denmark? Are we prepared to do that? That should be discussed, and it should be discussed forthrightly. And I thank him for raising that issue.

There is much more to say, but I will have plenty of chance to say it, so I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I see my colleague from Missouri is here. I tell him this will be very brief, my remarks. I don't want him to depart. I know he has been standing here for some time.

It is on an unrelated matter that is the subject of this debate, Mr. President. And let me just say, having the privilege of standing here and listening to the Presiding Officer share his remarks, I commend him for those remarks. And I thank my colleague from Delaware for yielding here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIS EMINENCE BERNARD CARDINAL LAW, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON, REFLECTING ON CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier last week I had the privilege of having a brief conversation with His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Law, the Archbishop of Boston. In fact, it is a nice coincidence that my colleague from Missouri is here on the floor as I say these remarks, because I shared with him a message that Cardinal Law had sent to our colleague from Missouri, Senator ASHCROFT, who had the privilege of knowing Cardinal Law when he was presiding as a bishop in Missouri back before assuming his present post. And he extended his best wishes to our colleague from Missouri. So I appreciate his presence here on the floor as I share these remarks.

In the course of our conversation, Cardinal Law mentioned to me he was going to be speaking at a conference

sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University. The topic of the conference was to be on Cuba, Mr. President.

The cardinal was very kind enough to send a copy of his remarks to me. And after reading them, I have no doubt that all of my colleagues should have that opportunity as well. They are excellent, excellent remarks and ones that I think will be worthwhile.

I know Members are going through their own private discussions of what should be our policy with regard to Cuba. There have been some changes here. How do you respond to them? Cardinal Law has laid out, I think, some very, very creative, clear, and interesting ideas on how we ought to move forward here. So I urge my colleagues to read these remarks.

Cardinal Law is extremely well informed on this subject. He has visited Cuba over the years. He has kept in very close contact with the clergy in Cuba. I was particularly struck, Mr. President, by what he believes we should have learned from Pope John Paul II's January visit to Havana; namely—and I quote him—

The Holy Father has amply demonstrated that a policy of positive engagement can achieve far more change within Cuba than can the [U.S.] embargo.

Cardinal Law starkly and very vividly highlights what he thinks is the failure of our current policy with regard to Cuba by contrasting it with our policies towards the People's Republic of China and even Vietnam—two nations that have had deplorable human rights records and where religious freedom is severely restrained, even as we speak here today.

He then pointedly asked—and I quote him—

If openness is thought to be further freedom in those nations where change is not so evident, how it is that a different standard is applied to Cuba where there is evident change?

Mr. President, I do not believe that there is a credible answer to that question. And that alone should tell us why the current U.S. policy with respect to Cuba is so flawed. Cardinal Law's remarks, which touched on such issues as the state of affairs in the Cuban and United States-Cuban relations are very insightful, and I urge my colleagues to read the full text of his remarks, which I now ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BERNARD CARDINAL LAW BEFORE THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

In preparing these remarks, I reviewed my correspondence file from persons who accompanied me to Cuba for the Pope's visit. Our direct flight from Boston to Havana might have established a record in itself! Every letter expressed appreciation for the opportunity to participate in a historic and profoundly moving event. Almost to a person there was the expressed desire to be of assistance to the Church in Cuba and to the Cuban people.

These pilgrims to Cuba included bishops, priests and sisters, and Catholic laity as well as Protestants and Jews. There were business leaders, bankers, doctors and a Health Care System President. There were heads of social service agencies and representatives of foundations, there were lawyers and judges, Congressmen, presidents of colleges, a law school dean and a university professor, and the editor of a national magazine. We were a wondrously diverse group, but we found unity in our conviction that the time is now for a change in U.S. policy towards Cuba.

Since returning from the Papal Visit, I have often been asked if I thought that change might now come to Cuba. The question misses the point that change has already come. An earlier barometer of change focused on the departure of Fidel Castro as the threshold for any substantive change. The events of the past year clearly demonstrate that that barometer simply does not work. The toothpaste is out of the tube, and Fidel Castro squeezed the tube.

Any blueprint for a change in policy which demands a change in leadership in another country is too rigid a starting point and depending on the means willing to be used to achieve that departure, could lack a moral claim. This is not to condone a dismal record on human rights. Religious freedom is certainly not yet fully developed in Cuba. The fact remains, however, that dramatic change has occurred within the past twelve months in the area of religious liberty. These changes could not have occurred without the active approval of President Castro. He has been a promoter, not an obstacle to what is now happening in Cuba.

It is not the visit alone, stunning though it was, which chronicles change. Events leading up to the visit must also be acknowledged. Some in Cuba with whom I have spoken place great emphasis on the private audience accorded Fidel Castro by Pope John Paul II. One must also note the mixed commission of government and Church to plan for the Papal visit which marks a sea change in that relationship. The Church was able to engage in a door to door nationwide mission in preparation for the Pope's visit. Religious processions were allowed, as were some outside religious celebrations. The exclusion of the Church from the use of public media was, at least in a modest way, but nonetheless establishing a precedent, lifted with the pre-visit nationally televised address by the Archbishop of Havana, Jaime Cardinal Ortega.

Quite before the time of planning for the visit, the Church was allowed a new expression of social services through Caritas Cuba. While its work is still narrowly circumscribed, a principle of public, organized social service by the Catholic Church has been recognized. The backlog of visa requests by foreign clergy, religious and other Church workers has been broken as the number of visas has dramatically increased.

Change cannot be rooted in a precise paradigm for the future. If we are to measure change realistically, it must be measured against the past. The past that I know in terms of the Church in Cuba begins in 1984. Before then, there were confiscations of Church property, the closing of Catholic schools and other institutional works, the departure, and some would argue the forced exile, of hundreds of Church personnel. There were the labor camps which number among their alumni the present Cardinal Archbishop of Havana. Pervading and justifying all this was an official version of history, employing a method with which we have become all too sadly accustomed in some current trends in the U.S. academy. It is the application of deconstruction to the study of the past in a way which serves an ideological end.

In an earlier visit to Cuba, I objected to President Castro concerning the severe intimidation of the omnipresent Committees of the Revolution. These watchdogs of Marxist orthodoxy saw as dangerously subversive the baptism of a child or the visit of a priest or the regular attendance at Mass. Castro's response, replete with Church history according to Marx, made the claim that the state did allow for religious freedom. The State was powerless, in his explanation, to counter the strong anti-Church sentiment of the people borne of what he described as the Church's oppressive and sinful past.

For the past fourteen years, I have been in continual contact with the Church in Cuba. I was present in the Nunciature in Havana the first time Castro met with Cuban bishops. There were no more than three substantive encounters of this kind before the Pope's visit. During the past fourteen years there have been sporadic efforts on the part of the Cuban government to marginalize the Church by suggesting that the bishops were "counter revolutionary", which in our terms would mean unpatriotic and subversive.

Against that all too schematic background, focus on Havana, Sunday, January 25, 1998. The Plaza of the Revolution has a new face: a heroic-sized painting on the facade of the national library portrays Jesus in the familiar style of the Sacred Heart. One million Cubans, with a sprinkling of foreign pilgrims, are ranged in front of the altar. Fidel Castro, in a business suit, is in the front row.

For me, one among the many moving moments stands out in a particularly vivid way. During the Havana Mass, the Holy Father commissioned representatives from various dioceses to go forth and present the message of the Church. He presented each with a Bible. The last person to approach the Pope was a older woman, quite frail, who was helped up the stairs by two young men. When she approached the Holy Father, she threw her arms around him. There they were, aging and frail, this elderly woman and the Pope, with their common witness to fidelity in the face of Communist oppression. As she was helped down the stairs, she was accompanied by the thunderous applause of thousands of Cubans.

I wondered what she thought. Must I not have been for her the unfolding of a miracle? What had it been for her these past years in a land governed by Marxism? What must have been her joy in this sea of Cubans, so many young and ecstatic in their celebration of faith? I could only think of Anna in the incident recorded by St. Luke. Anna was an old woman, a widow, who spent her days in prayer and fasting in the Temple. When Mary and Joseph brought the infant Jesus to present him to God in the Temple, Anna came to the scene at that moment. St. Luke says "she gave thanks to God and talked about the child to all who looked forward to the deliverance of Jerusalem."

It must be said that the Cuban government could not have been more obliging and welcoming. The Masses of the Holy Father were televised live nationally.

As the Holy Father left Jose Marti Airport on January 25th, he said that in our day "no nation can live in isolation. The Cuban people therefore cannot be denied the contacts with other peoples necessary for economic, social and cultural development, especially when the imposed isolation strikes the population indiscriminately, making it ever more difficult for the weakest to enjoy the bare essentials of decent living, things such as food, health and education. All can and should take practical steps to bring about changes in this regard."

These are important words of the Pope which have meaning not only for the Catholic faithful but for all women and men of

good will, including those who exercise leadership in government. Current U.S. policy towards Cuba was set during the missile crisis. A few things have happened since then, however, including the tearing down of the Berlin Wall and the unraveling of Communist hegemony in Eastern Europe. The visit of the Holy Father to Cuba in January of this year is one of those defining events. A policy driven by events of an earlier time does not meet the challenge of new possibilities which the Holy Father's visit opens up.

One of the strongest impediments to new policy initiatives is the pressure of partisan politics. Is it but the musings of an unrealistic cleric to suggest that an earlier pattern of a bipartisan foreign policy could serve us well again? To that end, I propose the establishment of a bipartisan National Commission on U.S./Cuban relations. Such a Commission, perhaps Presidential or conceivably organized by a non-governmental body, would have as its charge the development of policy initiatives which could build on the changes already perceived in Cuba since the Pope's visit. The work of this Commission should be completed within three to six months. It should not take longer than this because the Commission's work would be essentially a simple and straightforward task.

The Commission might be co-chaired by President Carter and President Bush or President Ford. It ought to include Senator LUGAR, Representative HAMILTON, a U.S. Bishop, Elizabeth Dole, head of the American Red Cross, two corporate CEO's, two prominent Cuban-Americans, someone from the field of medicine and someone representing the concerns of the media.

Since the Holy Father's visit, there has been the release of more than 400 prisoners. While one political prisoner is one too many, this direct response to the Holy Father's visit cannot be dismissed. So very much more needs to be done to broaden the scope of human rights in Cuba. However, I am convinced that the best way to do this is to move the starting point of U.S. Policy from the missile crisis to the Papal visit. The Holy Father has amply demonstrated that a policy of positive engagement can achieve far more change within Cuba than can the embargo.

Cardinal Ortega has commented on the so-called Helms-Burton Act that "any economic measure that aims to isolate a country and thus eliminates the possibility of development, thus threatening the survival of people is unacceptable."

It is impossible to reasonably support the embargo against Cuba while at the same time granting most favored Nation status to the People's Republic of China, and while moving into closer relations with Vietnam. Both of these nations have a deplorable record on human rights in general and on religious liberty specifically. If openness is thought to further freedom in those nations where change is not so evident, how is that a different standard is applied to Cuba where there is evident change?

We should not wait for the report of a bipartisan commission to introduce some measures which would ameliorate human suffering in Cuba, which would foster cultural, religious and other interchanges, and which would therefore, encourage the new attitude of openness and change within Cuba. It is time for the U.S. To respond positively to the change that is occurring in Cuba.

There is no moral justification for the current embargo. In terms of effectiveness as an agent of change it has proven to be complete failure. The most egregious aspects of the embargo, namely the prohibition of sale of food and medicine, must be lifted immediately. The two bills currently in Congress

which would do this should be immediately passed. What is needed in Cuba is the ability to purchase food and medicine in the U.S. A singular focus on facilitating charitable donations of food and medicine is patently inadequate.

There are certain things that can be done tomorrow by the President of the United States.

The President should agree to license direct, humanitarian flights to Cuba.

The President could take immediate action to ease remittance restrictions, increase visiting privileges, and expand opportunities for U.S. citizens particularly Cuban Americans, to visit Cuba by restoring direct flights. The right to travel is a Constitutional right. It should not be violated for outdated political reasons.

The President could restate that he will continue suspending the international trade bans of Helms-Burton indefinitely. This would help the people of Cuba and it would ease the concerns of our closest allies and trading partners.

The President should give serious critical attention to the legal opinion that concludes that the Executive Branch has the legal and constitutional right to grant a general license for medicines and for food. Such an action on the part of the President would, of course, effectively end the food and medicine embargo immediately.

The foreign policy initiatives of a President can be decisive. President Nixon went to China. President Carter brought Begin and Sadat to Camp David. President Reagan met Gorbachev in Iceland to ease nuclear tensions and President Bush followed up by reducing our nuclear weapons. President Clinton has the possibility of charting a new relationship between the United States and Cuba.

Let me end by recounting an incident during the Pope's visit. One of the pilgrims traveling with us took a walk along the waterfront. He was alone, it was raining, and the pavement was slippery. He stumbled and fell, with a resultant large cut in the head. Some passersby stopped their car and took him to the emergency room of the nearest hospital. The care he received was both professionally competent and compassionate. However, he was struck by the fact that the only medicine he could observe on the shelf in the treatment room was some alcohol. When the doctor arrived to stitch his wound, he first reached into a pocket of his white coat, removed a light bulb, and screwed it into the empty socket so that he could see more easily. It is not just a bulb that is missing. There is often a lack of power with devastating consequences, especially in surgery. The lack of medicines more quickly and cheaply attainable from the U.S. severely restricts the treatment that can be provided. Even more basically, the effects of the lack of sufficient food threaten the most vulnerable members of the population, the old and the young.

I would submit that the people of Cuba deserve better than that from us. I would submit that it adds no honor to our country to deprive a people of those necessities which should never be used as bargaining chips.

Change is occurring in Cuba. The question is, do we have the political will and moral courage to change?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues some very specific recommendations Cardinal Law has made to President Clinton and the administration, recommendations which the President has the authority, without any acts of Congress, to undertake.

And I recite them very briefly to you here: Restore direct flights to Cuba; ease restrictions on remittances and travel; suspend implementation of title III indefinitely; and utilize current executive authority to grant general licenses to permit the sale of food and medicines. I say "title III." That is of the Helms-Burton legislation.

Mr. President, I strongly support these recommendations and hope that the President will immediately act on them.

Let me summarize briefly some of the other major points made in the course of Cardinal Law's presentation.

On the positive side, the Cardinal noted that "change has already come" to Cuba in many ways; "dramatic change has occurred within the last twelve months in the area of religious freedom"—I am quoting him from his remarks—"a principle of public, organized social service by the Catholic Church has been reorganized" by Cuban authorities; "the backlog of visa requests by foreign clergy, religious and other Church workers has been broken as the number of visas has dramatically increased;" and, "there has been the release [in the last few weeks] of more than 400 [political] prisoners [in Cuba]."

The cardinal also readily acknowledges that Cuba's human rights record—and I agree with him—has been dismal. No one is suggesting, I hope—not by my remarks—that there has been a total transformation in Cuba. There has not been a total transformation, but there has been change, and it is significant, and we ought to respond to those changes that have occurred.

He reminded—Cardinal Law did—listeners of Pope John Paul's party comments as he left Havana to return to the Vatican. I quote him. He said:

The Cuban people cannot be denied the contacts with other peoples necessary for economic, social, and cultural development, especially when the imposed isolation strikes the population indiscriminately.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say Cardinal Law was extremely critical of current U.S. policy. He noted that the "[c]urrent U.S. policy towards Cuba was set during the missile crisis" and that "[a] policy driven by events of an earlier time does not meet the challenge of new possibilities which the Holy Father's visit opens up."

Finally, Cardinal Law made a number of very important recommendations concerning how we might begin to fashion some new and constructive policy initiatives. He recommended, for example, that steps be taken to isolate U.S.-Cuba policy from partisan politics by establishing a bipartisan national commission on U.S.-Cuban relations. I think this is an intriguing idea and one that I intend to discuss personally with the President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I believe that the cardinal's remarks are timely, they are important, and they are worthy of our

serious consideration. I urge my colleagues to review them personally in these coming days as they formulate their own views on how we ought to proceed with regard to U.S.-Cuban relations.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I will be happy to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I just want to, first of all, commend my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, for his understanding of Cardinal Law's statement and for the constructive nature in which the Senator has referred to it.

I do think that it is an enormously serious document. I agree with the Senator that it deserves a great deal of study. I had had the opportunity to talk to him prior to the time of delivery. He is motivated by a very deep and continuing humanitarian concern from his frequent visits there and from the study of the people on the island.

I just want to commend the Senator, who is a real leader in the issues of the hemisphere, and to thank him for an excellent statement, and to say that I think it has been an enormously constructive and positive statement and I hope our colleagues will pay attention to it. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you, Mr. President.

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to participate in the debate regarding NATO.

One of the interesting facts about the debate is that the mission of NATO has not been a matter of significant discussion.

There are a lot of questions—about the cost of enlargement, the political and strategic benefits to potential new members of NATO, and the effect of any expansion of the NATO alliance on our relationship with Russia—that have all been discussed. These issues have received the most attention.

But while expansion of NATO numerically is significant, perhaps the mission of NATO deserves serious consideration as we look at an institution which has not only been involved in a long heritage of successful maintenance of the territorial integrity of our comembers of this organization in Europe, but has also been a vital part of protecting American interests.

NATO has been very successful. Earlier, the Senator from Washington stated that NATO has been the most successful multinational defense orga-

nization in the history of the world. And I think that is a fair statement. A major achievement of the organization is the fact that a third world war has not erupted in Europe. It is pretty clear that the Soviet Union, in its days of power and strength, dared not infringe on the territory of those protected by the NATO alliance. That is to the credit of the organization.

Article 5 of the NATO treaty was the heart of the organization. And I would like to refer the Members of the Senate and those interested in this debate to Article 5 at this time.

Article 5 States:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

What the heart of the treaty really designates is that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was an organization designed to affect and protect the territory—the territorial integrity—of the Nations that were its member states.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, we did not have the same kind of threat to the territory of the NATO states that had existed prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union. I think few of us would argue with the proposition that the NATO alliance really was an alliance which drew a bright line to defend against the potential incursion by the Soviet Union.

Since the Soviet Union collapsed, there has been discussion among NATO planners to find a new mission for the Alliance. Counterproliferation, the advancing of political "interests" of NATO members, peacekeeping, and crisis management became the kinds of issues discussed at NATO—an entirely different mission than it originally had and, frankly, a mission that is not consistent with the charter of NATO itself.

The assembled NATO powers, in 1991, adopted and promulgated a strategic concept. For the strategic concept of 1991, there was an interesting transition in the statement of what NATO is all about. Collective defense, the concept in Article 5 which has been the central theme and thesis of NATO for its years of great success, was relegated to the bottom of the list of mission priorities.

As a result of putting collective defense at the bottom, a number of other things were listed as missions of NATO. In some respects, I find these new mission priorities to be challenging because they are not the kinds of things for which NATO was created, and they are not the kinds of missions that the U.S. Senate and its giants in the Senate ratified when ratifying the

NATO treaty 50 years ago. The "fundamental security task" in the new strategic concept of 1991 was "To provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable security environment in Europe . . . in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any European nation or to impose hegemony through the threat or use of force."

This is a major expansion and a substantial change in the mission of NATO. It is a change in the direction in which the organization is headed. It changes NATO's responsibility. Clearly, no longer is NATO for the collective defense of a limited territory. NATO now has the impossible task of stopping intimidation and coercion throughout NATO and non-NATO Europe alike. So the mission of NATO has been transitioning from the mission ratified by the Senate, and it has been evolving, as if treaties are allowed to evolve. It has been organic, rather than static or having specific boundaries.

The catch phrase that defines this effort is that NATO must "go out of area or go out of business." This whole concept, I think, demands very close observation.

Mr. President, I have tried to point out that the objectives specified in the strategic concept of 1991 embraced by the NATO allies is a set of objectives far different from that which the NATO organization was authorized to achieve in its Charter, which was ratified by the U.S. Senate. I believe that NATO was not intended for these new purposes.

The understanding of the U.S. Senate in 1949, and the understanding of the American people, has been that NATO is designed to protect territory—the territory of member nations—not designed to be on call in other areas in Europe and, as the Secretary of State has mentioned, in Africa and literally to the uttermost parts of the Earth.

I will be submitting an amendment for consideration by the Senate to make it clear that collective security will remain the heart of NATO, and that this is the only mission allowable under the treaty, because it is impossible to amend the treaty without bringing it back to this Senate for amendment.

My amendment is tailored not to constrain NATO's effectiveness in the future, nor is it intended to micro-manage NATO's military planning from the Senate floor. The central portion of the amendment is taken directly from the North Atlantic Treaty itself. My amendment states that any military operation outside Article V must be based on the principle of collective defense, namely, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of a NATO member.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his agreement in allowing me to finish my remarks.