

# BUSINESS MEETING

*Wednesday, July 11, 2018*

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
WASHINGTON, DC.

1           The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 12:15 p.m., in Room S-116, the Capitol  
2 Building, Hon. Bob Corker, chairman of the committee, presiding.

3           Present: Senators Corker [presiding], Rubio, Johnson, Flake, Gardner, Isakson,  
4 Paul, Menendez, Cardin, Shaheen, Coons, Udall, Kaine, Merkley, and Booker.

## **OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BOB CORKER, U.S. SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE**

5           **THE CHAIRMAN.** I will go ahead and call the meeting to order. We have seven  
6 senators here. We need 11 to vote, so we can move through this quickly. On the  
7 agenda today is S. Res. 557, which was held over from the business meeting yesterday,  
8 and one FSO list.

9           S. Res. 557 expresses the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of  
10 NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region, and urges its member states  
11 to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance. I want to thank  
12 Senator Wicker for introducing this resolution, and Senators Cardin, Shaheen, and Tillis  
13 for cosponsoring this important measure. The NATO alliance advances our strategic

1 interests based on shared values and allows us to address common security threats,  
2 including those posed by a resurgent Russia and by terrorism.

3 My recent trip to the Nordic and Baltic regions demonstrated to me the  
4 important role this defense alliance plays in regional security and stability, especially in  
5 frontline states such as Denmark and Latvia. As we approach the NATO summit this  
6 week and the President's summit meeting in Helsinki next week, the United States must  
7 stand firmly with our NATO allies and reaffirm our commitment to the transatlantic  
8 partnership. We must be clear that the U.S. will not turn a blind eye to the Putin  
9 regime's long history of aggression, including its violation of the territorial integrity of  
10 Ukraine, its interference in elections, and its current activities in Syria.

11 In light of these challenges, a strong NATO remains essential for maintaining a  
12 rules-based international order created with U.S. leadership that has helped democracy  
13 thrive around the world and has made America a safer home for our citizens.

14 Do you have any comments, Senator Menendez?

**STATEMENT OF HON. BOB MENENDEZ,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY**

15 **SENATOR MENENDEZ.** I do, Mr. Chairman. First of all, thank you for calling  
16 this business meeting. As I stated yesterday, NATO has been critical for over 7 decades  
17 after World War II. They were there during the Cold War, and it was on September 11th  
18 that we invoked the self-defense clause on behalf of the United States for the only time

1 in NATO history. It is there with some stability in those countries, and has been, for the  
2 last 17 years, with us in Afghanistan. It creates a critical part of our national security  
3 alliance and architecture, so I believe we need the strongest support for NATO, and I  
4 strongly support your amendment.

5 On the territorial integrity of Ukraine as well as Russia's annexation of Crimea,  
6 and the human rights abuses under Russia's illegal occupation, my second degree  
7 amendment is because violence has been increasing in Eastern Ukraine. Across the  
8 region, the Kremlin is saying to me and other Department officials on what its views  
9 are. We should be increasing the sanctions on Russia that we passed last year, and I  
10 suggest the amendment and call for current sanctions to be strengthened and remain in  
11 place until the Ukrainian situation is resolved.

12 **THE CHAIRMAN.** We now have a quorum. Does anybody have any further  
13 comments?

14 [No response.]

15 **THE CHAIRMAN.** We will now move to S. Res. 557, but I would like to first call up  
16 the Manager's Amendments, which make a number of technical and grammatical edits  
17 to the preamble and resolving clause of the resolution. Then we will proceed to the  
18 Corker First Degree Amendment Number 1 and the Menendez Second Degree  
19 Amendment to it. Is there a motion to approve the two Manager's Amendments, en  
20 bloc, by voice vote?

1           **SENATOR SHAHEEN.**   So moved.

2           **SENATOR CARDIN.**    So moved.

3           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.**  Can we have a recorded vote?

4           **THE CHAIRMAN.**  The clerk will call the roll.

5           **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Risch?

6           **THE CHAIRMAN.**  Aye by proxy.

7           **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Rubio?

8           **SENATOR RUBIO.**  Aye.

9           **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Johnson?

10          **THE CHAIRMAN.**  Aye by proxy.

11          **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Flake?

12          **SENATOR FLAKE.**  Aye.

13          **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Gardner?

14          **SENATOR GARDNER.**  Aye.

15          **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Young?

16          **THE CHAIRMAN.**  Aye by proxy.

17          **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Barrasso?

18          **THE CHAIRMAN.**  Aye by proxy.

19          **THE CLERK.**    Mr. Isakson?

20          **SENATOR ISAKSON.**  Aye.

1 THE CLERK. Mr. Portman?  
2 THE CHAIRMAN. Aye by proxy.  
3 THE CLERK. Mr. Paul?  
4 SENATOR PAUL. No.  
5 THE CLERK. Mr. Menendez?  
6 SENATOR MENENDEZ. Aye.  
7 THE CLERK. Mr. Cardin?  
8 SENATOR CARDIN. Aye.  
9 THE CLERK. Mrs. Shaheen?  
10 SENATOR SHAHEEN. Aye.  
11 THE CLERK. Mr. Coons?  
12 SENATOR MENENDEZ. Aye by proxy.  
13 THE CLERK. Mr. Udall?  
14 SENATOR UDALL. Aye.  
15 THE CLERK. Mr. Murphy?  
16 SENATOR MENENDEZ. Aye by proxy.  
17 THE CLERK. Mr. Kaine?  
18 SENATOR KAINE. Aye.  
19 THE CLERK. Mr. Markey?  
20 SENATOR MENENDEZ. Aye by proxy.

1           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Merkley?

2           **SENATOR MERKLEY.**   Aye.

3           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Booker?

4           **SENATOR BOOKER.**   Aye.

5           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Chairman?

6           **THE CHAIRMAN.**   Aye, and let it be recorded Senator Cardin voted aye.

7           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Chairman, 20 ayes, 1 nay.

8           **THE CHAIRMAN.**   The ayes have it. Now we will move to the Corker First Degree  
9   Amendment Number 1. My amendment adds a clause to the resolution to reaffirm  
10   support for the territorial integrity of Ukraine while condemning the illegal invasion  
11   and attempted annexation of Crimea, which violated Russia's commitments under the  
12   Helsinki Final Act and the Budapest Memorandum. The language reflects current U.S.  
13   policy that I think is important to emphasize going into both the NATO and Helsinki  
14   summits.

15           Is there a motion to consider the Corker first degree and the Menendez second  
16   degree amendments, en bloc, by voice vote?

17           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.**   Can we have a recorded vote?

18           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Risch?

19           **THE CHAIRMAN.**   Aye by proxy.

20           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Rubio?

1           **SENATOR RUBIO.** Aye.

2           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Johnson?

3           **THE CHAIRMAN.** Aye by proxy.

4           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Flake?

5           **SENATOR FLAKE.** Aye.

6           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Gardner?

7           **SENATOR GARDNER.** Aye.

8           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Young?

9           **THE CHAIRMAN.** Aye by proxy.

10          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Barrasso?

11          **THE CHAIRMAN.** Aye by proxy.

12          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Isakson?

13          **SENATOR ISAKSON.** Aye.

14          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Portman?

15          **THE CHAIRMAN.** Aye by proxy.

16          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Paul?

17          **SENATOR PAUL.** Aye.

18          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Menendez?

19          **SENATOR MENENDEZ.** Aye.

20          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Cardin?

1           **SENATOR CARDIN.**   Aye.

2           **THE CLERK.**   Mrs. Shaheen?

3           **SENATOR SHAHEEN.**   Aye.

4           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Coons?

5           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.**   Aye by proxy.

6           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Udall?

7           **SENATOR UDALL.**   Aye.

8           **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Murphy?

9           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.**   Aye by proxy.

10          **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Kaine?

11          **SENATOR KAINE.**   Aye.

12          **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Markey?

13          **SENATOR MENENDEZ.**   Aye by proxy.

14          **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Merkley?

15          **SENATOR MERKLEY.**   Aye.

16          **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Booker?

17          **SENATOR BOOKER.**   Aye.

18          **THE CLERK.**   Mr. Chairman?

19          **THE CHAIRMAN.**   Aye. The clerk will report.

20          **THE CLERK.**   The yeas are 21, the nays are zero.



1           **THE CHAIRMAN.** The amendments carry. Are there any other amendments?

2           **SENATOR PAUL.** Yes. I do not object to the resolution before us per se.

3 Yesterday, though, we also voted to give our ironclad commitment to everyone in  
4 NATO. This resolution also says, hey, you want to join NATO, join NATO. So,  
5 basically, you are applying Article 5 protection to anyone in the world who wants to  
6 join NATO. So, I really object to the idea we would admit anyone to NATO, which has  
7 been our policy for some time.

8           Whether or not to expand NATO I think is a question that deserves to be  
9 debated. Any such debate should ask the question does NATO expansion help or hurt  
10 U.S. national security. Does adding countries such as Albania and Montenegro, U.S.  
11 security will ensnare us in possible regional disputes. Are we going to risk war with  
12 Russia by expanding NATO to include countries that are already mired in military  
13 conflict with Russia?

14           To understand what NATO expansion does to our relationship with Russia, one  
15 must at least be aware of Russia's perspective. An awareness of Russia's perspective  
16 does not mean that we countenance their point of view, but we are aware that our  
17 actions lead to reactions, that we are aware that NATO expansion is -- does not occur in  
18 a vacuum. Russia's perspective is greatly influenced by Secretary of State James Baker's  
19 promise to Gorbachev. As Germany was unified, Secretary Baker said NATO will not  
20 expand one inch eastward after Germany is unified.

1           We once had a robust and thoughtful debate in our country over diplomacy and  
2 our desire to avoid war, but lately I think both parties tend to shake their fists in the air  
3 and declare to our adversaries, take this sanction, take this expansion of NATO, take  
4 this travel restriction under the misguided notion that unilateral actions will lead to  
5 capitulation. Yet instead of capitulation, we often have seen rising tensions increase  
6 nationalism and a ratcheting up of Cold War-like fever.

7           In one case, in one respect, I think we can even argue Putin is a reaction to the  
8 NATO expansion. The nationalism of Russia is a part of the reaction to NATO's  
9 expansion. There was a time when main voices counseled against Russia's expansion.  
10 Perhaps the most famous diplomat over the last century, George Kennan, wrote in 1998,  
11 and when Yeltsin was still in power and we were not so worried about a nationalistic  
12 U.S., we thought we were going to have elections coming in our direction. Russia was  
13 heading in our direction.

14           He wrote in '98 before the rise of Putin, before the rise of Russian nationalism,  
15 before the Russian aggression, he said, "Expanding NATO would be a fateful error" that  
16 would "inflame the nationalist, anti-Western, and militaristic tendencies in Russian  
17 opinion," and "restore the atmosphere of the Cold War to East-West relations." Kennan  
18 went on to say, "I think" NATO expansion "is the beginning of a new cold war. I think  
19 the Russians will gradually react quite adversely." And he was saying all of this before  
20 the Russians began acting adversely and will affect their policies.

1 I think it is a tragic mistake. We have signed up to protect a whole series of  
2 countries even though we have not-- the resources were not intentioned to in any  
3 serious way. Charles Kupchan at Georgetown writes similarly. He says, "NATO has  
4 ignored its vociferous objections and expanded eastward in successive waves since the  
5 1990s, bringing the world's most formidable military alliance up to Russia's borders.  
6 The Kremlin may well have returned to its bullying ways whether or not NATO's  
7 frontier moved Russia's way. But Moscow perceives a threat from NATO's advance and  
8 resents its effort to peel away Russia's traditional sphere of influence." Kupchan goes  
9 on to say, "Limiting NATO's reach is about not just exercising strategic prudence  
10 toward Russia, but also maintaining the integrity of the alliance's solemn commitment  
11 to collective defense."

12 We have a commitment. We have an Article 5 commitment. Do we dilute that by  
13 adding everybody in the world to NATO so close to Russia that we have no intention of  
14 actually going to war with them? Kupchan goes on to say "NATO should not be in the  
15 business of extending territorial guarantees to countries that are deep into Russia's  
16 periphery and therefore very difficult to defend."

17 In an open letter opposing NATO expansion, former Secretary of the Navy, Paul  
18 Nitze, former ambassador to the USSR, Jack Matlock, and many others wrote that  
19 "NATO expansion risks exacerbating instability, causing Russia to believe the U.S. and  
20 West are attempting to isolate, encircle, and subordinate them. It is very imposing."

1 MIT says, "Once committed to defend allies everywhere, a state becomes obsessed  
2 with its political and military prestige, and vulnerable to the claim that small wars  
3 must be fought in the hope of deterring large ones. This is especially true when the  
4 actual strategic value of these allies is modest."

5 Pat Buchanan puts it succinctly. "The Senate is handing out permanent security  
6 guarantees to Eastern Europe, where no president has ever seen a vital interest and no  
7 U.S. army -- I mean, not even General Eisenhower's -- ever fought before." In fact,  
8 Eisenhower himself warned of becoming entangled in European affairs. As he assumed  
9 command of the NATO force in Europe in 1951, Eisenhower uttered the prophetic  
10 words of caution: "If in 10 years all American troops stationed in Europe for national  
11 defense purposes have not been returned to the U.S., this whole project will have  
12 failed."

13 Retired Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis also warns of extending NATO to  
14 former parts of the Soviet Union. He says, "Extending NATO membership to Georgia,  
15 or Ukraine as others advocate, in no way strengthens U.S. security, but rather  
16 unequivocally increases America's strategic risk." Davis' point is worth reiterating.  
17 Expanding NATO to Russia's border does not make us more secure. Indeed, pushing  
18 NATO to Russia's border makes Russia more likely. Davis concludes: "Washington  
19 should seek to maintain a world-class deterrent while ensuring U.S. participation in  
20 alliances serve American interests—not place those interests at higher risk."

1           **THE CHAIRMAN.** How many more pages do you have?

2           **SENATOR PAUL.** One and a half more, and my statement is not too much to ask  
3 for a debate over expanding NATO. My amendment today simply strikes the  
4 resolution's open-ended invitation to NATO expansion. Those who lament a new Cold  
5 War with Russia should think twice before expanding NATO to Russia's borders as  
6 they have existed for 70 years. Instead of endlessly meddling here, we should look for  
7 ways to engage -- rather than engage in conflict.

8           As we look at the open-door policy which have brought countries in, such as  
9 Montenegro whose military is smaller than the Washington, D.C. police force, I cannot  
10 help but think of the spark which started the slaughter of World War I where Russia  
11 confronted Austria and Hungary over Serbia. With this historical context in mind is  
12 why I offer my amendments to this legislation. I would be willing to consider one vote  
13 on both of my amendments together. The first strikes paragraph 5 from the resolving  
14 clause. This clause encourages all NATO member-states to clearly commit to further  
15 enlarging the alliance, including extending invitations to any aspirant country which  
16 has met the condition required to join NATO.

17           The second strikes the 11th whereas clause from the preamble which states  
18 "NATO's enlargement has delivered advanced security and stability to all NATO  
19 member-states, including Montenegro. The newest NATO member has demonstrated  
20 the importance of NATO's open-door policy for all aspiring countries." Luxembourg

1 and Montenegro have less than 2,000 active military personnel; Latvia and Estonia --  
2 Slovenia and Estonia less than 10,000. It can be fairly argued these countries cannot  
3 even defend themselves, let alone contribute to the defense of the United States in a  
4 meaningful way. Instead, they present trip wires for the United States to come to their  
5 aid.

6 So, I ask for consideration of the amendments together, and basically what I'm  
7 asking for is that we not have an open-ended invitation to join NATO. That is also  
8 backed up by what every one of you say in view of how you voted on yesterday an  
9 ironclad result to defend everybody in Article 5 in defense of NATO while also offering  
10 admission to everyone that basically would address this.

11 **THE CHAIRMAN.** Thank you, and thank you for letting us consider these en bloc.  
12 Our intention for the resolution is to support -- four of us were in Finland last week,  
13 and while they do not aspire currently to be a part of NATO, at some point they might.  
14 And, in fact, that could balance something that actually increases -- I think we ought to  
15 help these countries meet the requirements. Fighting for having democracies in all of  
16 those countries, all of those things do benefit the security of U.S. citizens.

17 I oppose both of these amendments. I appreciate the senator bringing them  
18 forth, and I would ask for a vote. I will say this resolution also states that we have  
19 security, and also we encourage them to seek ascension when they are qualified. And  
20 all of us who would entertain a vote when a new country is aspiring to be a part of

1 NATO, we have the right to vote against that should that occur. I think the  
2 amendments actually send a negative signal to our NATO allies, and I oppose them.

3 **SENATOR MENENDEZ.** Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I deeply oppose the  
4 amendments. We are not inviting anyone to enter NATO. We are inviting those we  
5 think can meet the standards of what it is to participate in NATO who will have to  
6 perform. And in terms of what is expected of NATO membership in contributing to our  
7 collective security, I say this is not about antagonizing Russia. They took over Crimea  
8 and continue to invade illegally a sovereign country on the issue of Ukraine, and  
9 violated the international order and continue to destabilize the country and others.

10 And lastly, on the -- on this question, this was a goal set by NATO collectively for  
11 2024, so when anyone suggests NATO countries are in arrears, they are not arrears.  
12 They are working towards that 2 percent commitment, which is supposed to take place  
13 by 2024. In fact, eight countries will, in fact, have their 2 percent this year, 7 years early.  
14 So, for all those reasons, I oppose the amendments.

15 **SENATOR PAUL.** One brief response. The Section 5, in fact, does say that it  
16 encourages all NATO member-states to clearly commit to further enlargement of the  
17 alliance, including extending invitations to any aspirant country which has met the  
18 conditions to join NATO. So, really you do dilute what you have. If you have 29  
19 countries or 58 countries, now you have a collective response to defend 59 countries, so

1 I think you are giving an open-ended welcoming sign -- blinking welcoming sign to  
2 come to NATO.

3 You also said yesterday for an ironclad commitment. All I would ask is that you  
4 prepare your constituents, your sons and daughters, to go to war for any of these 29  
5 countries that you have now, plus any others that may aspire to join NATO.

6 **THE CHAIRMAN.** Is a voice vote acceptable?

7 **SENATOR PAUL.** I would rather do it by a roll call.

8 **THE CHAIRMAN.** The vote will be on the two Paul amendments en bloc. The  
9 clerk will call the roll.

10 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Risch?

11 **THE CHAIRMAN.** No by proxy.

12 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Rubio?

13 **SENATOR RUBIO.** No.

14 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Johnson?

15 **SENATOR JOHNSON.** No.

16 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Flake?

17 **SENATOR FLAKE.** No.

18 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Gardner?

19 **SENATOR GARDNER.** No.

20 **THE CLERK.** Mr. Young?



1 THE CHAIRMAN. No by proxy.

2 THE CLERK. Mr. Barrasso?

3 THE CHAIRMAN. No by proxy.

4 THE CLERK. Mr. Isakson?

5 SENATOR ISAKSON. No.

6 THE CLERK. Mr. Portman?

7 THE CHAIRMAN. No by proxy.

8 THE CLERK. Mr. Paul?

9 SENATOR PAUL. Yes.

10 THE CLERK. Mr. Menendez?

11 SENATOR MENENDEZ. No.

12 THE CLERK. Mr. Cardin?

13 SENATOR CARDIN. No.

14 THE CLERK. Mrs. Shaheen?

15 SENATOR SHAHEEN. No.

16 THE CLERK. Mr. Coons?

17 SENATOR COONS. No.

18 THE CLERK. Mr. Udall?

19 SENATOR UDALL. No.

20 THE CLERK. Mr. Murphy?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Business Meeting

*July 11, 2018*

1           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.** No by proxy.

2           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Kaine?

3           **SENATOR Kaine.** No.

4           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Markey?

5           **SENATOR MENENDEZ.** No by proxy.

6           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Merkley?

7           **SENATOR MERKLEY.** No.

8           **THE CLERK.** Mr. Booker?

9           **SENATOR BOOKER.** No.

10          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Chairman?

11          **THE CHAIRMAN.** No. The clerk will report.

12          **THE CLERK.** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 1, the nays are 20.

13          **SENATOR PAUL.** Mr. Chairman, I intend to file additional views.

14          **THE CHAIRMAN.** Without objection.

15          [The prepared statement of Senator Paul follows:]

ADDITIONAL VIEWS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RAND PAUL

Whether or not to expand NATO is a question that deserves to be debated. Any such debate should ask the question: Does NATO expansion help or hurt US national security?

Does adding countries such as Albania and Montenegro add to US security or simply ensnare us in possible regional disputes?

Are we willing to risk war with Russia by expanding NATO to include countries that already are mired in military conflict with Russia?

To understand what NATO expansion does to our relations with Russia, one must at least be aware of Russia's perspective. An awareness of Russia's perspective does not mean that we countenance their point of view but that we are aware that our actions lead to reactions, that we are aware that NATO expansion does not occur in a vacuum.

Russia's perspective is greatly influenced by Sec of State James Baker's promise to Gorbachev as Germany reunified in that "NATO will not expand "not one inch eastward"

We once had robust and thoughtful debate in our country over diplomacy and our desire to avoid war. Of late, both parties tend to shake their fists in the air and declare to our adversaries: "Take this sanction. Take this expansion of NATO. Take this travel restriction," under the misguided notion that our unilateral actions will lead to capitulation.

And yet, instead of capitulation, we've often seen rising tensions, increased nationalism, and a ratcheting up a Cold War-like fever.

There was a time when many voices cautioned against reckless NATO expansion.

Perhaps the most famous diplomat of the last century George Kennan, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to Yugoslavia wrote:

*Expanding NATO would be a "fateful error" that would "inflare the nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion" and "restore the atmosphere of the cold war to East-West relations.*

Kennan went on to say:

*I think [NATO expansion] is the beginning of a new cold war.*

*I think the Russians will gradually react quite adversely and it will affect their policies. I think it is a tragic mistake ... We have signed up to protect a whole series of countries, even though we have neither the resources nor the intention to do so in any serious way.*

Charles Kupchan, professor at Georgetown similarly writes:

*NATO has ignored Russia's vociferous objections and expanded eastward in successive waves since the 1990s, bringing the world's most formidable military alliance up to Russia's borders. The Kremlin may well have returned to its bullying ways whether or not NATO's frontier moved Russia's way. But Moscow perceives a threat from NATO's advance and resents its effort to peel away Russia's traditional sphere of influence, helping fuel the confrontational turn in the Kremlin's foreign policy and renewed rivalry with the West.*

Kupchan goes on to say:

*Limiting NATO's reach is about not just exercising strategic prudence toward Russia but also maintaining the integrity of the alliance's solemn commitment to collective defense. NATO should not be in the business of extending territorial guarantees to countries that are deep into Russia's periphery and therefore very difficult to defend.*

In an open letter opposing NATO expansion in Eastern Europe, former Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze, former Ambassador to USSR Jack Matlock, and others wrote that NATO expansion risked exacerbating instability and cause Russia to believe that:

*the United States and the West are attempting to isolate, encircle, and subordinate them.*

Barry Posen from MIT agrees. He explains:

*Once committed to defend allies everywhere, a state becomes obsessed with its political and military prestige, and vulnerable to the claim that "small" wars must be fought in the hope of deterring large ones. This is especially true when the actual strategic value of these allies is modest.*

Pat Buchanan puts it succinctly:

*The Senate is ... handing out permanent security guarantees to Eastern Europe, where no president has ever seen a vital interest and no US Army -- not even Gen. Eisenhower's -- ever fought before*

In fact, Eisenhower, himself, warned of becoming entangled in European affairs. As he assumed command of NATO forces in Europe in 1951, General of the Armies Dwight D. Eisenhower uttered prophetic words of caution: "If in 10 years, all American troops stationed in Europe for national defense purposes

have not been returned to the United States, then this whole project will have failed."

Retired Lt. Colonel Daniel Davis warns of extending NATO to former parts of the Soviet Union:

*Extending NATO membership to Georgia-or Ukraine, as others advocate-in no way strengthens U.S. security, but rather unequivocally increases America's strategic risk.*

Davis' point here is worth reiterating:

Expanding NATO to Russia's border does not make the US more secure. Indeed, pushing NATO to Russia's border makes war with Russia more likely.

Davis concludes:

*Washington should seek to maintain a world-class deterrent while ensuring U.S. participation in alliances serve American interests -- not place those interests at higher risk.*

My amendments today simply strike the resolutions open ended invitation to NATO expansion.

Those who lament a renewed cold war with Russia should think twice before advocating to expand NATO to Russia's border.

Saner minds prevailed for 70 years of Cold War to avoid conflict with Russia. Instead of endlessly rattling sabers, the Senate should be looking for ways to seek engagement rather than conflict.

Thomas Jefferson was one of those saner voices. Jefferson wrote:

*I am for free commerce with all nations ... I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe, entering that field of slaughter to preserve their balance ...*

It is important NOT to forget that Europe has twice in the past 100 years turned into a field of slaughter as Europe has fought to preserve "balance".

George Washington and really all of our founding fathers warned that "entangling alliances" would ensnare America in the wars of Europe.

As I look at the "open door" NATO policy which has brought in countries such as Montenegro, whose military is smaller than the Washington DC Police force, I can't help but think of the spark which started the slaughter of WWI when Russia confronted Austro-Hungary over Serbia.

With this historical context in mind, this is why I offer my two amendments to this legislation.

The first: strikes paragraph 5 from the resolving clause. This clause "encourages all NATO member states to clearly commit to further enlargement of the alliance, including extending invitations to any aspirant country which has met the conditions required to join NATO".

The second strikes the 11th "whereas clause" from the preamble, which states "NATO's enlargement has delivered enhanced security and stability to all NATO member states, including Montenegro (the newest NATO member), and has demonstrated the importance of NATO's Open Door Policy for all aspiring countries and for invitations to join NATO to be issued as soon as an aspirant country has met the conditions for membership."

Luxembourg and Montenegro have less than two thousand active military personnel. Latvia, Estonia, Slovenia and Albania have less than ten thousand.

It can be fairly argued that these countries cannot even defend themselves, let alone contribute to the defense of the United States in a meaningful way. Instead, they present tripwires where the United States will be forced to come to their aid under Article 5.

1           **THE CHAIRMAN.** All right. The question is on the motion to approve S. 557, as  
2 amended.

3           All those in favor, say aye.

4           [A chorus of ayes.]

1 THE CHAIRMAN. Opposed?

2 SENATOR PAUL. No.

3 THE CHAIRMAN. With that, the ayes have it. The resolution is agreed to.

4 The final vote is to consider the FSO list on the agenda.

5 All in favor of approving the FSO list, please signify by saying aye.

6 [A chorus of ayes.]

7 THE CHAIRMAN. Opposed?

8 [No response.]

9 THE CHAIRMAN. With that, the ayes have it, and the FSO list is agreed to.

10 SENATOR COONS. I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as being present on  
11 the votes.

12 THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

13 I ask unanimous consent that staff be allowed to make technical and conforming  
14 changes.

15 Without objection, so ordered.

16 And without objection, the committee will stand adjourned.

**[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]**