

**OPENING STATEMENT**  
**SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR**  
**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
**HEARING ON THE WASHINGTON TREATY**  
**April 8, 2003**

We are pleased today to welcome Marc Grossman, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, William Kristol, Editor of *The Weekly Standard*, and General Wesley Clark, former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, to the Committee.

Today the Committee is holding its fourth hearing on NATO enlargement. We have undertaken this review of NATO in preparation for floor action in May on the Protocols of Accession to the Washington Treaty for Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania. I am hopeful that the Senate will pass the Protocols of Accession for all seven candidates prior to President Bush's scheduled trip to Europe late this Spring.

Even as the Committee works to fulfill this legislative duty, our review of NATO has an additional purpose. With U.S. forces heavily engaged in Iraq, this Committee and the Senate must consider what role NATO can and should play in the global war on terrorism. NATO has to decide if it wants to participate in the security challenge of our time. It has to decide whether it wants to be relevant in addressing the major threat to the safety and economic well-being of the citizens of its component countries. If we do not prevent major terrorist attacks involving weapons of mass destruction, the Alliance will have failed in the most fundamental sense of defending our nations and our way of life.

This reality demands that as we expand NATO, we also retool it, so that it can be a mechanism of burden sharing and mutual security in the war on terrorism. America is at war, and we feel more vulnerable than at any time since the end of the Cold War and perhaps since World War II. We need allies to confront this threat effectively, and those alliances cannot be circumscribed by geographic boundaries.

Many observers will point to the split over Iraq as a sign that NATO is failing or irrelevant. I disagree. But as we attempt to mend the Alliance's political divisions over Iraq, we must go one step further and ask if NATO had been united on Iraq, could it have provided an effective command structure for the military operation that is underway now? And would allies beyond those currently engaged in Iraq, have been willing and able to field forces that would have been significant to the outcome of the war? In other words, achieving political unity within the alliance, while important to international opinion, does not guarantee that NATO will be meaningful as a fighting alliance in the war on terror.

For more than 50 years, NATO was uniquely able to forge consensus among the allies, maintain political will, gather resources, and coordinate action to defend Europe from military attack. The Alliance stated its desire to remain relevant at the Prague summit last November,

when NATO heads-of-state approved the NATO Response Force and the Prague Capabilities Commitment as part of the continuing Alliance effort to improve capabilities for waging modern warfare. The Alliance also declared that it would tackle the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

In our previous Committee hearings on NATO, we have heard encouraging testimony that our allies are taking promised steps to strengthen their capabilities in such areas as heavy airlift and sealift and precision-guided munitions. We also have heard that the seven candidates for membership are developing niche military capabilities that will be useful in meeting NATO's new military demands. But much work is left to be done to transform NATO into a bulwark against terrorism. An early test will be NATO's contribution to peacekeeping and humanitarian duties in the aftermath of combat in Iraq. A strong commitment by NATO nations to this role would be an important step in healing the Alliance divisions and reaffirming its relevance for the long run.

While the immediate aim of these hearings has been to debate whether the seven candidate countries have met NATO membership standards, I would observe that the dominant concern of the Committee in the hearings has been NATO's relevance and cohesion. This focus would seem to indicate confidence among Committee members that the aspirant nations are ready for membership. I anticipate an overwhelming vote in favor of NATO enlargement. The affirming message of the first round of enlargement led to improved capabilities and strengthened transatlantic ties. I am hopeful that this second round will do the same.

We look forward to hearing the insights of our distinguished witnesses as we discuss this timely issue.

###