

**COMMISSION ON
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

234 FORD HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515

(202) 225-1901

EMAIL ADDRESS: CSCE@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV

INTERNET WEB SITE: [HTTP://WWW.HOUSE.GOV/CSCE/](http://www.house.gov/csce/)

Report on Human Rights and the Process of NATO Enlargement



**Prepared by the Staff of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe**

June 1997

Central Europe



The Baltic States



82244 (RXX) 12-6-94

PREFACE

The Commission held a series of three public hearings on “Human Rights and the Process of NATO Enlargement” in anticipation of the summit of Heads of State and Governments of Member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to be held in Madrid, Spain, on July 8 and 9, 1997. The hearings focused on implementation of commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act and other documents of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) by those signatory countries invited to present testimony. The hearings were held under the Commission’s statutory mandate, contained in Public Law 94-304, “to monitor the acts of signatories which reflect compliance with or violation of the articles of the Final Act...with particular regard to provisions relating to Cooperation in Humanitarian Fields.” The Commission also took into account numerous references to human rights and OSCE commitments contained in NATO documents and U.S. law concerning enlargement of the Alliance.

The hearings provided a unique opportunity for prospective candidates for NATO membership to make statements on recent developments in their respective states, including their respect for OSCE norms and principles. Invitations were extended to ten OSCE states which have expressed a strong interest in NATO membership: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. An official representative from each of the countries testified and responded to questions from Commissioners. A complete transcript of each of these hearings is included in this report. In addition, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia requested the inclusion of a statement on that country’s interest in joining NATO, which has been included.

The Commission convened these hearings with the aim of providing timely information to the American people, the Congress, the Executive Branch, and the international community on developments in the countries under review, with particular emphasis on human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The emergence of new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and the demise of the Warsaw Pact created a security vacuum in the territory between the current eastern frontier of NATO and the Russian border. The first attempt to address the new security realities in the region occurred at the end of 1991 with the establishment of NATO's North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) as a forum for the evolution of a new relationship based on constructive dialogue and cooperation. In early 1994, the Partnership for Peace (PfP) was launched with the aim of providing a practical program to transform the relationship between NATO and states participating in PfP, moving beyond dialogue and cooperation to forge a genuine security partnership. (All 27 states of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) are OSCE participating States.) Simultaneously, NATO began to consider the possibility of enlarging the Alliance. The result was the 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement which addressed practical steps and requirements candidates for membership would have to satisfy. In December 1996, NATO foreign ministers called for a NATO summit at which one or more countries that wanted to join NATO would be invited to begin accession negotiations.

The U.S. Congress was instrumental in stimulating the debate through several legislative initiatives. The NATO Participation Act of 1994 (PL 103-447) provided a reasonable framework for addressing concerns about NATO enlargement, consistent with U.S. interests in ensuring stability in Europe. The law lists a variety of criteria, such as respect for democratic principles and human rights enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, against which to evaluate the suitability of prospective candidates for NATO membership. The Act stipulates that participants in the PfP should be invited to become full NATO members if they... "remain committed to protecting the rights of all their citizens...." Under section 203, a program of assistance was established to provide designated emerging democracies with the tools necessary to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership.

The NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (PL 104-208) included an unqualified statement that the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights are integral aspects of genuine security. The law also makes clear that the human rights records of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe interested in joining NATO should be evaluated in light of the obligations and commitments of these countries under the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act.

A brief implementation review, prepared by Commission staff, focusing on continued human rights concerns in each of these countries, as well as an overall assessment of their compliance with OSCE commitments, is included in this report. Necessarily, this implementation review focuses on compliance problems and does not attempt to present a full picture detailing the successes of each of these countries, or placing these events in their full context. This approach is taken because compliance obligations are absolute, not contextual or comparative, and compliance problems and their evaluation are the purpose of this review. Of the countries which participated in this series of hearings, most were viewed as having made significant progress in their compliance with their OSCE obligations. While it is understood that each country will negotiate accession separately and will be considered for membership on a case-by-case basis, support for an expanded NATO does not negate the fact that each of the countries considered for the expansion has residual problems with its transition to democracy. Commission staff will continue to monitor progress in addressing the concerns raised during the course of these hearings as each of the countries considered pursues full NATO membership.

The Commission made repeated requests for an administration witness to present testimony on U.S. policy on the process of NATO enlargement. The lack of a timely response to these requests,

together with the narrow time frame before the Madrid summit, forced the Commission to proceed without the benefit of hearing directly from the administration on this important foreign policy matter. Written materials provided by the administration are included in this report.

A final section devoted to NATO policy includes the 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement, among other key Alliance documents.

Respect for basic human rights plays a fundamental role in advancing genuine security and stability and, as such, must be an integral aspect of the expansion process. The human rights record of prospective candidates for NATO membership deserves close scrutiny. None of the countries seeking NATO membership, including those considered to be leading contenders, is without problems. Further progress is expected in these and other OSCE states with the aim of advancing genuine peace and security in Europe through respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Conclusions

The Commission staff finds that most of the countries which participated in these hearings were in substantial compliance with international standards relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, as reflected in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovenia are in substantial compliance, while Slovakia and Macedonia are not.

In the lead up to the Madrid summit, it is critically important that the NATO Member States construct—and prepare for agreement at the summit—a clear process for accession to NATO by prospective countries. Emerging democracies not receiving negotiation invitations from the Madrid summit must be assured that there is a transparent, fair, and objective process for them to follow leading to accession talks as soon as they meet the criteria for membership, such as those set forth in the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996.

OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The North Atlantic Treaty of April 1949, also known as the Washington Treaty, brought into being an alliance of independent countries with a common interest in maintaining peace and defending their freedom through political solidarity and adequate military defense to deter and, if necessary, repel all possible forms of aggression against them. At the heart of the Treaty is Article V which notes that “an armed attack against one or more [allies] shall be considered an attack against them all.” The original NATO countries were the United States, Canada, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway, and Portugal. In 1952, Greece and Turkey acceded to the Treaty. The Federal Republic of Germany joined the Alliance in 1955 and, in 1982, Spain became a member.

The process of internal and external adaptation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was initiated by the 16 leaders of the Alliance at their summit meeting in Brussels in January 1994. The goal of adaptation is to enhance stability in Central and Eastern Europe following the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Further impetus was given to the process when the NATO leaders, in December 1994, decided to undertake a study of the issues of enlargement. The NATO Enlargement Study issued in September 1995 contains general criteria, including democratic structures, a free market economy, a respect for human rights, etc. The study does not name prospective members. New members must accept a full range of responsibilities, such as building a military able to contribute to collective defense.

In general, allied states support enlargement but wish to expand NATO without antagonizing or isolating Russia. The allies wish to assure that enlargement will not dilute the political like-mindedness or military effectiveness of the Alliance. Some allies express a reluctance to assume costs for expansion of the Alliance.

THE CONGRESS

Congressional supporters of enlargement believe that some Central and East European countries have made substantial progress towards democracy, and that NATO membership would consolidate that progress and fill the security vacuum between Western Europe and Russia. Opponents contend that NATO’s future is not clear, that admitting new states could weaken the alliance’s core mission of collective defense, and that expansion could fuel nationalistic tendencies and instability in Russia.

Congress has played an active and generally supportive role in the debate over enlargement of the Alliance. On June 4, 1996, identical bills (H.R. 3564 and S. 1830) calling for NATO enlargement were introduced in the House and Senate. The bills stated that the United States has important security interests in Central and Eastern Europe that could be served by enlargement; named Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary as the most qualified early candidates for NATO membership; authorized greater defense assistance to these three countries, and prospectively to other states in the region; endorsed Partnership for Peace as a successful program; named other Central and East European countries as having made important progress towards eventual qualification for membership; and called for a cooperative relationship with Russia. The legislation did not include a date by which enlargement should occur. In July 1996, the Administration dropped its opposition to H.R. 3564. The Senate bill added Slovenia as a country having made significant steps towards qualifying for NATO membership. Other

countries mentioned as deserving support as they pursue membership were Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine.

On September 30, 1996, the President signed into law the Omnibus Appropriations bill (P.L. 104-208); which contains the compromise version of H.R. 3564 and S. 1830.

The FY1997 Defense Authorization Act contained an amendment, offered by former Senator Sam Nunn and others, requiring a study of the financial costs and strategic implications of enlargement by the Administration. The study was issued on February 26, 1997.

RELATED LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN 105TH CONGRESS

H.Con.Res. 10 (Solomon) A concurrent resolution recommending the integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

S.Con.Res. 5 (Roth): A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the extension of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 to certain democracies of Central and Eastern Europe is essential to the consolidation of enduring peace and stability in Europe.

H.Con.Res. 53 (Solomon) A concurrent resolution encouraging and expediting the integration of Romania at the earliest stage into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

H.R.1431 (Gilman) A bill to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes.

S.Con.Res. 29 (Gorton) A concurrent resolution recommending the integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

THE ADMINISTRATION

The Clinton administration proposed expansion of the Alliance at the December 1994 NATO summit. Administration officials believe a range of U.S. interests could be protected by expansion, including the strengthening of nations that share the U.S. belief in democracy; the development of free-market economies open to U.S. investment and trade; the securing of allies willing to share in cooperative efforts on a range of global issues, and preservation of a Europe free of the domination of any one power.

The Administration has opposed setting explicit criteria for new members. Determining which countries may enter the Alliance is solely in the hands of current members; establishing such criteria, it is argued, would provide candidate states with standards on which they might campaign for membership, and the allies wish to avoid such a process. Nonetheless, very general guidelines have been mentioned by the President. He has said that “countries with repressive political systems, countries with designs on their neighbors, countries with militaries unchecked by civilian control or with closed economic systems need not apply.”

Administration officials oppose either a timetable for expansion or naming most likely candidates. Privately, they acknowledge that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are the likely first candidates for membership; and some include Slovenia on the list. On October 22, 1996, President Clinton called for the admittance to NATO of new members by 1999. It was the first time that the Administration set a deadline for enlargement. The President promised that the alliance's mutual security guarantee would apply to new members.

PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

The Administration's Partnership for Peace (PfP) program was adopted at the January 10-11, 1994, NATO summit. PfP provides a framework for NATO's evaluation of states considered to be candidates for alliance membership. PfP is intended to assist a state to establish civilian control over its military, develop "transparent" defense budgets that outline military capabilities to its public and to its neighbors, learn new military doctrine, and work with NATO states to develop specific capabilities, such as peacekeeping. Since 1994, many PfP states have held joint training exercises with NATO states. Each of the current 27 PfP countries is also a member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). (See list of PfP countries on page 221.)

COSTS

An April 1995 RAND study estimated that NATO expansion to include the Visegrad states [Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia] would require \$10-50 billion over ten years, or as much as \$100 billion or more should more vigorous measures be necessary to develop a strong defense posture. In March 1996, the Congressional Budget Office issued a report assessing costs of enlargement under five possible options. Costs at the low end would be \$60.6 billion, with the U.S. share being \$4.8 billion, and at the high end \$125 billion, with the U.S. share being \$18.9 billion.

The Administration's February 1997 Report to Congress estimated that the cost of admitting four (unnamed) members would be \$27-35 billion between 1997-2009. The emphasis for prospective new members would be on enhancing "interoperability" (such as developing air defense and command-and-control compatible with those of current NATO members, and training on the alliance's operational concepts), modernizing and downsizing their militaries, and upgrading facilities such as airfields and roads for receiving reinforcements from current member states. Over 12 years, the estimated annual costs to the United States would be \$150-200 million; \$800-1000 million to new member states; and \$600-800 million to the other current members.

NATO-RUSSIA CHARTER

Discussion of NATO expansion has caused a strong negative response from Moscow. On October 25, 1996, the Duma passed a resolution opposing enlargement by a vote of 307-0. Russian officials often contend that the "Two plus Four Treaty" of 1991 that united Germany prohibits the expansion of NATO beyond their border on the east. The Treaty does not in fact contain such language, nor imply such an agreement. In March 1996, Russian Foreign Minister Primakov offered this "compromise": the Alliance might expand, he said, if neither nuclear nor conventional forces of current members, nor NATO HQ were stationed on new members' soil. NATO Secretary General Solana quickly rejected the "Primakov compromise" as an infringement of the sovereignty of candidate states.

On September 6, 1996, former Secretary Christopher endorsed a French plan for negotiating a "charter" between NATO and Russia. The charter was to establish institutional means for consultation

with Russia over European security issues, but would give Russia a “voice, not a veto” in NATO councils.

At the U.S.–Russia summit of March 1997, Russia dropped a demand that a charter be a legally binding document; instead, any such document will be a “political” document. U.S. officials opposed a legally binding document because it would have given Moscow leverage to demand consultation on issues that NATO members might wish to decide among themselves. In addition, some Administration officials may have preferred to avoid Senate scrutiny of such a document in the process of treaty approval. The U.S.-Russia joint statement agreed at the Helsinki summit stated that “the NATO-Russia relationship would include consultation and, to the maximum extent possible where appropriate, joint decision-making and action on security issues of common concern.”

A “Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation” was signed by all current NATO members in Paris on May 27, 1997. The Act defines the goals and mechanism of consultation, cooperation, joint decision-making and any joint action that will constitute the core of the mutual relations between NATO and Russia.

UKRAINE

Discussions between the Alliance and Ukraine produced the “Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Ukraine” which was initialled on May 29, 1997, and is expected to be signed at the July NATO summit in Madrid. The Charter provides the framework for further consultation and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine, carrying the partnership forward to a qualitatively new level.

THE MADRID SUMMIT

The Final Communique, of the December 10, 1996, NATO Ministerial recommended that Heads of Government of NATO states invite “one or more” candidate states to the July 8-9, 1997, NATO summit in Madrid to discuss the beginning of accession negotiations. It also noted NATO has “no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members....” A key factor in the length of the negotiations with prospective new members could be the readiness of current member states’ parliaments and populations to accept the inherent strategic responsibilities of admitting new members. Administration officials state that there is an “emerging consensus” among current NATO members on prospective candidates, but concede that not every current member is fully ready to move forward to enlargement. The Administration wishes to admit new members by the 50th anniversary of NATO’s founding on April 4, 1999.

MECHANICS OF ENLARGEMENT

Intensive accession negotiations between the Alliance and those countries named in Madrid will be undertaken. The result will be an amendment to the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty containing the names of proposed new member states agreed to on the basis of consensus in Brussels. The parliaments in each of the NATO capitals will then be called upon to ratify the amendment. In the United States, the Senate would be asked to give its advice and consent. During consideration of the original 1949 Treaty, the President made a commitment to the Senate that the admission of new members to the Alliance would be subject to a two-thirds vote. The document taken up by the Senate could be a single paper with the name(s) of proposed new members or individual papers with names for each country proposed for membership. When the Senate took up the candidacy of Greece and Turkey in the early 1950’s, a single paper with both names was considered.

STANDARDS

NATO ENLARGEMENT: THE OSCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMPONENT

The following references on human rights and OSCE commitments are taken from NATO documents and U.S. law relating to NATO enlargement:

The North Atlantic Treaty of 1949:

“They [NATO Members] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, **founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law...**”

Partnership for Peace Framework Document of 1994:

“...**Protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights, and safeguarding of freedom, justice, and peace through democracy are shared values fundamental to the Partnership...**They reaffirm their commitment to fulfill in good faith the obligations of the **Charter of the United Nations** and the principles of the **Universal Declaration on Human Rights...**They also reaffirm their commitment to the **Helsinki Final Act** and all subsequent CSCE documents...”

NATO Study on Enlargement of 1995:

“*Prospective members will have to have demonstrated a commitment to and respect for OSCE norms and principles...*”

NATO Participation Act of 1994 (PL 103-447):

Participants in the Partnership for Peace should be invited to become full NATO members if they...**remain committed to protecting the rights of all their citizens...**”

Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY'96 (PL 104-107):

To be eligible to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994, “each country must have made significant progress toward establishing...**adherence to the rule of law and to the values, principles, and political commitments set forth in the Helsinki Final Act** and other declarations by the members of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe...”

NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (PL 104-208):

“**Protection and promotion of human rights is an integral aspect of genuine security, and in evaluating requests for membership in NATO, the human rights records of the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should be evaluated according to their commitments to fulfill in good faith the human rights obligations of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act.**”

Excerpt from the
1990 OSCE CHARTER OF PARIS FOR A NEW EUROPE

HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY AND RULE OF LAW

We undertake to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations. In this endeavour, we will abide by the following:

Human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and are guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government. Respect for them is an essential safeguard against an over-mighty State. Their observance and full exercise are the foundation of freedom, justice and peace.

Democratic government is based on the will of the people, expressed regularly through free and fair elections. Democracy has as its foundation respect for the human person and the rule of law. Democracy is the best safeguard of freedom of expression, tolerance of all groups of society, and equality of opportunity for each person.

Democracy, with its representative and pluralist character, entails accountability to the electorate, the obligation of public authorities to comply with the law and justice administered impartially. No one will be above the law.

We affirm that, without discrimination,

every individual has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief,

freedom of expression,

freedom of association and peaceful assembly,

freedom of movement;

no one will be:

subject to arbitrary arrest or detention,

subject to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;

everyone also has the right:

to know and act upon his rights,

to participate in free and fair elections,

to fair and public trial if charged with an offence,

to own property alone or in association and to exercise individual enterprise,

to enjoy his economic, social and cultural rights.

We affirm that the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of national minorities will be protected and that persons belonging to national minorities have the right freely to express, preserve and develop that identity without any discrimination and in full equality before the law.

We will ensure that everyone will enjoy recourse to effective remedies, national or international, against any violation of his rights.

Full respect for these precepts is the bedrock on which we will seek to construct the new Europe.

Our States will cooperate and support each other with the aim of making democratic gains irreversible.

Excerpt from the
1995 STUDY ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

A. WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED POLITICALLY OF NEW MEMBERS

Commitments entered into by new member states should be the same as for present Allies, including acceptance of the principles, policies and procedures already adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that new members join. Willingness and ability to meet such commitments, not only on paper but in practice, would be a critical factor in any decision to invite a country to join.

Bearing in mind that there is no fixed or rigid list of criteria for inviting new members to join the Alliance, possible new member states will, nevertheless, be expected to:

- Conform to basic principles embodied in the Washington Treaty: democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law;

- Accept NATO as a community of like-minded nations joined together for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security, with each nation contributing to the security and defence from which all member nations benefit;

- Be firmly committed to principles, objectives and undertakings included in the Partnership for Peace Framework Document;

- Commit themselves to good faith efforts to build consensus within the Alliance on all issues, since consensus is the basis of Alliance cohesion and decision-making;

- Undertake to participate fully in the Alliance consultation and decision-making process on political and security issues of concern to the Alliance;

- Establish a permanent representation at NATO HQ;

- Establish an appropriate national military representation at SHAPE/SACLANT;

- Be prepared to nominate qualified candidates to serve on the International Staff and in NATO agencies;

- Provide qualified personnel to serve on the International Military Staff and in the Integrated Military Structure if and as appropriate;

- Contribute to Alliance budgets, based on budget shares to be agreed;

- Participate, as appropriate, in the exchange of Allied intelligence, which is based entirely on national contributions;

- Apply NATO security rules and procedures;

- Accept the Documents which provide the basis for the existing policies of the Alliance. (1)

The Alliance expects new members not to “close the door” to the accession of one or more later candidate members, as referred to also in paragraph 30 of Chapter 2.

B. WHAT PROSPECTIVE NEW MEMBERS WILL NEED TO DO POLITICALLY TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR MEMBERSHIP

Prospective members will have to have:

- Demonstrated a commitment to and respect for OSCE norms and principles, including the resolution of ethnic disputes, external territorial disputes including irredentist claims or internal jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, as referred to also in paragraph 6 of Chapter 1;
- Shown a commitment to promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility;
- Established appropriate democratic and civilian control of their defence force;
- Undertaken a commitment to ensure that adequate resources are devoted to achieving the obligations described in section A and C.

C. WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED MILITARILY OF NEW MEMBERS

New members of the Alliance must be prepared to share the roles, risks, responsibilities, benefits, and burdens of common security and collective defence. They should be expected to subscribe to Alliance strategy as set out in the Strategic Concept and refined in subsequent Ministerial statements.

An important element in new members’ military contribution will be a commitment in good faith to pursue the objectives of standardization which are essential to Alliance strategy and operational effectiveness. New members should concentrate, in the first instance, on interoperability. As a minimum, they should accept NATO doctrine and policies relating to standardization and in addition aim at achieving a sufficient level of training and equipment to operate effectively with NATO forces. PfP cooperation, including the Planning and Review Process, can help to improve the interoperability of Partners’ forces with those of NATO Allies and aspiring new members should be expected to participate actively in PfP activities; but these are limited in scope to forces made available by Partners for cooperation in peacekeeping, humanitarian and SAR missions, and related training and exercises.

D. WHAT PROSPECTIVE NEW MEMBERS WILL NEED TO DO MILITARILY TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR MEMBERSHIP

The ability of prospective members to contribute militarily to collective defence and to the Alliance’s new missions will be a factor in deciding whether to invite them to join the Alliance.

New members will need to adapt themselves to the fact that NATO’s strategy and force structure are designed to exploit multinationality and flexibility to provide effective defence at minimum cost. NATO policy is therefore heavily dependent on standardization, particularly in the areas of operations, administration and material. Current NATO standardization priorities include commonality of doctrines and procedures, interoperability of command, control and communications and major weapon systems, and interchangeability of ammunition and primary combat supplies.

There are at present over 1200 agreements and publications that new members should undertake to comply with. Compliance should be an evolutionary and controlled process to enhance Alliance operational effectiveness. Although national participation in standardization is optional, there are a number of areas, such as communication and information systems and measures to facilitate reinforcements where military necessity requires participation. One way of achieving improved interoperability might be for new members to select units that can act as cornerstone units around which the rest of their forces can be developed with priority being given to maximizing these units' interoperability with existing NATO units. To determine the minimum requirements necessary for operational effectiveness, a review of the STANAGs and Allied Publications is already under way. A country-by-country assessment of prospective new members' standardization will also be required, based on levels of standardization displayed during the full range of PfP military and defence activities. A proposal should be developed by the Alliance in consultation with the prospective new member so that it will understand what will be expected of it. In addition, NATO schools and training will need to be developed so that the forces of new members can achieve interoperability with NATO in a reasonable time, and new members can adapt to NATO doctrine across a broad spectrum of activities.

Although the funding of new members' enhanced interoperability is their responsibility, it poses important challenges for the Alliance as a whole. There is a military imperative to achieve the minimum level of interoperability required for military effectiveness as quickly as possible. There is also a political imperative to demonstrate intra-Alliance cohesion, to ensure that new members feel that they are participating fully in the Alliance and to enable them to make an equitable contribution to collective defence at an early stage. In principle, both objectives should be achieved within the existing arrangements for funding Allies' development, procurement, infrastructure and other costs (i.e. using national resources and the Security Investment Programme as appropriate).

FOOTNOTE:

1. These include, in particular:

The Agreement on the Status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, National Representatives and International Staff (Ottawa Convention, 1951);

The NATO Agreement on the Mutual Safeguarding of Secrecy of Inventions relating to Defence, and for which applications for Patents have been made (Paris, 1960);

The Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status on their Forces (London, 1951);

The NATO Agreement on the Communication of Technical Information for defence Purposes (Brussels, 1970);

as well as

The Strategic Concept; Summit Declarations and NAC decisions in Ministerial and permanent session as reflect in NAC Communiqués, including those issued in Oslo in June 1992 and Brussels in December 1992 in which the Alliance undertook to support, on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, including by making available Alliance resources and expertise;

Documents on cooperation between NATO and any partner state already agreed with new member(s) join the Alliance, recognizing that Alliance policies evolve over time and in the light of new circumstances.

COUNTRY ANALYSES

BULGARIA

Since the fall of communism in 1989, Bulgaria has made important strides toward respect for human rights, including minority rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

A parliamentary election in October 1991 was won by the Union of Democratic Forces (UDF), a broad anti-Communist alliance, but its government fell from office in October 1992. A non-party government took over but never managed to have strong support within parliament and resigned in October 1994. Parliamentary elections were held in December 1994 with the ex-Communist Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) obtaining a narrow majority, enabling it to form a government in January 1995.

In November 1996 UDF presidential candidate Petar Stoyanov, a pro-market and pro-Western liberal defeated the ex-Communist candidate for this largely ceremonial post. After 30 days of mass protests fueled by economic hardship due to Socialist mismanagement of the economy, Stoyanov brokered an agreement among the political parties on February 4, 1997, for early general elections on April 19. An interim government led by Sofia mayor Stefan Sofiyanski took important steps to reform the economy. The UDF won the pre-term April elections with a 52% majority (BSP received 22% and three smaller parties surpassed the 4% threshold). The new UDF government, led by Prime Minister Kostov, was voted in on May 21. Both the election campaign and vote were free and fair, and the voting process was orderly and well-run.

The new UDF government's greatest challenge will be to improve the bleak, but recovering, economic situation by undertaking further strong economic reform measures to rehabilitate and restructure the economy as well as serious efforts to combat corruption. Joining NATO and the EU are also priorities. A national consensus appears to exist on the need for sweeping reforms and a "reformist majority" exists in the new Bulgarian parliament.

Human rights generally are respected in Bulgaria, but problems remain in some areas. The situation of minorities, especially ethnic Turks, has improved considerably since the fall of communism. The Turks are represented in the parliament (through a largely ethnic Turkish party, now part of the Alliance for National Salvation, which received 7.6% of the vote), even though the July 1991 Bulgarian Constitution continues to prohibit political movements or parties based on ethnic or religious affiliation. Most minorities are afforded significant opportunities to preserve and develop their cultures and identities. Macedonian groups, however, have occasionally been prevented from holding conferences, or have had their meetings broken up or materials confiscated.

Societal mistreatment of some minorities, especially the Roma, remains a serious problem. As in other Central and East European countries, Roma face high levels of discrimination—in the workplace, school and housing. According to various reports from human rights organizations, Romany street children are harassed, physically abused, and arbitrarily arrested and detained by security forces. Some are detained in labor education schools where living conditions are very poor.

Another serious problem is use of unwarranted, and even lethal, force by police or security forces against criminal suspects or individuals in detention. Roma are disproportionately victims of police abuse.

The Constitution provides for freedom of religion, and there are no legal restrictions on registered religious groups. Most operate freely and openly. The requirement to register, though, has presented a problem for some non-Eastern Orthodox churches (so-called “non-traditional” religious groups). The legal requirement that religious groups whose activities have a religious component register with the government has presented an obstacle to their activity—for example, the Jehovah’s Witnesses and the evangelical church, Word of Life, both of which have been denied registration. Occasionally the police have shut down meetings of unregistered religious groups. Furthermore, some of these groups have experienced difficulty in renting assembly halls or obtaining permits for outdoor assemblies. There have also been instances of harassment and even physical assault. The new government has indicated it intends to improve the situation for “non-traditional” religious groups and guarantee freedom of religion to all Bulgarians.

While an independent judiciary exists in Bulgaria and the Constitutional Court, in particular, has on occasion demonstrated its independence, the judiciary has significant funding, staffing and organizational difficulties which impede its effectiveness.

Bulgaria has experienced and survived dramatic economic and political change in the last six months, testifying to its stable democratic framework. Reform efforts to date, including those undertaken by the caretaker government since February, promise change in the right direction, and Bulgaria’s new political leaders appear to have the political will and popular support to carry them through to success given enough time and encouragement.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Bulgaria is in substantial compliance.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Although Czechoslovakia was praised early and often for its peaceful transition from communism, differences between the country's two major ethnic groups, the Czechs and the Slovaks, became evident almost immediately and were quickly exploited. In late 1992, the country's slide towards partition picked up steam and by January 1, 1993, the Czech Republic and Slovakia formally and peacefully parted.

Since then, the Czech Republic has been largely successful in its efforts to consolidate democracy. The Czech Republic enjoys free and fair elections, an independent judiciary, and an active political opposition. The rule of law is generally respected.

Although the widespread and systematic human rights violations which characterized the Communist era quickly ceased after 1990, a few specific human rights problems persist.

The Czech Republic, upon emerging as an independent state in 1993, implemented restrictive conditions for citizenship for former Czechoslovaks who were permanent residents on Czech territory at the time of the breakup of the country. As a consequence of this citizenship law, some former Czechoslovak citizens have been left stateless or with an unclear legal status; according to a recent report by Human Rights Watch/Helsinki, that group may include several hundred orphans. The citizenship law has been criticized at meetings of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). In particular, the Czech citizenship law attaches to past criminal acts a heavier penalty (i.e., loss of the option of Czech citizenship) than existed at the time that the crime was committed, in violation of international norms which prohibit the *ex post facto* increase of criminal penalties. Moreover, the Czech Republic specifically agreed in the 1996 Programme of Action of the CIS Conference on Migration: "States shall ensure that, through the operation of national laws, all persons who were citizens of a predecessor state and who are permanently residing on the territory of a successor state, enjoy or be granted citizenship." Although amended in April 1996, the Czech citizenship law fails to meet this standard.

The Czech Republic has actively sought to address the wrongs inflicted by prior regimes, including through the adoption of laws providing for the restitution of, or compensation for, the wrongful confiscation of property. While this is a laudable effort, the specific laws adopted by the Czech Republic have proven problematic.

First, a restriction in the Czech 1991 restitution law (which governs claims arising from the Communist era) limits restitution to those who currently hold Czech citizenship. In practice, this provision (in combination with other citizenship laws) acts to discriminate, almost exclusively, against Czechs who obtained refuge—and citizenship—in the United States. Although the U.N. Human Rights Committee held, in 1995, that the citizenship restriction in the 1991 law is discriminatory and violates the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Czech Government has not yet taken any measures to bring this law into conformity with the country's international human rights obligations.

Czech officials sometimes maintain that the citizenship exclusion is necessary to prevent restitution to ethnic Germans expelled *en masse*, as alleged collaborators, at the end of World War II. This is a red herring. Current Czech law does not provide private property restitution for any confiscations which occurred between 1945 and 1948, the period of the German expulsion. Accordingly, even if the citizenship restriction were dropped, German expellees would still be excluded because of the tempo-

ral restriction. Resolving the problems faced by Czech Americans should be a minor legislative drafting matter.

A second problem in the area of property claims stems from the 1994 law adopted to address Nazi-era confiscations. In that case, the Ministry of Finance has created conditions for restitution or compensation that are not required by the law itself, requiring applicants to go through costly and time consuming litigation. The Ministry's actions defeat the very purpose of the law and call into question the operation of the rule of law in the Czech Republic in this area.

The Czech Republic continues to have a law that criminalizes defamation of the Republic or the President. Significantly, one of the trademarks of the former Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was the persistent application of criminal penalties like this one against those who had allegedly "slandered" the state; human rights monitors documented the cases of hundreds of people in many countries charged under such statutes who had done no more than question the system. President Havel, aware that this Communist-style law is incompatible with the Czech Republic's international free speech obligations, has pardoned most (if not all) of those convicted under it.

Many of the human rights problems experienced in the Czech Republic are effectively addressed through means available at the national or local (versus international) level, as is the case in most democracies. Such opportunities, though, have been hampered by an overcrowded court system where cases may linger for years. Moreover, the Czech courts have been slow to incorporate international human rights norms or principles in their decision making. Finally, in at least one significant case, a lower court refused to implement a decision of the Constitutional Court, which the Constitutional Court criticized as a subversion of the constitutional order.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, the Czech Republic is in substantial compliance.

ESTONIA

Estonia is a parliamentary democracy. The Estonian Constitution provides for the full range of human rights and freedoms in conformity with international standards.

Following Estonia's re-establishment of independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the international human rights organization Freedom House rated Estonia as only "partially free," an indication of dissatisfaction with Estonia's treatment of former Soviet citizens (particularly ethnic Russians, Ukrainians, and Jews) who lived in Estonia but were not eligible for citizenship since, among other factors, they did not speak Estonian. Many Non-citizens could not travel abroad because they did not possess aliens' passports. The 1992–95 government delayed its decision on issuing aliens' passports to those who were eligible for Russian citizenship. This policy, based on a provision of the 1993 Aliens Law, had the practical effect of "shoehorning" thousands of former Soviet citizens into Russian citizenship.

A centrist coalition elected in 1995 initiated a more liberal policy, and the government has begun issuing aliens' passports, residence permits, and travel documents to legally resident non-citizens (i.e., those residing in the Estonian SSR prior to July 1990). The OSCE mission in Tallinn estimates that this process should be completed by summer 1997. In his testimony before the Commission, the Estonian Ambassador to the United States stated that "no one will be forced to take a citizenship they do not want," a statement indicative of Tallinn's desire to put the ethnic contentions—at least officially and legally—behind them and move ahead with European integration process.

Democratic elections have been held since 1992 and suffrage has been expanded. Since 1993, non-citizens have been permitted to vote in municipal elections. Scandals and public exposure of malfeasance in office have forced some officeholders, including a former prime minister, to resign.

Religious worship is unhindered. According to the law, religious organizations are required to register with the Ministry of Interior and a "Board of Religion." In 1995, there was a contretemps between the Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church—headquartered in Stockholm during the Soviet period—and the Russian Orthodox patriarchy in Moscow over the control of parishes. This was essentially an internal matter over hierarchical fealty and property, and not a human rights issue.

Freedom of expression is respected. There is a wide spectrum of print periodical and electronic media.

Freedom of association and peaceful assembly is observed. Non-citizens may not join political parties, but are allowed to form associations. The right to form and join a labor union is provided for in the constitution.

Freedom of movement is respected. Citizens and legal residents have the freedom to travel if they have valid travel documents. According to the State Department's 1996 *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices*, "some non-citizens complain of delays in obtaining travel documents." In the case of the aliens' passports, the country of entry must recognize the Estonian-issued aliens' passport as valid.

Like other Central and East European countries, Estonia suffers many of the social consequences of the Communist period: violent crime, inadequate prison facilities, mistreatment of prisoners and detainees, and the use of excessive force by the police. "Police and corrections personnel continued to commit human rights abuses. . . the major human rights abuses continued to be mistreatment of prison-

ers and detainees, and the use of excessive force by the police,” according to the State Department’s 1996 *Country Reports*.

Due to the Soviet legacy, the legal system is not entirely developed. The civil and criminal code is under revision. In September 1995, Legal Chancellor Eerik-Juhan Truuvali criticized the low level of legal education among state officials, which, he contended, led to bureaucratic arbitrariness. However, the judicial system went out of its way to extend legal protection and due process to Petr Rozhok, an ethnic Russian Zhirinovskiyite and political activist who went to court to challenge his expulsion from Estonia for “anti-government agitation.” The court ruled in Rozhok’s favor and he was allowed to remain in Estonia.

According to the law, members of national minorities enjoy equality before the law. A “Law on Cultural Autonomy” (going back to the 1920’s) provides government subsidies to cultural organizations for national minorities. There are complaints by ethnic Russians that they suffer various forms of discrimination in day-to-day life. Much of this is related to employment situations that require Estonian language competency. Some observers maintain that the Estonian bureaucracy is unresponsive to both ethnic Estonians and Russians.

There are no limits on property ownership for citizens. Non-citizens may not own land *per se*, but may own private apartments or businesses.

Freedom House now rates Estonia as “completely free.”

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Estonia is in substantial compliance.

HUNGARY

Hungary is a parliamentary democracy with an independent judiciary. In the most recent elections—held in 1994—the Hungarian Socialist Party (HSP) won 209 of 386 parliamentary seats, defeating a center-right coalition that had ruled since 1990. Prime Minister Gyula Horn, the leader of the HSP, heads a coalition government. The political and economic transition has been relatively stable and systematic and Hungary is among the most economically successful of post-Communist countries. The country has made major strides in its transformation to a market economy, with the private sector generating about 70 percent of GDP. The judiciary enjoys a reputation for fairness and is regarded as being independent. The important role played by the Constitutional Court has bolstered respect for the rule of law. Significantly, the Court has frequently drawn on international human rights norms and principles during its deliberations.

The country has received high marks for its human rights record, and the government generally respects human rights and civil liberties of its citizens. However, according to the 1996 State Department human rights report, the authorities do not ensure due process in all cases. Pre-trial detentions are limited to one year while criminal investigations are in progress, but may be extended indefinitely on the prosecutor's motion with the judge's concurrence. While this occurs infrequently, it appears to disproportionately affect Roma. Reportedly, Roma, too, are kept in pretrial detention more frequently and longer than non-Roma.

There are ongoing instances of police harassment and abuse and beatings of criminal suspects, though internal police controls have been tightened. Roma and certain foreigners appear to be disproportionate victims of police ill-treatment.

Hungary has an active and liberal policy with respect to minorities, and the 1993 law on ethnic and national minorities permits organized forms of limited self-government in areas where substantial numbers of minorities reside. Thirteen ethnic and national groups are accorded minority status and, with the exception of the Roma (the largest minority), enjoy significant opportunities to develop their identities. Since 1995, there exists a parliamentary Ombudsman for Ethnic and National minorities. As in other Central and East European countries, Roma (4-8 percent of the population) have suffered discrimination, abuse or physical attacks, including by police. The Hungarian Government, which has granted Roma extensive rights of political consultation, recognizes the need for social and educational policies to help them.

The print media is independent, but the government still controls national TV and most radio stations, although there are plans to privatize portions of the electronic media.

Hungary's parliament has approved a law creating a foundation to administer property confiscated from Hungarian Jews during World War II and to oversee payments to survivors of the Holocaust. The government is implementing a compensation program. The Hungarian Jewish Heritage Fund will pay out lifetime annuities worth \$23.5 million to Hungarian survivors of the Holocaust, in addition to giving the fund real estate and valuable paintings. The Hungarian Government also recently approved an agreement with the Vatican on property restitution, agreeing to return to the Catholic Church substantial assets confiscated by the Communists.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Hungary is in substantial compliance.

LATVIA

Latvia is a parliamentary democracy. The Latvian Constitution provides for the full range of human rights and freedom in terms of generally accepted international standards. The establishment of the National Human Rights Office has been welcomed by the human rights community.

Following Latvia's re-establishment of independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the international human rights organization Freedom House rated Latvia as only "partially free," an indication of dissatisfaction with its treatment of former Soviet citizens, mostly ethnic Russian or Russian-speaking, who could not travel abroad as they did not possess aliens' passports and had difficulty securing proper residence registration. A petition drive to amend the 1994 citizenship law to make it more restrictive was unsuccessful.

Democratic elections are held regularly. According to law, persons who remained active in the Communist Party after January 13, 1991 may not stand as candidates, but in at least one case, this provision has been disregarded. The democratic electoral system has not necessarily produced political stability or a functional legislature. Corruption in the government and society is widespread. Some cabinet ministers have been forced to resign for corruption or past KGB associations.

The rule of law has been undermined on many occasions by officials in the Latvian Citizenship and Immigration Department (CID) who did not provide residence permits to eligible applicants who were entitled to them. Even where court rulings overturned negative decisions, the CID sometimes resisted complying. Personnel changes were made in the CID, and applicants for residence permission are now being more fairly treated. The State Department's 1996 *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* states, "The Citizenship and Immigration Department continued to act arbitrarily in some cases concerning the residence status of non-citizens, although independent observers noted improved performance and a reduction in the number of complaints."

Latvian law designates five "traditional" religious faiths. Religious education may be provided to students in public schools on a voluntary basis only by representatives of these five denominations. The Jehovah's Witnesses have been denied registration in Latvia, and an appeal is still under review. After the widely reported death of a young Jehovah's Witness whose religious beliefs affected her choice of medical treatment, there were attempts by legislators to prescribe fines for undefined "activities" by unregistered religious organizations. The National Human Rights Office and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out that the provisions would violate international obligations in the field of religious freedom, and the parliament took no final action on this matter.

Within economic constraints, the press operates freely, publishing a wide range of viewpoints. There are considerable content restrictions on the electronic media.

Freedom of association is respected. However, the Riga city council has on occasion attempted to limit demonstrations by non-citizen groups. Non-citizens are enjoined from forming political organizations.

Freedom House now rates Estonia as "completely free."

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Latvia is in substantial compliance.

LITHUANIA

Since the re-establishment of independence in 1991, the international human rights organization Freedom House has rated Lithuania as “completely free.” A Department of International and Human Rights within the Ministry of Justice is mandated to monitor Lithuania’s legal system for compliance with international accords to which Lithuania is a signatory. The major humanitarian issues for Lithuania after the re-establishment of independence has been a high level of violent crime, a stagnant economy, and a legal system still burdened by its Sovietroots.

Compared with Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania has a much smaller percentage of ethnic non-Lithuanians, mostly Poles and Russians (the pre-war Jewish community was nearly destroyed by the Nazis); anyone living legally in Lithuania in 1991 was granted citizenship, if he/she so desired. As a result, Lithuania has avoided much of the “ethnic” (actually, political) tension found in Estonia and Latvia.

Democratic elections have been held regularly. Scandals and public exposure of malfeasance in office have forced some officeholders to resign.

Article 5 of the Law on Religious Communities and Associations mentions nine religious communities that have under the law been declared “traditional” and as such are eligible for governmental assistance: Latin Rite Catholics, Greek Rite Catholics, Evangelical Lutherans, Evangelical Reformed, Orthodox, Old Believers, Jews, Sunni Muslims, and Carats. There are no restrictions on the activities of other religious communities.

Freedom of expression is protected, and there is a wide range of print media. Prior restraint over either print or broadcast media and restrictions on publication are prohibited, unless the government determines that national security is involved. Journalists working for the state-owned electronic media have in the past complained about pressure by superiors to avoid criticism of government policies in their television and radio reporting. Investigative journalists covering organized crime have been harassed and received death threats from organized crime operatives. In 1993, a prominent journalist was killed in a gangland-style slaying.

There are no limits on freedom of association, peaceful assembly, or movement, except that only citizens are permitted to establish political organizations. The Communist Party and other Soviet-associated groups are forbidden. Permission to hold public demonstrations is routinely granted within reasonable limits. Labor unions are permitted. According to the State Department’s 1996 *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices*, the Lithuanian Workers Union has charged that management officials in some state enterprises has attempted to interfere with union organizing, at times dismissing trade union activists.

Like its fellow Central and East European countries, Lithuania suffers many of the social consequences of the Communist period. Corruption and crime have been major problems. Police on occasion beat detainees and abuse detention laws. Hazing of recruits in the military is a serious problem. Police corruption is reportedly on the rise, and prison conditions remain poor. The 1996 *Country Reports* lists numerous instances of human rights abuse by police.

The constitution provides defendants with the right to counsel. In practice the right to legal counsel is abridged by the shortage of trained advocates who find it difficult to cope with the large numbers of criminal cases brought before the courts. In order to deal with an outbreak of violent crime, parlia-

ment passed in 1993 a preventive detention law that allows the authorities to hold a suspected criminal for up to 2 months, as opposed to the earlier maximum of 72 hours prior to being brought before a judge. This law was amended in 1995 in an effort to avoid abuse.

Private property is permitted and much state property has been privatized. Beside citizens of Lithuania, citizens of European Union and NATO nations are permitted to own land. However, some Lithuanian citizens claim that formerly nationalized real estate (land and buildings) is frequently not returned under various illegal pretexts, but rather is sold off as State-owned property.

Lithuanian citizens enjoy equal rights under the law regardless of their ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity. There have been complaints, however, by ethnic Poles that they experienced discrimination in property privatization (in 1993 the Lithuanian Prime Minister admitted to some problems in this area). Ethnic Poles also complained about the redistricting of an ethnically Polish suburb of Vilnius into the city limits. A suggestion by the Minister of Education in early 1997 to abolish Polish-language instruction in Polish-majority public schools was vigorously rejected by the prime minister.

Rehabilitation of Stalin-era political prisoners led to reports in 1991 that some persons alleged to have been involved in World War II war crimes during the Nazi occupation had benefited from this rehabilitation. Many Holocaust survivors maintain that—due to negligence, incompetence, or indifference—certain people suspected of having committed atrocities against the Jews were rehabilitated.

A small Jewish community exists, largely in main cities. Jewish leaders have called on officials to provide better police protection for Jewish cemeteries in Kaunas, Vilnius, and Klaipeda, which have been subject to sporadic vandalism and pilferage.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Lithuania is in substantial compliance.

MACEDONIA

The Republic of Macedonia is about the size of the State of Maryland with an ethnically mixed population of just over 2 million persons. Neighboring countries have fought bitterly over the south central Balkan region in which the Republic is located, and only in 1991, with the breakup of Yugoslavia, has Macedonia formally emerged as an internationally recognized independent state. While it has been able to avoid new conflict associated with this breakup, international concern about the possibility of such a conflict and its implications was strong enough in 1992 and 1993 to cause the deployment of an OSCE spillover mission and an U.N. peacekeeping presence which has included several hundred U.S. forces. The end of the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina in late 1995 and an interim agreement resolving many outstanding issues between Macedonia and Greece a few months earlier have stabilized the situation in Macedonia considerably. The recent violence in Albania, the tension resulting from continued repression in Kosovo, and new incursions by Yugoslav forces on Macedonia-Serbian border, however, demonstrate that external sources of instability persist.

The introduction of political pluralism in 1990 and the establishment of effective independence the following year has led to an increase in the respect shown by Macedonian authorities for human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, progress has been slow, and problems remain. For example, while there is substantial independence and freedom of expression evident in the media, much of it remains under government control and is generally perceived to be sympathetic to the government. In addition, law enforcement personnel generally operate within their legal constraints, but police officers have been reported occasionally to delay the initiation of court proceedings and access to an attorney for some persons taken into custody. Excessive use of force has also been reported in making arrests.

Macedonia's citizenship law is among the most restrictive in Central and Eastern Europe. While the country has been independent for a little more than half a decade, a 15-year residency requirement effectively denies citizenship to those who had been legally residing in the Republic at the time independence was declared. This requirement has especially affected the Albanian population, some of which moved to Macedonia from Kosovo and other parts of the former Yugoslavia prior to the breakup of that federation.

Macedonia's population includes a substantial number of minorities. The Albanian community, representing 22.9 percent of the population, is by far the largest of these minorities, followed by a Turkish community representing 4 percent of the population, and Roma and Serbs each representing over 2 percent. Macedonian authorities have gone far in responding to minority concerns, including substantial educational opportunities for Albanians in their own language. Coalition governments have been formed with ethnically based, Albanian political parties. At the same time, Albanians are underrepresented in government administration at all levels, especially in the police force, even in areas where their ethnic group predominates. Albanians are represented in the military in close proportion to their share of the population as a whole, but are less represented among the officer corps. While Albanian activists allege official discrimination, Macedonian authorities respond that qualified persons for police or other official duties are difficult to find. Minorities seek even greater educational opportunities in their own language—in the case of the Turks even though they do not use that language at home themselves—but the government counters that they are not bound to provide any additional opportunities and that economic constraints make such opportunities virtually impossible anyway. Albanians and Turks engage in some private education of their youth, which is tolerated by the authorities but does not have an appropriately sound legal basis.

A greater problem for Macedonia than the actual denial of rights is the existence of nationalist Macedonian and Albanian parties, which make exaggerated complaints and excessive demands. While Macedonian nationalists protest even modest measures to assist minorities, Albanian nationalists call for various forms of regional autonomy that would, in effect, turn the country into a federal state. Moderate Macedonian and Albanian leaders have control of the government and cooperate in seeking the fullest integration of all groups in the country, but nationalists hold enough support among the population to limit progress. The resulting polarization and tension, more than actual denials of human rights, endangers Macedonia's social stability.

Macedonia held its first multi-party elections in November 1990, and its second such elections—the first time as an independent state—in October 1994. In both cases, the will of the people was reflected in the results, although the lack of stronger democratic development and careless organization detracted from the quality of the electoral process. Government leaders sometimes seem resistant to democratic development, either due to a lack of understanding, a desire to maintain power, or a concern that such development under existing economic and social constraints could be destabilizing. The judicial system does seem to operate independently and under the guidance of concepts characterizing the rule of law.

Macedonia did not seek Yugoslavia's breakup, and moved toward independence only when the federation of six republics and two provinces had effectively disintegrated. While Macedonian nationalists may have done so, Macedonian officials have not supported policies which threaten neighboring countries. In the case of Greece, which claimed otherwise and imposed an economic embargo on Macedonia in 1994 as a result, Macedonia generally expressed a willingness to talk and address those concerns that were found to be legitimate. An October 1995 agreement settled most differences between the two countries, and Greece acquiesced to Macedonia's becoming a full member of the OSCE.

Macedonia's adherence to OSCE principles and provisions has increased in recent years, despite adverse economic conditions and regional instability. Especially considering its ethnic make-up and history of warfare rather than independent statehood, the country probably deserves more credit than it receives.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Macedonia at present still falls somewhat short of sufficient compliance. The situation could improve quickly, but it will require increased effort not only on the part of Macedonian authorities but of opposition parties and society as a whole.

POLAND

Of the post-Communist Central and East European countries, the Republic of Poland has consistently been at the edge of reform and in making the transition from communism to democracy.

Poland was the only Communist country in the region to have a mass movement of dissent. That is, while a small elite publicly opposed communism in other countries in the region, a large segment of the adult population in Poland openly and actively opposed the prevailing regime. Not surprisingly, Poland was the first country in the region to achieve (in 1989) a negotiated transition of power from a Communist to non-Communist government.

Poland's broadly based civil society, with its roots in the Solidarity movement, has facilitated the consolidation of democracy. Poland enjoys free and fair elections, an independent judiciary, and an active political opposition. The rule of law is respected and a long-envisioned overhaul of the constitution has been approved by the voters.

By and large, human rights are respected and, most importantly, the full panoply of domestic human rights machinery (e.g., a Civil Rights Ombudsperson, recourse to the courts, political pressure exerted through the Parliament) has proved adequate, in most instances, to resolve problems that may arise.

There is, however, one peculiar area where Poland's otherwise sterling record is tarnished: since 1989, each post-Communist government has failed to remove a Communist-era criminal defamation law. Under this law, acts which "publicly insult, ridicule, and deride the Polish nation, the Polish Republic, its political system, or its principal organs are punishable by between 6 months and 8 years of imprisonment"; prison terms of up to 10 years are provided for those who commit these acts in print or through the mass media. This law impermissibly restricts free speech in violation of Poland's international human rights obligations.

Significantly, one of the trademarks of the former Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was the persistent application of criminal penalties like this one against those who had allegedly "slandered" the state; human rights monitors documented the cases of hundreds of people in many countries charged under such statutes who had done no more than question the system.

It is especially odd that Poland has failed to remove this last vestige of the Communist era. As a practical matter, the law does little actually to protect Poland, as few cases have been prosecuted under the law and each recourse to the law only generated a stream of international criticism.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Poland is in substantial compliance.

ROMANIA

Romania emerged in 1989 from one of the most repressive Communist regimes in Europe, and, with the national elections of November 1996, experienced its first peaceful transition of government since 1937. Romania has taken significant and demonstrable steps to consolidate democracy and the rule of law and improve respect for human rights in the 8 years since the ouster of the Ceausescus. These efforts have accelerated under the leadership of President Emil Constantinescu and his ruling coalition.

Romania is a constitutional republic with a multiparty system and a directly elected president as chief of state. Romanians held their third national elections in November 1996, and rejected ex-Communist Ion Iliescu and his Party of Social Democracy of Romania (PDSR), which had ruled the country continuously since the 1989 revolution. President Constantinescu leads a coalition of former opposition parties known as the Democratic Convention (CDR). The CDR and its allies also swept the parliamentary races putting that institution under the control of a left-right-center "coalition of coalitions," and earlier in the year also scored major victories throughout the country in local elections. Significantly, the Democratic Union of Hungarians (UDMR), representing Romania's 1.7 million ethnic Hungarians, participates in the new coalition government at the cabinet level. Consistent with his campaign pledges, the President has made a public accounting for the bloody events of 1989 and 1990 and economic and institutional reform, especially a war against corruption, his main priorities.

Constantinescu and his coalition lost no time in crafting a tough series of new economic measures geared toward solidifying macroeconomic reforms, expediting privatization and expanding investment. The government engaged the IMF in new negotiations, based on its reform package, and as a result, the IMF released funds which had been withheld due to the previous government's intransigence toward privatization and other market reforms. The new government has eliminated selected subsidies and undertaken reform of the central banking system. Two stock exchanges are rapidly expanding.

Human rights are generally respected in Romania although problems persist in some areas. The Constitution of Romania provides for freedom of expression and prohibits censorship. Romanian citizens have access to several hundred daily and weekly newspapers as well as an array of private radio and television stations. Nevertheless, Romania retains criminal defamation laws, under which several prominent journalists have been convicted of libel of government officials and sentenced to prison terms. While those convicted were later pardoned—by former President Iliescu and President Constantinescu—the restrictive penal code provision remains in force.

The constitution provides for religious freedom and the government does not generally impede the observance of religious belief. According to the State Department's 1996 *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices*, Romania recognizes 15 religions whose clergy may receive state financial support and has licensed 385 other faiths, organizations and foundations as religious associations entitling them to exemption from income and customs taxes. However, these religious associations may not found churches and are not permitted to perform rites of baptism, marriage, or burial. Several religious organizations, including Jehovah's Witnesses, have made credible allegations of harassment by government officials who have impeded their proselytizing and worship. A recent incident involving attacks against a group of Baptist worshipers in rural Romania drew immediate condemnation by President Constantinescu and an investigation of the incident. Constantinescu also convened a meeting of representatives of all faiths in Bucharest in an effort to encourage dialogue and prevent such incidents in the future.

Romania's largest and most vocal minority is its 1.7 million ethnic Hungarians who, along with the very small Jewish community (less than 15,000) are frequently the targets of extremist rhetoric from the Party of Romanian National Unity (PUNR) and the fringe press. The Hungarian minority party, the UDMR, holds 40 seats in Parliament and a cabinet post. In 1996, Romania signed and ratified a bilateral treaty with Hungary to increase cooperation between the two countries. A similar treaty with Ukraine was recently signed, and both of these documents specifically state the parties' intention to guarantee protection of minority rights.

As in many European countries, the Romany population continues to be marginalized and discriminated against in housing, education and employment. Sporadic violence against Romany communities continues, and this group is significantly more likely to suffer harassment by police and physical abuse while in custody. Several criminal cases involving attacks against Roma remain stalled in the courts. The Constantinescu government is attempting to engage the leaders of the Roma communities in developing new programs to increase tolerance and improve educational and economic opportunities for Roma.

Since emerging from the brutal Ceausescu dictatorship in 1989, Romania has enacted a democratic constitution, ratified all international agreements concerning respect for human rights and taken concrete steps to consolidate democracy and a market economy. While some of these efforts, particularly on the economic front, stalled under the administration of former Communist Ion Iliescu, they have moved into a "fast-forward" mode under the administration of President Constantinescu and the Democratic Convention. There is every indication that these efforts will continue and expand. Perhaps no other country in Central or East European has come so far in such a brief period of time as Romania. The events of the past 7 months in Romania compel, at a minimum, a "fresh look" at her eligibility for NATO membership. If Romania is not invited to begin negotiations for accession at the Madrid summit, it is incumbent upon NATO to define clearly the parameters and prospective timetable for future accession and to take steps to strongly support continued economic reform and strengthening of democratic institutions in Romania.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Romania is in substantial compliance.

SLOVAKIA

Although Czechoslovakia was praised early and often for its peaceful transition from communism, differences between the country's two major ethnic groups, the Czechs and the Slovaks, became evident almost immediately and were quickly exploited. In late 1992, the country's slide towards partition picked up steam, and on January 1, 1993, the Czech Republic and Slovakia formally and peacefully parted.

Since then, Slovakia has followed a checkered path towards reform. Free and fair elections have been held, a workable constitution was approved, and the economy is relatively strong. Nevertheless, 7 years after the Velvet Revolution and 4 years after Slovakia became an independent state, a culture of democracy has not penetrated the halls of parliament or the inner circle of the cabinet. While the trappings of a pluralist society are present on paper, they fail more often than they work. In short, the consolidation of democracy taking place in other Central and East European, post-Communist countries is not yet evident in Slovakia.

There are several areas, in particular, where the transition to democracy is not complete.

One of the principal shortcomings in Slovakia's democratic transformation is the failure of the ruling coalition to tolerate a loyal opposition. That is, the parties who gained control of the parliament in the last elections (held in 1994) govern to the complete exclusion of the opposition. (Currently, Slovakia is ruled by a brown-red coalition consisting of the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia, the far right-wing Slovak National Party, and the left-wing Association of Workers of Slovakia.) Any and all critics of the ruling coalition's policies are portrayed as enemies of the state and menaces to the very existence of an independent Slovakia. In fact, Slovakia rapidly established the attributes of statehood and sovereignty after achieving independence and faces no credible challenges to its statehood from either its former partners, the Czechs, or from the Hungarians who ruled Slovakia prior to World War I. The international community clearly accepted and endorsed Slovakia's independence by admitting it to international organizations such as the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Council of Europe.

Moreover, the ruling coalition parties have used their control of the parliament to maintain a monopoly on virtually every aspect of governance. Most significantly, opposition parties have been precluded from any meaningful participation in the state board which governs media activities (which is appointed by the parliament); the National Property Fund (which oversees privatization); or the parliamentary bodies responsible for oversight of the security forces.

There has been an alarming coincidence between opposition to the government and victimization by unsolved violent crime. For example, since 1995, the son of President Kovac (who is a critic of Prime Minister Meciar) was kidnaped; a witness who may have had evidence linking that crime to the government was subsequently murdered; and four key opposition parliamentarians have been attacked or had bombs explode at their homes. At least two prominent journalists who have been critical of Prime Minister Meciar have also been beaten.

The failure of the police and security apparatus in Slovakia to investigate and prosecute effectively violent attacks on opposition leaders or journalists has led to suspicions that these attacks were orchestrated by elements within the government who are not being held accountable before the law for their actions.

Two recent, high profile events also illustrate the threat to the rule of law in Slovakia. First, in November 1996, a member of the Slovakian Parliament, Frantisek Gaulieder was stripped of his parliamentary mandate after resigning from the Prime Minister's party. Gaulieder has alleged that falsified documents were used against him; after his removal, a bomb was set off at his home. Second, in May 1997, the Ministry of Interior prevented a referendum from being held, violating Slovakia's constitutional provisions governing such referenda and denying the people of Slovakia a chance to have their views heard. This serious disregard for the rule of law suggests the ruling coalition may be becoming desperate in its bid to hold onto power.

The rhetoric of government officials towards ethnic minorities has been characterized by hostility and intolerance. Although the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities has recommended that Slovakia adopt an omnibus minority language law to fill gaps or resolve ambiguities in the existing laws and reassure the nervous minority communities, government officials—notwithstanding their assurances that they would do so—have taken no concrete steps toward this goal. On the contrary, some Slovak political leaders from the coalition parties have made racist remarks about Hungarians and Roma, only fueling the insecurity of these groups. The government has also adopted laws or implemented practices such as banning the playing of non-Slovak national anthems and barring the issuance of report cards in the Hungarian language which appear specifically designed to harass the Hungarian minority.

While overshadowed by the increasing negative developments in Slovakia, there are some positive aspects which bear consideration.

First and most importantly, Slovakia has, in the past 2 years, witnessed the emergence of a genuine civil society: people from all walks of life are willing to engage in some aspect of public life. This has been manifested through the birth or development of non-governmental organizations, trade unions, and community-based groups dealing with the environment, health care issues, education and job training and human rights. Although the government has been resistant to change from below and a recently passed law on foundations clearly limits such grassroots organizations, further democratic reform in Slovakia would be unlikely without the existence of such groups.

Second, although the ruling coalition's policies toward minorities have been marked by intolerance, opposition political parties that are predominantly ethnic Slovak have refused to be drawn into ethnic nationalism of the kind that has engulfed some other post-Communist countries. Although these parties' cooperation with the ethnic Hungarian opposition parties may not be a basis on which coalitions are built, there is clearly a sufficient basis for a normal working relationship. Accordingly, the so-called "ethnic" problems in Slovakia are by no means intractable (or, for that matter, even really ethnic) but reflect, in fact, the shortcomings of democratic reform experienced by all citizens of the country.

Finally, the Slovak Constitutional Court has served, on many occasions, to ensure that international norms have been respected in Slovakia. It is well regarded both in and outside of the country and has been perceived as fair and constructive. Unfortunately, the Court is overburdened by the high volume of cases generated by controversies involving the government or ruling coalition; most recently, the government failed to respect the Court's rulings regarding the above-mentioned referendum. Some members of the Constitutional Court have received death threats.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Slovakia is not in substantial compliance.

SLOVENIA

Slovenia is a small country—about the size of New Jersey and with a population of just under 2 million people—which only gained independent statehood in June 1991. Once part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it had been part of the former Yugoslavia since the creation of that state in 1918. There was a brief, 2-3 week military confrontation with Yugoslav authority when independence was declared, but territorial defense units loyal to the Slovenian state held their own against the Yugoslav National Army (JNA), which had greater interests elsewhere. Slovenian forces lost only one dozen men, one-third that of the JNA, and over 3,000 Yugoslav soldiers surrendered. This contrasts with the almost 9,000 killed in Croatia in 1991, and an estimated 250,000 killed in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, where in both cases the victims were overwhelmingly civilian.

Slovenia's democratic development and economic liberalism preceded its independence. Even in the 1980s, there was a stark economic contrast between it and the five other republics of the Yugoslav federation. Limits on the tolerance of dissenting views were imposed mostly at the federal level. With subsequent reforms in which the former Communist leadership has led the way, there have been few human rights issues of concern since independence.

Over 90 percent of Slovenia's population declare themselves to be ethnic Slovenes. Indeed, populations of this ethnic group extend into neighboring Italy, Austria and Hungary. Members of the small national minorities that exist in Slovenia enjoy their rights as such. The indigenous Hungarian and Italian minorities, numbering just over 8,500 and 3,000 respectively, have the right to representation in parliament, bilingual education and use of their own national symbols. There is also a smaller Romany population of about 2,500 persons. Generally speaking, those who were legally residing in Slovenia at the time independence was declared were able to obtain citizenship, including more than 200,000 non-Slovenes. An ombudsman for human rights can deal with outstanding citizenship cases.

Freedom of religion is respected for all faiths and denominations.

There are about 16,000 refugees in Slovenia from Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, with few complaints about their treatment by the authorities. There have been some neo-fascist expressions of hatred, for example in the songs of rock groups, but they seem very isolated and generally unpopular.

Though vulnerable to political pressure, the media is free, albeit with some indications of self-censorship lingering from the more restrictive Yugoslav period.

The judicial branch of government acts independently, and the police and armed forces all are under civilian control.

Slovenia held the first multi-party elections in the former Yugoslavia in April 1990, which were free and fair and resulted in the Communists losing control of government. The third and most recent set of elections, in November 1996, were very competitive, to the point that building a ruling coalition became a difficult process. It appears as if none of the major political parties would want significantly to alter the country's course. The President, Milan Kucan, and Prime Minister, Janez Drnovsek, were high-ranking members of Slovenia's old League of Communists who have maintained genuine popularity in the era of political pluralism.

Slovenia's quest for NATO membership has been hampered not by its record on human rights and democratization, but by its association with the former Yugoslavia. Many criticized its unilateral deci-

sion to declare independence in 1991 as irresponsible—even if understandable and confirmed by referendum—since the collapse of the Yugoslav federation was correctly predicted to precipitate a conflict in which innocent parties would be the primary victims. Defenders of Slovenia’s action point to Serbia’s dominance of federal power and desire to centralize the Yugoslav state.

Slovenia’s decision, however, cannot excuse those persons who are responsible for aggression and massive human rights violations elsewhere. Moreover, the international community’s inability, especially in the OSCE, to define adequately the Helsinki principle regarding the equal rights of peoples, including their right to self-determination, makes it difficult to criticize Slovenia on these grounds.

Once recognized as an independent state in 1992, border questions were raised by Italy for some time, and small differences over the establishment of what is now an international border with Croatia remain. Larger issues of Yugoslav succession persist, including the division of assets and debts, although Slovenia unilaterally accepted what it considered its share of the debt in order to gain access to international financial institutions. Slovenian officials argue that their country can serve as a model for other former Yugoslav republics desiring NATO membership, and that, more importantly, to exclude an otherwise qualified candidate on the basis of its past association with the former Yugoslavia alone would send a dangerous message to the countries of the Balkans.

In conclusion, Slovenia’s record of compliance with OSCE principles and provisions has been good, and for a sufficiently long period of time that there is no reason to believe this will change.

On the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents, and with a particular focus on those provisions relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law, Slovenia is in substantial compliance.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

HEARING

APRIL 24, 1997

The Committee met in room 538 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Chairman, presiding.

Commissioners present: Hon. Alfonse D'Amato, Chairman; Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman; Hon. Jon Christensen, Commissioner.

Witnesses: H. E. Ojars Kalnins, Ambassador of the Republic of Latvia; H. E. Jerzy Kozminski, Ambassador of the Republic of Poland; H.E. Alfonsas Eidintas, Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania; H.E. Grigore Kalev Stoicescu, Ambassador of the Republic of Estonia

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ALFONSE D'AMATO

Senator D'AMATO. I apologize for the delay. We were just receiving a briefing on a Department of Energy facility at Brookhaven Lab which is located up in Long Island, and there are some problems with radiation escaping off of the site—or we hope that it hasn't escaped off the site—and contaminating the ground water. We just had a briefing, so I am deeply sorry to be late starting. I apologize to my colleagues, Congressman Christensen and Congressman Smith, for the delay.

This is the first in a series of Commission hearings on the subject of NATO enlargement. Today, the Commission will hear from official representatives of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on their countries' views on the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO.

I'd like to make an observation. I recall back in the late '70s, and even in the early '80s, that few would have thought that we would be here today. We've come a long way in terms of even being able to consider this historic effort which I think eventually can and should be successful. I am absolutely and totally convinced that it is the right thing to do and that there are a number of criteria that should be met by those nations that seek entry into NATO.

I remember Captive Nations days that we would have in New York and thousands of those people who represented the captive nations would march and demonstrate for freedom. I think most of the world looked on those who were calling for and championing the cause of freedom with indifference as the highest degree of respect and many looked upon them with disdain and disbelief. If you recall those days and think back, there were very few who believed. It is remarkable that we have come so far in a relatively short period of time.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is intended to focus specifically on how well the candidate states have implemented OSCE's agreements and complied with OSCE's principles. We'll ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance in NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas who will examine those issues more thoroughly.

Let me make it clear I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO

enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it's important that the United States and our NATO allies make very clear that those states not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so they can join when they are ready.

If we do not do this, we make a great mistake. We run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the East European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

I could go on but I think, more importantly, I would like to hear from the Ambassadors of the countries and I know that my colleague, Congressman Smith, Co-Chairman and former Chairman, has a statement. He has been a champion for the freedom of the peoples who were once enslaved and who now we are so delighted to have an opportunity to welcome as partners in providing real security. Congressman Smith has a statement to make, and I'm going to ask that my full statement be placed in the record in its entirety.

Congressman Smith.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend you for holding this hearing and this, the beginning of a series of hearings on human rights and the process of NATO enlargement.

As an original co-sponsor of the 1996 NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act, as a strong advocate of NATO enlargement, and Co-Chairman of our Commission, I consistently emphasize the importance of human rights in the expansion process. During the House's consideration of that bill language which I proposed on human rights, I'm happy to say it was approved in the last Congress.

With the adoption of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act, the Congress has made clear that the human rights records of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe interested in joining NATO should be evaluated in light of the obligations and commitments of these countries under the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act. I would note, Mr. Chairman, that all 27 states of the Partnership for Peace are participating states of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. That membership has committed each state to act in accordance with all OSCE documents, including the Helsinki Final Act.

NATO enlargement provides an excellent opportunity for countries desiring membership to demonstrate their commitment to the Alliance's shared values, including respect for human rights as well as their ability to fulfill the military and political obligations expected of all member states. Prospective members should meet the criteria set forth in the NATO Participation Act and other relevant legislation before they are admitted as full members of NATO.

Mr. Chairman, the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, including those represented here today, have made tremendous strides in working to overcome the legacy of communism. The prospect of

NATO membership has already given important impetus to the reform process under way in most of the countries in the region and has contributed to the resolution of a number of longstanding disputes. I commend the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland for the impressive progress they have made in such a short time.

It would be an injustice of historic proportions, Mr. Chairman, if we did not take advantage of the unique opportunity we have today to embrace those countries of the region committed to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

Mr. Chairman, as we look to the upcoming Madrid NATO Summit and beyond, I am concerned about the lack of a genuine and transparent process to ensure that those emerging democracies that do not receive invitations in July to join NATO will be considered for membership as soon as they meet that criteria.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank you for your good leadership over the years we have traveled together, many of the captive nations when they were under that Communist domination and you have always been a champion for human rights and respect for the dignity of men and women everywhere and I want to thank you.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Congressman Christensen.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm anxious to hear their testimony.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you.

Before I call our first Ambassador to testify, let me make this very clear: It is my opinion—and I believe it's an opinion widely shared by not only my colleagues here on the Commission but in general by most of the members of Congress—that Russia should not have a veto over NATO enlargement, no state's candidacy should be foreclosed, and under no circumstances should we yield to Russian opposition to any state's membership. Unfortunately, there are still leaders in Russia who view NATO enlargement and the inclusion of those countries who are formerly dominated by Russia as a victory for the West and a defeat for Russia. This should be viewed as a victory for enlightenment, for freedom, for people's rights, and for respect for their sovereign choices. NATO enlargement gives them the opportunity to provide collectively for their security in ways that they could not otherwise, in certain cases, achieve. I just think we have to understand that.

Ambassador Kozminski from Poland, we are indeed delighted that you're with us and we'd like to hear your testimony first.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY JERZY KOZMINSKI, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Amb. KOZMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Members of the Commission, I must confess it is a new experience for me to appear before you in this way. My staff and I have observed many Congressional hearings but never before from this chair at the witness table. To be honest, it is not something I thought I would be doing nor would I want to set a precedent. But given the great accomplishments of the Helsinki Commission, especially during the Cold War era, and in recognition of its strong support

for NATO enlargement, I wanted to accede to this request and provide you with information on human rights developments in Poland.

Poland's long and obstinate resistance to and ultimate victory over Communist rule was based exactly on a firm belief in and respect for political and civil liberties. That is why postulates of basic human rights were at the core of the Solidarity movement and the opposition's struggle against an authoritarian regime. In those days, the Helsinki Committee was illegal in Poland and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was published by the underground press.

The bloodless revolution in Poland of 1989, triggering the chain reaction in all of Central Eastern Europe, opened long-awaited opportunity to implement these principles and values.

The human rights dimension was a crucial part of the totality of the reconstruction of the state institutions. It served as a clear guidepost when Poland began to introduce a democratic system and free market economy, launching at the same time an independent foreign policy.

Taking into account the magnitude of this unprecedented task, the enormity of the Communist legacy, the accomplishments are as impressive as they are successful. Although they are a tribute to the efforts and sacrifices of the Polish people, I would like to recognize here the role played by our friends, especially by the United States. So I would like to thank you and, through you, American taxpayers, noting that your assistance was really well used.

Senator D'AMATO. Ambassador, I want to commend you on that enlightened observation and it is so refreshing to hear someone say—excuse me for my interruption but it is so unusual to hear someone say, “I want to thank the Americans and the American taxpayers who are putting up dollars and that they were well used.” That's a wonderful thing. Very refreshing. So let me just commend you.

Amb. KOZMINSKI. Thank you. It's been something more than a political and financial support.

Poland has been able to overcome the inherited macroeconomic disaster and to build a new economy with a dynamic private sector, increasing exports and foreign investments, with GDP rising more than six per cent per annum in recent years.

Poland has established a parliamentary democracy based on a multiparty political system, free elections, and the rule of law with an independent judiciary. Neither the frequent successions of governments nor social and economic tensions and hardships have prevented Poland in any way from conforming with the norms of a free and democratic society. Of particular significance is the implementation and strengthening of control mechanisms, including the Constitutional Tribunal, the Tribunal of State and the Ombudsman's Office for Citizens' Rights as well as the widespread growth of NGOs which now amount to 20,000. The influential Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights conducts investigations without government interference.

One of the pillars of a democratic country is freedom of speech and pluralism in independent media which contribute significantly to the building a better- informed, more tolerant and pluralistic civil society. The explosion of private competing nationwide and local TV, radio stations, as well as print and electronic media is a powerful engine supporting Poland's young democracy.

Critical steps were made to protect rights of minorities which constitute 4 percent of the total population. Apart from establishing favorable conditions to develop actively their distinct identities,

minority organizations are not required to meet the 5 percent threshold of ballots cast to provide minorities with the adequate representation in the Parliament, something I believe is a special solution in the practice of democracies. The process of promoting the rights of Ukrainian, Byelorussian, German and Jewish populations is indeed of historic and moral dimension. It has been directly linked with the establishing of good, neighborly relations with all of Poland's neighbors, including with Germany and Russia.

Of crucial importance is the fact that a new chapter of Polish-Jewish relations has been opened. The history of the Jewish community in Poland was long and rich but half a century ago it was overshadowed by the tragedy of the Holocaust committed by the Hitlerite Nazis on Polish soil. We are all diminished by the horror of the Holocaust. Today in Poland, however, there is an active and growing Jewish community that constitutes an integral part of our civil society.

The latest development is the important law signed by the Polish President on April 15 regarding, among other things, the restitution of Jewish communal property. This law also includes a provision to establish a foundation with the participation of representatives of the World Jewish Restitution Organization.

The crowning act of the Polish transformation is the passage by the National Assembly of a new constitution on which a national referendum has been called for May 25th. A result of long debates to gain the broadest possible consensus, this highest law of the land clearly defines the separation and balance of powers and confirms categorically all human, political and civil rights and liberties. It confirms, among other things, freedom of speech, freedom of religion and conscience, the right of assembly, the right to organize and to strike, the principle of being innocent until proven guilty and the right of habeas corpus.

The new Constitution also reiterates Poland's commitments to fulfill all its international human rights obligations. It is noteworthy to mention the stabilizing role that Poland plays internationally in this respect. In the OSCE Review Conference on human rights held in Vienna in 1996, Poland found itself amidst a group of countries whose record was recognized. The protection of human rights remains also a cornerstone for Poland's participation in the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the entry of Poland and other Central and East European countries into NATO both will reflect our successful transformation and will consolidate respect and promotion of human rights, which results from the very principles of the Euro-Atlantic community. In fact, the mere prospect of the Alliance's membership has been a remarkable stimulus supporting the resolution of various issues in East Central and Eastern Europe including the rights of minorities as an important component of human rights.

Hence, one could say that NATO has managed to play its historic role in our region even before our countries have managed to become NATO members. I believe it's yet another reason why NATO's doors should be wide open today and in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I stand ready in the future to discuss issues of mutual concern with you and other distinguished Commissioners in our personal exchanges of views. Thank you again.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

At this time before I continue to take testimony, I'm going to turn to my Co-Chairman, Congressman Smith. He has an 11:00 hearing at which he is going to be participating and so I'm going to let him pose his questions and make his statements at this point in time. Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask and I will submit in writing questions to each of our very distinguished Ambassadors. I want to thank you. I know mention was made by at least one delegation and I got some letters on this from people in my district.

One of the things that the Helsinki Commission has done for years is invite Ambassadors and people of high rank from the countries that make up the CSCE or the OSCE now to give them an opportunity, a platform to make their case. So I do think it's a very positive thing. Some people took it as a very negative thing that we were inviting some Ambassadors here. Judging by some of the letters I got, I want you to know that that's not the case.

As you know, the hallmark of our government—and it doesn't always hold up under scrutiny though—is transparency. Absolute openness. If we have a disagreement, we put it out on the table rather than under the table and, in the long run, that always, I think, serves all interests involved.

I do have a number of questions. As I indicated, I do regret I do have to go. But I would like to just say for the record, too, that Mr. Ambassador Kozminski, there are some of us who are very concerned frankly that recently Poland reversed itself on its pro-life initiatives that it had made under Lech Walesa's government. I know that there was a tremendous amount of pressure placed on the government to reverse that and to adopt a pro-abortion perspective. Many of us believe that the most fundamental of all human rights is the right to life.

It's interesting that when the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which I signed or gave the speech in support of when I was Bush's delegate to the United Nations, the Polish diplomat was very involved in helping to craft that and right there in the preamble is very strong affirmation language concerning the dignity and the respect that ought to be accorded to unborn children.

The recent reversal of Poland's pro-life laws was seen by many of us as a step backwards in the area of human rights. Not everyone agrees that protecting the unborn is a human rights issue. I think, just like in the slavery issue, some day that will be seen as self evident and really a no-brainer. That birth is an event that happens to all of us is not the beginning of life and those unborn children are deserving of respect and the violence of abortion, whether it be what we're discussing in the Senate and House, partial birth abortion where the brains are literally sucked out and shame on the United States for its lack of compassion and respect for those babies. But it was seen by many of us as a step backwards when Poland adopted a very pro-abortion law, most recently the latter part of last year.

Again, I do have a number of questions that I would like to pose and I will do it writing to all of you distinguished Ambassadors.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Congressman.

At this time, I'd like to recognize Ambassador Eidintas of Lithuania. I think it's interesting. It wasn't that many years ago when I sought entry into Lithuania at the invitation of your Foreign Minister and then Prime Minister. The Russians at the border stopped us; they did not want to recognize the sovereignty of the people of Lithuania. It was a great battle, courageous, led by people power. I think it was Mr. Landsbergis who was then the President and it was a demonstration of the will of people to

overcome the fire power of the armies. Just let me say that who would have thought, again within such a relatively short period of time, that we would be here and discussing the issue of your joining, of Lithuania joining NATO. Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY ALFONSAS EIDINTAS, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Amb. EIDINTAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and for your legendary trip in 1990 which was a significant signal that many, many people and famous people support us in this difficult period.

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Members of the Commission, it gives me great satisfaction today in front of such a distinguished audience to be able to speak of my country's motivation to join North Atlantic Alliance. It is extremely significant that Lithuania is here today with our closest traditional regional partners, Latvia, Estonia and, I would like to stress, Poland. Whereas this is a very positive grouping of NATO candidates, unlike others which artificially separate us from Poland and other Central and East European states. Whatever the reason might be for today's arrangement, I feel it's a wise precedent.

Lithuania's sensitivity to such apparent technicalities may seem surprising but for us, it's a matter of principle. U.S. policy never recognized our incorporation into the Soviet Union. Now, in striving for NATO membership, we do not want to be included in the group of former Soviet Republics. Our cultural and historic experience is firmly rooted in Europe, in Western tradition. Guided by the conviction that we shared the same values, face the same challenges, have the same vision of Europe's future, we come today to the community of Western democracies.

Since regaining its independence, Lithuania has joined the effort to reinforce European security and cooperation. We consider the Helsinki Final Act an historic contribution to peace and cooperation in Europe.

I can say with a great satisfaction that Lithuania enjoys good relations with all of its neighbors, Latvia, Belarus, Poland and the Kaliningrad region of Russia. We cannot afford disputes with our neighbors and this has been the consistent policy of successive governments. We have signed border agreements with Latvia and Belarus. Negotiations with Russia on the limitation of the border with the Kaliningrad region are almost finished. Poland and Lithuania extended mutual recognition of borders in the 1994 Lithuanian-Polish Treaty. We are working together very closely with our traditional border partners of Latvia and Estonia and our historical regional partner, Poland.

The common goal of a democratic and indivisible Europe has helped Lithuania and Poland to overcome longstanding tensions and sensitivities. As a member of the international community, Lithuania has inherent rights as well as responsibilities. Yes, we can express concern about anti-democratic developments in Belarus and about a concentration of Russian military forces near our border in the Kaliningrad region. When we see a threat to our independence, we will make it known. But we strongly believe that only through dialog and negotiation can the nations of Europe find mutually acceptable solutions. Also, the involvement of the international community can safeguard the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of states.

Our deepening cooperation with all of our neighbors makes us optimistic about the future relationship with them. The Russian people, for example, consider us as a good neighbor. I would like to point out that a recent poll conducted by the Center for International Sociological Investigation in

Russia showed that 70 percent of the Russian people regard NATO membership for Lithuania as an internal matter for the Lithuanians and only 22 percent predicted a worsening of Lithuanian-Russian relations if Lithuania joins NATO.

Because this Commission's main concern is the preservation and advancement of human rights, I would like to take a moment to comment on the human rights situation in my country. Lithuanian legislation is in line with the European norms of human rights including guarantees for national minority rights. Today no ethnic tensions are evident in Lithuania. All permanent residents of Lithuania have the opportunity to acquire Lithuanian citizenship. All citizens have the right to foster their culture, practice their religion, speak their own language. Lithuania has further guaranteed these rights by acceding to international human rights documents including them in treaty signed with its neighbors.

The Constitution provides for state support of ethnic communities. National minorities have the right to their own educational institutions. Lithuanian public schools have complete programs of education or at least certain courses taught in Russian, Polish, Byelorussian and Ukrainian. Other groups, Jews, Armenians, Germans, Kurds, Tatars, and Greeks, have schools for instruction in their languages. In the current school year, almost 14 percent of all school children attend the schools with languages of instruction other than Lithuanian. Ethnic minorities comprise about 19 percent of Lithuania's total population.

National minorities also have their own media. There are 34 periodicals in Russian, eight in Polish, and many bilingual publications in a variety of languages. Lithuanian state radio and television have programs in Russian, Polish, Tatar, German, Byelorussian and Ukrainian.

The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities visited Lithuania only once in January '93 and recorded no significant violations. Since 1990, Lithuania has been continuing and deepening democratic reform. Our Constitution enshrines basic human rights, free speech and freedom of assembly. We have had two peaceful changes of government after democratic parliamentary elections. The responsibilities of local governments have been increased. I would like to stress that democratic civilian control of the Lithuanian armed forces is assured. Only civilians may occupy the post of Minister of National Defense and the Commander of the Armed Forces is subordinate to this Minister. The government, the Minister of National Defense, and the Armed Forces Commander are accountable to Parliament.

Last but not least, I would like to remind you that Lithuania has successfully carried out deep economic reform. We are now starting to bear the fruits of our efforts, as evidenced by the fact that our GDP is again growing and yearly inflation continues to fall.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I said at the beginning. Lithuania shares the western values of democracy, rule of law, and free market. We share the vision of a peaceful and secure Europe in which NATO is an integral part. As members of NATO, we'll make a lasting contribution to the peace, security, and prosperity in Europe and the larger trans-Atlantic community.

Thank you very much.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you.

Ambassador Stoicescu of Estonia. Mr. Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY GRIGORE KALEV STOICESCU, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Amb. STOICESCU. Thank you, Chairman, distinguished members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to outline my country's vision on the record of fulfillment of Estonian obligations and commitments under the Helsinki Final Act. It is also an unusual setting for us but, nevertheless, thank you for this opportunity.

Today's hearings, in light of the NATO enlargement, for the sake of brevity, and keeping in mind the focus of the OSCE commitments, in my introduction I would not touch upon Estonian policy regarding enlargement and Estonia's determination to join the Alliance. I can only assure you that this policy has not changed and is not going to change. But if there are any questions, I will be happy to answer to them.

The liberation of the Baltic States, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and the accession of many independent states with the CSCE all occurred just a short while before the Helsinki meeting in the spring of 1992 and influenced the decisions that were taken there. The challenges of change and the subsequent Stockholm Council Meeting gave Europe new instruments of preventive diplomacy as well as freer hands in crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

In December 1992 in Stockholm, Estonia was one of the first countries to invite a CSCE mission onto its territory. With the restoration of its independence, Estonia began confirming and updating its border agreements according to principles of the Helsinki Final Act. Estonia has no territorial claims or disputes with its neighboring countries. For Estonia, the Estonian-Latvian Sea Border Agreement highlights the success of regional cooperation and the importance that Estonia places on strengthening relations with all its neighbors.

Estonia looks forward to the conclusion of agreement between the Republic of Estonia and the Russian Federation on the Estonian-Russian state border without any delays and linkage to irrelevant issues in this regard. The text of the agreement was already agreed, in fact, several times, in October and November 1996 and a corresponding joint protocol was signed by the heads of both delegations. There was also an agreement between the foreign ministers of the two countries reconfirming this agreement.

Estonia is today a state governed by the rule of law functioning democratic institutions and a fully effective balance of powers between the executive branch, the legislature and the judiciary. In our country, all the practical groundwork necessary for the successful integration of a large population of foreign origin such as the provision of residency permits and travel documents, etcetera, is in its final stages.

The integration process has been a challenging undertaking, however. It has also not been the only undertaking which Estonia has been dealing with. In the last 5 years, the primary focus has been on reintegration with Europe. The Western values and trans-Atlantic structures of which integrating the non-Estonian population into our society has been one part of the huge dangers affecting all Estonians. The OSCE mission has fulfilled a highly praiseworthy role by offering advice, monitoring the integration process, and publicizing Estonia's adherence to the advice that other states of the OSCE have given us.

As I said, when I performed previously the duties of Ambassador to the OSCE for Estonia, I highly praise the role of the United States.

Estonia has followed a consistent and close policy to integrate those residents who are not Estonian citizens. Since 1992, Estonia's governments have held a firm position on the right of these people to choose their citizenship, to choose it voluntarily, and have maintained the belief that citizenship cannot be forced on anyone. For those people now living in Estonia but holding only documents of the former Soviet Union, consecutive governments have provided the means by which their legal status is defined and their human rights are persuaded. If people do not apply for Estonian citizenship or have not chosen which citizenship they wish to hold, they are still given a clear legal status in Estonia. Estonia's constitution and legal acts such as the law on aliens provide the legal status for the preservation of their human rights.

Over 200,000 people have registered their mass support for this important legal provision by applying for the residency permits as specified by the law on aliens. On March 11, 1997, the government created an amendment to the law on aliens. According to this amendment, people who have applied for temporary residence permit before July 12, 1995, will be eligible for permanent residence permits starting in the summer of 1998. Residents without Estonian citizenship are entitled to take part in the political process.

Importantly, citizens of other states or those who have not yet chosen their citizenship have the right to vote in local government if they are permanent residents or have applied for their residency permits. Estonia is one of the limited number of states where such an opportunity exists.

In addition to that, from the beginning of April 1997 a special advisor to the Prime Minister was appointed on inter-ethnic relations. The new advisor's tasks include helping to resolve the problems of social integration of non-ethnic Estonians and matters related to the termination of the legal status of the Russian speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you Estonia will continue the process of the integration of non-Estonian citizens through a modern democratic process. I thank you very much.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Kalnins from Latvia. Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY OJARS KALNINS, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA

Amb. KALNINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to express my appreciation for this opportunity to speak on behalf of Latvia. This means a great deal to me personally because Latvia has had a longstanding relationship with the Helsinki process and with the Commission and the staff members who did a great deal in Latvia long before we established our independence. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of you personally for the contribution that you made in that struggle.

I'd also like to use this opportunity to express my condolences to the family and colleagues of Sam Wise. I had the privilege of working with Sam and I'd like to say here that he was a very true friend of Latvia and we will miss him.

Senator D'AMATO. Yes, he was a true friend of freedom.

Amb. KALNINS. Yes.

The restoration of independence in Latvia in 1991 was an event of enormous significance, not only to the people of Latvia but to Europe and the international community as a whole. While many viewed this period 6 years ago as the end of the cold war, for Latvia this finally signalled the end of World War II itself. We have restored our rightful independence, regained our sovereignty, and launched our first steps on the road back to the western community of democratic nations.

From the outset, Latvia's foreign policy priorities have been clear. Our cultural and historical identity compels us to return to the Europe of which we have always been an integral part. Our geopolitical situation compels us to equally full integration into trans-Atlantic security structures as well as developing a good and mutually beneficial relationship with Russia.

Toward this end, Latvia became a signatory of the Helsinki Accords and a committed member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Latvia's relationship with the OSCE has been a special one for the Helsinki process played an invaluable role in promoting fundamental human rights in Latvia long before we became OSCE members.

The Republic of Latvia's commitment to the Helsinki process came naturally for the principles, norms, and standards embodied in the Helsinki Final Act were also the guiding principles of our nation and government. Since 1991, Latvia has had two parliamentary elections and five governments and all have consistently demonstrated their commitment to the implementation of OSCE commitments.

During that time, we have established laws in a national framework for the observance and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. We have signed the European Convention on Human Rights, worked actively with U.N. human rights agencies, and in 1995 became one of the first countries in the world to establish an independent national human rights office based on the recommendations of the Vienna Conference on Human Rights.

Latvia's laws on citizenship and naturalization were developed in consultation with various international organizations including the OSCE and now offer the possibility of naturalization for nearly all of Latvia's permanent residents. In addition, Latvia has no outstanding territorial claims nor disputes and looks forward to a conclusion of an agreement between the Republic of Latvia and the Russian Federation on the Latvia-Russia state border.

Latvia is grateful to the OSCE for the work of the OSCE mission which has been operating in Latvia since 1993. This mission has been invaluable in advising the government on citizenship and other issues and has played a critical role in monitoring the implementation of the Latvian-Russian Agreement concerning the disposition of the Skunda radar facility and the status of Russian military pensioners.

We welcome the recent statement made by OSCE Chairman and office, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Mr. Flavio Cotti, wherein he announced that the role of the OSCE mission in Latvia has been largely completed. We are now working with OSCE in reviewing ways in which the role of this mission can be transformed and adjusted to the realities. We believe that the successful completion of the work of the OSCE mission in Latvia serves as testimony to the effectiveness of the

OSCE as an organization. It demonstrates that through OSCE involvement problems can be resolved in a constructive manner. Latvia has been living proof that the Helsinki process works.

The success also demonstrates Latvia's real commitment to OSCE principles and its readiness to become fully engaged in all aspects of new European and trans-Atlantic security structures. It is for this reason that Latvia seeks membership in the European Union and specifically the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If the goal of NATO enlargement is to increase security and stability in an undivided Europe, then it is the goal of Latvia to play an active and constructive role in building this new security architecture.

Latvia seeks to be a provider of security, not simply a consumer. Only by being an integral part of the European security structure can we contribute our fair share. We have already demonstrated our willingness and capabilities in this regard by contributing troops to the IFOR and SFOR operations in Bosnia and will continue to do so in the future. We are also active participants in all aspects of Partnership for Peace and welcome the expanded role envisioned for this program.

Ultimately, however, we seek full membership in NATO. For Latvia and for Europe, there is no other alternative if European security, stability, and integration is sought. While we see no reason why Latvia and its neighboring states of Estonia and Lithuania cannot be candidates for the first round of NATO enlargement, we believe that practical cooperation between NATO and its Baltic partners after Madrid is even more important than the order of admission into NATO.

It is our hope that the U.S. Congress and the Administration will focus on this critical post-Madrid phase of NATO enlargement. Latvia has been joined by other candidate countries in offering initiatives that ensure not only that the door to NATO remains open but that new linkages and deeper ties be established between NATO and candidate countries. Supporters of NATO enlargement have stated that Madrid should be the beginning and not the end of the NATO enlargement process.

If this process has an end, that end should be a secure and undivided Europe. What is needed then is a clear understanding of the means that will enable all of us to reach that end. We need a roadmap and signposts that will tell us that we are moving in the right direction and that we are on the correct path to reach our goal.

In November of last year, U.S. Ambassador to Sweden Thomas Siebert stated, and I quote, "For my government, the question of NATO membership for the Baltic States is not if but when. We are firmly committed to helping them prepare for NATO membership and take this commitment very seriously."

Latvia also takes this commitment very seriously and welcomes this pledge of support. It would only add to the question of when the equally critical question of how. That is why it is of crucial importance that regardless of who receives the first invitations in Madrid that: 1) Latvia be provided a clear perspective for its future membership, 2) a framework be established for relations between candidate countries and the Alliance after Madrid and 3) that clear and uniform criteria be established for membership. The security and stability of Europe must be based on engagement, inclusion, and integration.

Since 1991, Latvia has been fully engaged and it is up to the West to include us in all future security arrangements so that the full integration of Europe can be successfully completed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Let me ask this question of all of you. I'm not going to include Poland in this. Three of you. As it relates to the question of the various ethnic groups that are in your country. I think some progress, it's fair to say substantial progress, has been made but how big a problem is it? Do you see outside forces contributing? Is it maybe the fear of the Russians that you will become part of NATO? How big is that fear on the part of the Russians? Does that exacerbate the problem and what do you see and what are you doing to deal with this? I'm talking about the Russian ethnic communities within your countries.

Mr. Ambassador.

Amb. EIDINTAS. Yes. We have not very large ethnic Russian community in Lithuania. It's 8 percent of the population. More than 90 percent of them are citizens of Lithuania so they are equal as Lithuanians and others in all respects. There's no problems indeed and they are pretty well integrated in Lithuanian community.

Senator D'AMATO. You're saying of the 8 percent, 90 percent are Lithuanian citizens.

Amb. EIDINTAS. Yes. From those eight.

Senator D'AMATO. Yes. OK.

Amb. EIDINTAS. So they are citizens and indeed we're trying to solve all the problems which appear. They have schools, as I said in my statement. I cannot feel any possibility of foreign involvement or activating this community against Lithuania's law or government. Everything goes pretty well in this area in our country and even some small groups, just former Communist party members, are not connected with some foreign or Communistic movement forces in CIS countries. But it's a very small group so it doesn't matter.

Senator D'AMATO. You are making progress, real progress.

Amb. EIDINTAS. Yes. I think that our citizenship laws which provide the possibility to acquire citizenship to them from the first day of the independence. We made a great step integrating the people and most of them speak Lithuanian. It's also very positive. They can be invited to governmental positions, to administration. So I cannot see any problems in this field.

Senator D'AMATO. I think it's just important for two reasons. No. 1, not to create an opportunity to be in opposition, joining NATO. No. 2, maybe even more importantly is the fact that repression that all of the captive people lived under and various nationals lived under for so many years is something that we don't want to inflict upon others. Now that the dynamics have switched, I think we should learn by the past experiences of how it was to be repressed and how those who are most victimized are people who were within their own country didn't have their rights and were treated as non-citizens.

So it's very difficult, I think, at times when people have lived under injustice to be forgiving but it is so important that the country's government move in that direction so that we can as we move into this new century with a whole new and different attitude, one of respect and support of the minority communities, the ethnic communities, respect for their rights because we saw our own rights being trampled.

Ambassador Kalnins, is there anything you'd like to add to that? How real is the Russian concern, do you feel, in terms of a threat to them, to their security when your country joins NATO?

Amb. KALNINS. I think when you talk about Russian concern, you have to distinguish between Russians in Moscow and Russians in Latvia. The Russians in Latvia have no concerns. Thirty percent of the population is ethnic Russian and about 40 percent of them are citizens already. The rest all have an opportunity to acquire citizenship. Not all choose to do so, but all have basically the same civil rights, human rights, that citizens do.

But what we've noticed is that most of the Russians in Latvia have no interest either in returning to Russia or going anywhere else. Economically, they're doing very well. I think they're very comfortable in Latvia. They enjoy the same rights. For example, in Riga there are more Russian language high schools than Latvian language schools and about 150 Russian language schools in Latvia as a whole. We teach middle education in eight different languages in Latvia. All of the major minorities are represented. We have very active minority organizations and associations so that you really don't hear complaints from the groups within Latvia.

The complaints seem to come from people outside, who have a different motivation and, although there hasn't been a poll taken, my guess is that if you were to poll all the residents of a country like Latvia, regardless of their ethnicity, they would all welcome the security that an organization like NATO would offer.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador.

Amb. STOICESCU. Thank you, Chairman. You have asked first how big a problem is this. It is not a big problem. There are indeed certain difficulties we have inherited—the beginning of the '90s from the past and this is a time-consuming process of integrating the population of foreign origin into our society. Still, the situation in Estonia is stable, as you know, even in areas mostly populated by Russians.

I may also put it that the difference in the standard of living that is seen on one side and the other side of the River of Narva is quite eloquent and, according to opinion polls, less than 2 percent of the population of foreign origin would prefer to leave the country and even of these, less than 2 percent, the majority not for Russia but rather to go to a Western country and it is more than obvious that there are no political needs they would ask for but rather everyday needs as do have many Estonians.

We are in a deep process of transformation of radical reforms that affect our entire population, notwithstanding ethnicity or citizenship. The economic rights are the same for the entire population.

You also asked if we do have kind of a fear of Russian interference. I don't know how to answer. We are a small neighboring country of Russia and it all depends on how Russia will develop on the path to becoming a more or less democratic country or not and on that will depend the situation not only in the Baltic area but far beyond. So the consequences will be far larger than just affecting Estonia.

What are our prospects in this sense? You asked what will you do with them. Well, I explained in our presentation that our policy is the policy of integrating these people into the Estonian society. The aspect of language teaching is very relevant. I can bring you examples of how many language training

centers that are functioning now in Estonia, about 30, about possibilities of having free of charge consultations for elderly people, for instance, for pensioners before passing the oral test. They don't have to pass the written test for naturalization and so on and so forth. So it's one thing that we call in one name a policy of integration. Thank you.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Kozminski, the Helsinki Commission in the past has voiced its concern regarding the retention of the Communist era criminal defamation law. I understand that your Congress has been in the process of making revisions to that law. When do you see that happening? That is the law that really imperils free speech and makes it possible to bring criminal charges against people for being critical of various government policies. I understand that the president is pushing to end that law, to terminate that law. When do you believe that will take place?

Amb. KOZMINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess that you are probably referring to article 270 of our Polish Criminal Code. Actually, right now there is a session of Polish Senate which is discussing the issue, and certainly, I cannot predict what is going to be the result of the proceedings but in general, I might say that the lower chamber of Polish Parliament (which is Sejm), has adopted a new criminal code. It has not entered into force yet because it's now to be finally confirmed by the Senate (the upper chamber of the Parliament) and then by the President.

However, the concept of freedom of expression which has been made public in recent days has been preserved in this new bill. Let me say what is a source of some misinterpretation surrounding the discussion about this. There is a provision which has to do with a restriction related to defamation and not with a restriction related to the freedom of expression. This article which is now being discussed does not restrict nor penalize the exercise of freedom of expression. Rather, it's directed against extreme situations of defamation. However, in practice there is no criminalization of public criticism made in non-abusive language, even if it may offend the state, its organs or any sector of the population.

But as a matter of fact, under the Communist system, this particular article was directed to penalize open criticism of public and political authorities. It had, for example, a notion of "political system," which was not to be criticized. Of course, it's not valid any more because this would question the very core of the freedom of expression, that is, if we didn't have the right to criticize the system.

So at present, I would say that prerequisites and notions used in this code such as public insult, scoff, and degrade, are rather interpreted and conceived as synonymous to defamation.

I might add the second point, namely that the construction of this regulation is deeply rooted in European traditions, and this concept is best reflected, as I understand it, though I'm not an expert in it, in one of the articles of the European Convention on Human Rights as well as in the case law development by the European Commission and Court of Human Rights.

It also might be interesting to remember that in Europe there are cases like, for example, those examined by the European Court of Human Rights, which are on the brink of defamation and restriction of freedom of expression. But when the European Court of Human Rights does examine such cases, it tends to recognize that the requirements of protection of reputation have to be somehow balanced against the interest of an open political discussion. Thus the practice is that acceptable criti-

cism is wider with regard to politicians than in relation to private persons. I believe this is the same spirit which is going to prevail in Poland and which does prevail in Poland.

Senator D'AMATO. Very good. I think it's important to make those distinctions and to indicate what the practice is now but I do think you need some recodification because there will be people who'll be looking to see if this law is still on the books and asking what could be the potential for misapplication or misuse of this law.

Let me say this, Mr. Ambassador. I want to note that the fact that Poland is right now engaged in very active negotiations with the Jewish community concerning the conditions around Auschwitz and I understand that those negotiations, while not yet concluded, are going very well, and I want to commend you for your effort and for the effort of the Polish government in undertaking this. Let me say that your effort has been observed and will continue to be observed and we applaud you for moving forward in that spirit.

Amb. KOZMINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe it's really an important long-term program. It was launched a year ago by the Polish President during his visit to the Holocaust Memorial Museum here and the first agreement was hammered out between the President of Poland and Mr. Miles Lerman, Chairman of the Holocaust Memorial Council, to go ahead with a long term program which was called "Auschwitz Program" and which is now the subject of discussion between, on the one hand, Polish national and local authorities and, on the other, by representatives of Jewish organizations such as the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, International Council of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau, Ronald Lauder Foundation and, of course, United States Holocaust Memorial Council, as well as Yad Vashem and World Jewish Congress.

So these are the partners of the process. A month ago there was a meeting of representatives of those organizations in Warsaw in which they did discuss the principles, how to go ahead with this program and they agreed the most important prerequisites as well as the most important guidelines for the future, and I believe that this process is getting its dynamics.

Senator D'AMATO. Well, let me commend you for this effort and urge you to continue. It has been noted. We are cognizant of it and I think it is important and it's a contribution to, I think, dealing with so many of the hurts that have existed for so long and it makes a very positive contribution.

Let me ask all of you one last question. How serious do you think the Russian opposition to your country's joining NATO is? How serious? Does it come from just Moscow? Do you view them as determined to block? Is there a real fear that somehow this is perceived as a loss to them and a victory, as I mentioned initially, for the WEST?

Ambassador, we'll start and go right across.

Amb. KALNINS. I think, based on polls that I've seen of public opinion in Russia, it appears that most Russians don't have an attitude about NATO as such and perhaps have even less an attitude about whether the Baltic States were to join or not. It would seem that the objections do come largely from Moscow for various reasons. When I think about that, I think back 10 years ago when we were struggling for independence and we were told then by the Soviet government that the idea of Baltic independence was totally unacceptable, out of the question and, as I think someone once said, over our dead body. Well, 10 years have passed. The Baltic States are alive and well. The Soviet Union is no more.

I think the degree of Russian objection to Baltic membership in NATO is perhaps directly related to the degree of support that the Baltic States get in the WEST or inversely related to that. I think that certain politicians in Moscow believe that if there is a lack of support for the Baltic States in the WEST that perhaps this process can be stopped, but if it's made known that this is inevitable, that the Baltic States are indeed an integral part of Europe and that this is not a threat to Russia because we seek to establish normal ties. Economically, we all have a lot to benefit from these ties. I see no reason why it can't be accepted very quickly in Russia that this is just a natural course of European integration.

Senator D'AMATO. Ambassador Eidintas.

Amb. EIDINTAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I mentioned in my testimony that according to polls 70 percent of the Russian people regard NATO membership of Lithuania as an internal matter of the Lithuanians. It's very important because Russia is under great change and we are optimistic that it will go along the democratic way.

On the other hand, Lithuania and Russia signed in July 1991 a treaty, and in one article of the treaty Russia agreed that Lithuania is a sovereign country and Lithuania is capable, has the right to choose the system of collective security that she wants. So formally, it's done so, Russia is not against Lithuania choosing the security system which we want. We want to be a NATO member so it's done.

But today's Russian Government opposes our right and its motivation I think is inappropriate for us. Motivation on the part of the former Soviet Union, former Republics of the Soviet Union. Because of U.S. nonrecognition policy—thank you very much for that—Baltic states were never recognized as a part of Soviet Union. We are not part of former Soviet Union, so we have arrived and we have all political parties' solution to go into that direction, and our opponents, of course we will discuss with them. We're working very closely with Russian government and with the Kaliningrad region, so I think that we will find common understanding and they will not fear our membership in NATO.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Kozminski.

Amb. KOZMINSKI. Thank you. My colleagues have already mentioned the difference between society and politicians. I do recognize the same difference as I'm looking at public opinion polls coming from Russia.

Secondly, talking about elites, about politicians. I would say there is probably a combination of various components in their motivation. I would distinguish two.

The first has to do NATO enlargement can be an important factor in internal debates, or even our struggle. Second, what is important, there are some politicians who really would like to keep the prospect open—"just in case," the prospect which has to do with the security vacuum existing in Central and Eastern Europe. These are the politicians who are still clinging to the previous notions of the past. Thirdly, I believe and I think it's also shared by our aspiring countries that the NATO enlargement, though it might be surprising to some, may open a new chapter of better relations between Poland and Russia and between Central and East European countries and Russia. Why?

On the one hand, it would certainly bring closer the zone of stability, security, harmony and prosperity to Russian borders. Second, NATO enlargement also would scuttle the hopes to derail the

process. It would remove the only contentious point which does exist in relations between those countries. And it would also scuttle the hopes of those politicians, to whom I referred to possibly regain some time in the future Moscow's control over its former satellites. Well, we know that such ambitions do not pose any danger today. However, they might influence future policy.

This is why the NATO enlargement, in conclusion, may open a new chapter of better relations between our countries—Joining NATO and having joined NATO—and Russia.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Stoicescu.

Amb. STOICESCU. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When you asked how serious is the Russian opposition, it's good to hear that a high representative of the United States asked either for advice or our opinion from small Estonia, but it's a very serious question, I must say.

Senator D'AMATO. Oh, it's a serious question. It is.

Amb. STOICESCU. It is a crucial question, I believe, and what I can say is that they—I mean the Russians, will never like the idea of enlarging NATO. But they will live with it, I think, within a large NATO, including the Baltics, including Poland, including other countries. I believe they are enough pragmatic besides being emotional to adapt themselves to new emerging realities as they evolve. It's not easy to run repeatedly against a wall when the door is open. The elite in Moscow will also change in time, both the military and the political ones.

Clearly, to say the last word, they do not have valid arguments to oppose in fact our own freedom of choice.

Senator D'AMATO. I want to thank all the Ambassadors. Let me make this clear before we end. I believe and this Commission will take a formal vote and I will submit a report to all of the members at a subsequent meeting so that there is no doubt about it that I am totally committed and would hope to see all of the nations that you represent admitted in the first round. It is important that we send a message, a clear message, that we will not allow a handful of political leaders and/or military leaders to derail the process of freedom and of security and one that brings about human rights and protects the dignity of men and women. This is what we are about.

I would note that all of you in your own way have stated very clearly that we were not cowed by the opposing military forces. They were real and I want to tell you it's not easy when you see someone who's got a submachine gun that he's carrying and he tells you no, you cannot go here or there. I just saw a little bit of that when I went to Lithuania. Things were improving because people had begun to move en masse.

So it would seem to me that the friends of democracy should at this time be more determined. I wonder sometimes how it is that it seems that we could be less determined when we have come so far from where we were before—when the wall of opposition was so formidable and you actually saw the tanks. We knew of the oppression and we knew of the people who were martyred and killed. Of the people who were jailed and tortured, for fighting for their independence and their right to conduct their own country as they saw fit, as opposed to living under foreign domination.

It sometimes seems to me that we forget very easily. So we have a handful of leaders saying oh, no, we will be opposed to this. Well, if we had bowed to that kind of opposition in the past, I suggest we would have no freedom, no rights for all of the people who now have opportunity and are living in freedom, regardless of what the makeup or composition of that community was. I remember, again going back to the late '70s and the '80s, marching for independence and people basically thought, they said, what are these characters doing? It was a well-kept secret that the United States never recognized the Baltic nations' incorporation into the Soviet Union. But if you asked the average citizen, he wouldn't have known that. They didn't know that.

So we've come a long way and now is not the time to be less vigilant. It is the time to redouble our efforts to go forward. So I want you to know that this is the first of a series of hearings that we will be holding with respect to this process and I believe that now is the time to go to those in our government and to our allies and to be very strong and to see to it that some of our allies support your membership—because I'm concerned about them, as well. They've always had a happy facility of looking the other way. They've always said, don't rock the boat.

They didn't want Poland to rock the boat. When the people of Poland were fighting for their freedom, I remember Lech Walesa's words so well and I'll paraphrase him. He said, you were asking, "What are those crazy Poles doing? Why are they doing this?" He said, "Well, it's easy for you because you are free. So here we are, we're not free and yet you will criticize us for so-called rocking the boat and creating problems."

That should be a great lesson. It is so easy for those who have their freedom, who have their security, to say, oh, my gosh, we shouldn't be creating instability because these people now want to join NATO and, after all, this may imperil our relationship whether it's with the Russians or someone else. I never heard of that. Well, I did hear of that but it's not something that we should be signing on to and so I urge you to carry that message as well.

This is not the time to shrink back. I have to tell you I would probably set up a diplomatic revolution if I mentioned some of our so-called—yes, our allies who are always worshipping at the altar of political expediency, generally to keep trade and keeping business relationships, etcetera, going. What's the difference? Sure, they have their freedom. They have their security. So why disturb any existing relationships or their comfort factor?

So I would hope that we would reinvigorate all of our communities, both the ethnic communities here and our allies, to say that this is not a time to shrink from our obligations. If we had, we would not be here today, your people, your countries would not enjoy the freedom that we have today. We should never take that for granted. I am probably preaching to the wrong group, and I am not really preaching. I'm just suggesting that we look at our collective experiences—if we reflect back over a time, none of the gains came easily. There were lives lost, there were great sacrifices, and now is not the time to retreat.

I thank each and every one of you for coming. I thank your countries and your leaders for moving forward in this endeavor and we look forward to seeing your countries in NATO. The Commission as a commission and as individuals, and I know I speak for all of my members, all of my colleagues in a bipartisan way to say that we look forward to working with you to accomplish this goal.

In the fullness of time, I think it will provide the kind of security, both economically and in terms of guaranteeing the freedoms of all of our people through this collective security pact that is the highest form of organization to guarantee individual rights and also responsibilities.

Thank you again. We stand in recess.

(The hearing was concluded at 11:42 a.m.)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE ALFONSE D'AMATO

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

APRIL 24, 1997

Welcome to the first in a series of Helsinki Commission hearings on the subject of NATO enlargement. Today, the Commission will hear from official representatives of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on their country's views on the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO is scheduled to announce at its July 8th and 9th summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, which candidate states will be invited to engage in negotiations leading to accession of these states to the Washington Treaty by 1999. Each of the states that have expressed interest in consideration for accession are participating states in the Organization For Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We have invited official representatives of states to present their own positions to the Commission to help meet the Commission's responsibility to the Congress and the American people to oversee implementation of the Helsinki Accords and subsequent Helsinki process documents, with a particular emphasis on human rights and humanitarian affairs. Congress and NATO have both recognized the significance of candidate states' compliance with OSCE principles in various official documents.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is intended to focus specifically on how well these candidate states have implemented OSCE agreements and complied with OSCE principles. We will ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance into NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas, who will examine those issues more thoroughly and with greater expertise.

Let me make it very clear that I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think that, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet the standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it is very important that the United States, and our NATO allies, make very clear to those states not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so that they can join when they are ready.

If we do not do this, we are making a great mistake. We run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the eastern European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

We must not create in eastern Europe a gray zone between NATO and Russia where the old "spheres of influence" and "balance of power politics" could give rise to lasting political instability, poverty, and isolation. Also, this means that any NATO - Russia "charter" must not create a group of "second class" NATO members whose security guarantees are diluted and undermined.

Ambassador Kalnins from Latvia, Ambassador Eidintas from the Republic of Lithuania, Ambassador Kozminski from the Republic of Poland, and Ambassador Stoicescu from Estonia are here this morning to present their governments' positions on NATO enlargement. I extend to each of you a warm welcome and say that we look forward to hearing your views.

While we will ask direct questions concerning OSCE compliance and implementation during the course of this morning's hearing, and these questions will address matters that are sensitive and sometimes controversial in the domestic politics of your countries, this does not mean that we are critical of your bids to join NATO. It does mean that we are very serious about candidate states actually meeting standards.

I am personally a supporter of including each of your countries in NATO. I think that Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia should each be included in NATO.

This morning, you each have the opportunity to explain to this Commission, to Congress, and to the American people why your country should be invited to join NATO. We are very interested in hearing these explanations directly from official representatives of candidate countries.

Finally, before we do hear from each of you, I want to address the question of Russia and her security concerns. NATO enlargement does not threaten Russia's security. An eastern Europe without NATO would threaten Russia's security by preventing Russia from changing its thinking about NATO and about European political and economic relations.

An eastern Europe without NATO would become a black hole of unrest, poverty, ethnic conflict, and extremism of worst kinds. This would likely keep Russian policy locked into Cold War, if not Czarist, patterns, drawing continuous overt and covert intervention in the affairs of the states in this area, pushing Russia to rebuild its military machine and deploy it westward, and triggering U.S. and allied reaction.

NATO expansion is good for Russia. The sooner the Russian foreign policy elite recognizes that fact, the sooner Russian energies can be focused on successful political and economic reform in Russia. Russia should be pleased that one of its strategic flanks will be secured by a strong defensive alliance.

Russia should take note that the political, economic, military, and foreign policy changes NATO is demanding of successful candidate states will build stable, democratic, free market countries that will not themselves engage in aggression against Russia and that will not allow themselves to become participants in some other state's aggressive designs.

The Russian foreign policy elites should climb up in the Kremlin's towers and look hard at the situations on Russia's other borders. Is it truly in Russia's best long term interests to make eastern Europe unstable and economically backward? After the experiences of Afghanistan and Chechnya, does Russia really think that the main threat to its independence and territorial integrity comes from NATO?

I have a question for Russia's leaders - when you get into trouble, who can you call upon for help? Recent reports of closer relations between Russia and China should not lead to the conclusion that Russia has a friend or an ally in China.

The only nations Russia can count on for help are the nations with the capacity to help. The only nations with that capacity are the developed nations of the West, the most powerful of whom are NATO members, and Japan.

For that help to be available, Russia needs to press ahead with the same agenda of reforms that the NATO candidate states are now addressing. It would be far easier to convince the western publics that Russia deserves help if it is a democratic, rule-of-law state with a free market economy.

Russia should not have a veto over NATO enlargement and no state's candidacy should be foreclosed. Russia needs to find leaders who can discard Cold War thinking and stop seeing NATO enlargement as a "victory" for the west and a "defeat" for Russia.

NATO enlargement is good for the United States, good for NATO's current member states, good for the candidate states, and, finally, good for Russia. Perhaps the best part of this enlargement process is not the military security guarantees that go with it to successful candidate states, but the leverage that the enlargement process exerts for basic changes in each candidate state that will result in better, safer, more prosperous lives for each of their citizens.

In closing, I want to briefly say something to those Americans who can trace their roots to Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, or Estonia. Thanks in part to the hopes and beliefs that you would not let die even when times were very bad, and to your hard work in the American political system, these countries are free and independent again, something the "realists" of ten years ago would have said couldn't happen, and would never happen. Keeping the faith, making sure that the U.S. never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, making sure that we supported Solidarity, making your voices heard here in Washington, those were key events that helped pave the way to where we are today. Thank you for your efforts and know that the futures of these countries could have been much worse but for your active support for freedom and human rights in each of them.

Now, I will turn to my distinguished Co-Chairman, Congressman Chris Smith of New Jersey, for any remarks that he might wish to make.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

APRIL 24, 1997

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you for initiating this important and timely series of hearings on Human Rights and the process of NATO enlargement. As we journey from the fall of the Berlin Wall toward the consolidation of democracy in Europe and beyond, the process of NATO enlargement is part of a long-term U.S. and Allied strategy to solidify peace and stability in Europe—a goal critical to our European allies, and, as American sacrifices in two world wars and the Cold War evidence—a vital American security interest as well.

I join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming the distinguished ambassadors of Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Estonia, and recall our visit to the Baltic states in February 1991 in an effort to support the new democratic leaders following the Soviet crackdown in January of that year. I was honored to return in the fall of 1991 as part of the first delegation to visit the Baltic countries following resumption of U.S. diplomatic relations. I look forward to returning to Warsaw in July of this year to attend the Sixth Annual Meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly which is being hosted by the parliament of Poland. I would also note that the OSCE's Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights is located in Warsaw, and that Poland will assume the OSCE chairmanship next year.

I want to emphasize at the outset that NATO enlargement is not a zero-sum game—not for those countries which have expressed an interest in joining the Alliance, nor for those who do not wish to consider membership. The enlargement of NATO is indeed part of a *process* supporting the growth of democracy and the rule of law in the new Europe—a process, the length and breadth of which will be largely determined by the efforts of the new democracies themselves. That process includes the expansion and strengthening of other transatlantic and European organizations such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, whose current 55 member States encompass Europe and the territories of the former Soviet Union, as well as the United States and Canada. The countries represented here today are OSCE participating States.

Significantly, the genesis of this process, the 1995 NATO Study on Enlargement, requires that prospective members will have to have demonstrated a commitment to, and respect for, OSCE principles. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms has been the driving force of the work of the OSCE and its predecessor, the CSCE, in the more than two decades since Helsinki. Respect for individual and human rights is the cornerstone of democracy, without which there can be no real peace and security, and, I submit, without which there can be no long-term economic growth and development as well.

In the exhilarating days following the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the OSCE member States met in Paris to create a Charter for a New Europe. Pledging to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government for our nations, our leaders reaffirmed their commitment to human rights and fundamental freedoms for all people, and decreed that their protection and promotion is the *first* responsibility of government.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore not only appropriate, but critical, that we examine the human rights records of those counties seeking NATO membership, and I look forward to the testimony of our distinguished witnesses.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

HEARING

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1997

The Commission met in room 538 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Chairman, presiding.

Commissioners present: Hon. Alfonse D'Amato, Chairman; Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman; Hon. Jon Christensen, Commissioner.

Witnesses: H.E. Mircea Dan Geoana, Ambassador of Romania; H.E. Alexandr Vondra, Ambassador of the Czech Republic; and H.E. Ernest Petric, Ambassador of the Republic of Slovenia.

Senator D'AMATO. First of all, let me welcome my Co-Chairman, Congressman Smith, and Representative Christensen and ask if they have any opening remarks.

Let me also extend our thanks to the ambassadors from the three countries, Romania, the Czech Republic and Slovenia for being here. We are deeply appreciative and it's good to see all of you again. Ambassador, good to see you.

I'm going to ask my Co-Chairman for his opening remarks, and then Congressman Christensen.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

Mr. SMITH. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to join you in convening this second hearing in our series on human rights and the process of NATO enlargement. As I mentioned in our earlier hearing, I am a strong advocate of NATO enlargement. I was an original co-sponsor of the 1996 NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act, and I vigorously advocate that the human rights records of countries which are and hope to be our NATO allies deserve close scrutiny and monitoring. Congress has indicated in no uncertain terms that the records of NATO hopefuls should be evaluated in light of the obligations and commitments made under the U.N. charter, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act. Not only is this good policy for the sake of the interests of the United States, these commitments are important to the citizens of the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe as well.

In this lead up to the NATO summit in Madrid, it is critically important that the Member States construct—and prepare for agreement at the summit—a clear process for accession to NATO by prospective countries. Regardless of which countries will be designated at Madrid to begin negotiations for accession, other emerging democracies must be assured that as soon as they meet the criteria, such as that set forth in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, that they will be on track for the accession talks.

Mr. Chairman, Slovenia is one of the best candidates for NATO membership in terms of meeting relevant criteria, including its respect for human rights. As part of Yugoslavia, Slovenia was never a member of the Warsaw Pact, and it is a trailblazer in this new era. Perhaps Slovenia's route to NATO membership can serve as a model for its fellow countries in the former Yugoslavia. Slovenia's economic reform and transition advanced smoothly, and its citizens enjoy the highest per capita income of any of the transition countries. Slovenia also creates useful geographic links between Hungary, another

leading candidate, and the rest of the Alliance. Like the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary, Slovenia has already been designated as eligible to receive assistance under Section 203(a) of the Partnership For Peace assistance provision.

I am happy we have before the Commission today, Mr. Chairman, the Czech Ambassador, a man who is known to the Commission from his days as a Charter 77 activist when the Commission was raising his case and others with the hard line Communists in Prague. I would say, parenthetically, I remember meeting with members of Charter 77 in Prague, though several were not able to attend because they had been arrested by the secret police during that particular Helsinki Commission trip.

Mr. Ambassador, you and other human rights monitors are to be commended for the work that you did, and I hope no one ever forgets how much Czech economic prosperity derives from the efforts of those like yourself who struggled to restore democracy to the Czech Republic. Because of people like you and President Havel, your country is on track for NATO membership today.

Of course, that does not mean that the Commission does not have some human rights concerns about the Czech Republic. Frankly, Mr. Ambassador, I am disappointed that Czech officials have not shown greater sensitivity to some of these issues, given the firsthand experience as dissidents that so many people in the Czech Republic in parliament have had. I hope to hear from you on these issues this morning and, regardless of the Madrid outcome, the Commission will be interested in seeing these problems ultimately resolved.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps none of the candidates under consideration for NATO membership have come as far in such a relatively brief period of time as Romania. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity in the context of this hearing to congratulate again President Emil Constantinescu, the Democratic Convention of Romania, and most importantly, the people of Romania who all shared in the victory last November when Romania experienced its first democratic and peaceful change in government since 1937.

President Constantinescu and Prime Minister Victor Ciorbea have courageously initiated a tough economic reform program aimed at taming inflation and promoting growth. These initiatives are already being implemented, and the Romanian people will find it necessary to move forward with strength and perseverance in order to see their country continue to develop a vibrant and expanding market economy. We in the United States applaud these efforts and stand ready to assist in any way we can.

President Constantinescu's war on corruption, efforts to streamline and depoliticize the bureaucracy, strengthen local government and reform the judicial system will substantially enhance the consolidation of democratic institutions and the rule of law in Romania. On the military front, Romania was among the first countries to join the Partnership For Peace program, has actively participated in the NATO-led efforts in the former Yugoslavia, and has recently assigned troops to the international contingent seeking to restore stability in Albania. For that we are very grateful.

Romania continues its efforts to enhance civilian administration and oversight of the military and has engaged in a number of successful joint exercises with the United States military and with our allies as well. Following on the heels of an important bilateral treaty with Hungary signed in September of last year, Romania recently initialed a similar treaty with the Ukraine.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the dark days of the Ceausescu era seem the distant past as Romania moves forward, invigorated under new leadership, toward her rightful place among the vibrant and

thriving democracies of Europe. This progress during President Constantinescu's short tenure is very impressive, and deserves every ounce of encouragement, support and review in light of the upcoming Madrid summit. Frankly, I hope that Romania is in that first tier when Madrid is concluded.

I join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming the Ambassadors of the Czech Republic, Romania and Slovenia, and look forward to hearing the concerns and interests presented on behalf of their governments. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, again, for convening this important hearing, and yield back the balance of my time.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Chairman Smith.

Congressman Christensen?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. No.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO

Senator D'AMATO. Okay. At this time, I'm going to ask that my remarks be placed in the record as if read in their entirety. And let me, if I might, welcome all three of the Ambassadors, the Ambassador of the Czech Republic, the Ambassador of Slovenia, and the Ambassador for Romania.

Let me say that I support the admission of the Czech Republic, of Slovenia, and Romania in the first round that will be announced in Madrid at the July 8th and 9th NATO summit meetings. And I call upon the U.S. and our NATO allies to move the three countries into NATO together. There has been, very candidly, some question with respect to Romania, but I think that she has come so far in such a short period of time. I join with my colleague, and no one who has worked harder and been a greater champion of human rights than Congressman Smith, I agree with his observations as it relates to the transformation of Romania, and I have been someone who has been watching Romania very carefully. I visited there. What I saw when I was there was not the best of situations, but I will say to you—as a matter of fact, it was deplorable—but since that time, since Senator Dole and I and the delegation visited, the transformation has been remarkable, and it has been one headed in the right direction. We have two members of the parliament who are here. Men who suffered, men who went to prison. Mr. Ion Ratiu and Senator Ticu Dumitrescu, are they both here? I didn't do too well by your names.

Mr. RATIU. Right. My name is Ion Ratiu.

Senator D'AMATO. And your colleague is here?

Mr. RATIU. My colleague is here, he is Senator Dumitrescu.

Senator D'AMATO. And we welcome you. And so when members of the movement for human rights who have been imprisoned and who have stood up are here saying, let us move forward, I think it is important that we recognize that.

Secondly, let me suggest that Romania, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia in no way could constitute or should constitute a military threat to the Soviet Union or to Russia. That is just nonsense for anyone to say, oh, you will create problems because Russians view this as a threat. I think they may look upon it somewhat jealously, because people are making their own choice, and will not have more in the way of defense, in the defense of their choice of freedom, their choice of government, their

choice individual rights to be exercised, and I believe that should be the goal that we should set. So, I am tremendously encouraged by the progress that has been made. I'm not—again, I want to be associated with the remarks of Congressman Smith as it relates to all of the countries, and there's no need to be repetitive. And, therefore, I will now ask for our statements from our Ambassadors.

I now call upon Ambassador Geoana. Mr. Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY MIRCEA DAN GEOANA, AMBASSADOR OF ROMANIA

Amb. GEOANA. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to start by thanking the Commission for organizing this hearing, and commending the activity of the distinguished members of the Helsinki Commission, in particular you, Mr. Chairman, and also Co-Chairman Smith, also I would like to welcome Congressman Christensen. Thank you for being today with us, Mr. Congressman. I would like also to pay a special tribute to our friends, the dedicated staff of the Helsinki Commission.

At present, Romania is a credible candidate under serious consideration for early NATO membership. The Helsinki Commission and U.S. Congress have merit in this. The Commission has been paying close attention to Romania. It had at times directed justified criticism towards several Romanian governments. It has also recognized the long way Romania has come. Criticism and praise, they have been generally well-grounded and beneficial for us. Romania, a country having had the legacy of one of the toughest Communist regimes, would not have come so far and so fast without the strong encouragement of and support by our American friends.

We want to join not only the most successful Alliance in history, but also a family of nations we belong to, by sharing and believing in the same principles and philosophy of a society based on fundamental freedoms and human rights, free enterprise and ownership and the rule of law. Romanians also see in the expansion of NATO the expression of a strong and enduring American commitment for Europe.

Romania wishes to join NATO and does not come empty handed to the Alliance. She brings in strategic and economic assets, human resources, the readiness to share burdens, and proven ability to provide security. Romania is integral to an enlarged Alliance if the new NATO is to be geographically and strategically balanced, and able to spill over security and stability.

It is our belief, shared by many distinguished members of the United States Congress, as well as by many European NATO member states, the High Representatives of the OSCE, Mr. Karl Bildt, stated in Washington only a few days ago, that only NATO military force, repositioned closer to the Balkans, can deter the re-ignition of military conflict in Bosnia after the planned departure of SFOR troops. The inclusion of Romania in NATO would be both a deterrent for conflict in this hot spot of Europe, and a stimulus for other nations to follow our example.

The aspiration to integrate with the Alliance is a longstanding one. It is rooted in Romania's tradition of looking to and siding with the West, in Romania's culture and in the profile of the Romanian people. Americans are struck by the high percentage of Romanians who support integration with NATO, 95 percent, more than in any other Central and East European nation. In addition, 70 percent of the population is ready to support the ensuing costs. The figures reflect heightened awareness of what NATO is and what NATO means, as well as a strong belief that Romania is an indispensable nation to the new Alliance, in the new transatlantic security environment.

The objective of NATO membership not only has deep roots in Romania, it has also already borne fruits. Firstly, on the domestic scene, the ever closer prospective of NATO membership reinforced the willingness of the population to accept the side effects of an accelerated reform.

Secondly, our foreign policy has been based on the understanding of the new responsibilities Romania, as a potential NATO member, is expected to assume. As Chairman D'Amato stated, a historic basic treaty was concluded with Hungary, and the follow-up to the treaty boosted the Romanian-Hungarian relations in an exemplary manner. At present, the two countries are developing an active partnership, and look forward to the visit of the president of Hungary, Mr. Goncz, to Bucharest later this week.

Joining NATO means that Romania will secure for some time the Eastern frontier of the Alliance. Romania has undertaken steps to ensure that this will be less of a frontier and more a stability anchor for an undivided Europe. To this end, Romania recently decided to ratify the CFE Flank Agreement. Also, at the beginning of May, Romania and its important neighbor, Ukraine, initialed a Basic Treaty expected to be signed and ratified in the near future. The treaty is a landmark for the new relations in a stable and peaceful Europe. Given the focus of this hearing, it is significant to note that both the Romanian-Hungarian and Romanian-Ukrainian treaty include provisions guaranteeing the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, at the highest existing standards. At the same time, the trilateral cooperation of Romania, Poland and Ukraine will further enhance the prospects for a sound regional development and anchor Ukraine to a region of stability.

To the South and South-East, Romania has traditionally had close relations with all Balkan nations. Complementary to good bilateral relations is Romania's active participation in subregional initiatives (like the Central and East European Free Trade Area, Southeast European Cooperative Initiative, Central and East European Initiative, the Black Sea Economic Operation, among others) as well as in the IFOR and SFOR. In addition, Romania has established a new pro-active regional diplomacy sending special envoys to the Balkan nations and to Albania, and appointing an ambassador at large for this region.

Romania has developed particularly good relations with the two South-East European NATO members, Greece and Turkey. The three of us represent our region in the "Coalition of the Willing," which helps restore order and peace in Albania—The Multinational Protection Force, under Italy's leadership. I am pleased to also note that we welcomed Slovenia joining in the nine nations' coalition.

In the field of democracy and human rights, since 1989, tremendous progress has been accomplished. Three rounds of free and fair elections took place. A new comprehensive legislative framework has been adopted. A vibrant civic society has been flourishing. Romania is not a perfect democracy, if there is such a thing. However, democracy has steadily evolved and consolidated in Romania, and democratic institutions are fully functioning. A new constitution was adopted as early as 1991, consecrating the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

Market economy operates with good prospects due to a bold program of economic reforms implemented by the Government of Romania and supported by international financial institutions. As a result, privatization has progressed at high speed, and foreign and American investments are coming and pouring in. The reforms are accompanied by a social safety network for the neediest. At a time when the United States Senate will be called upon to ratify the accession treaties, estimates indicate that Romania stands a good chance to be a flourishing, resourceful, and healthy market economy.

Indicative of the situation of human rights is the recent decision of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe to cease the special monitoring of my country, and to state that Romania has fulfilled all commitments undertaken in the field of human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to national minorities. Similar conclusions were reached by the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities, Dr. Max van der Stoep, during his recent visit to Romania. As you are aware, Romania is one of the three or four European countries where national minorities are part of the ruling coalition. The participation of representatives of the Hungarian minority in the administration at the cabinet and local levels has already proved to be effective and beneficial to strengthening an inclusive democratic society where every individual enjoys the same political, economic, social and civic rights and opportunities.

At the same time, the administration has paid particular attention to the Roma minority, to its social and political integration to ensuring education and economic opportunities for members of this group. For example, as a result of state funded programs, the Roma children in Romania have the opportunity to study in their language with Roma speaking professors in primary and secondary school, as well as in college using handbooks as well as digests of Roma literature published in their language.

While looking to the future, to Romania's membership in NATO, we have drawn lessons from the past. On Holocaust Day, the president of Romania made a statement in Bucharest deploring the unforgivable genocide, acknowledging Romania's share in this inferno, and honoring the memory of the Holocaust victims. Prior to this, at the beginning of April, several real estate properties formerly belonging to the Jewish community in Romania were restituted to their rightful owners through a Resolution adopted in fast track proceedings by the Government in Bucharest.

This step follows the adoption of a restitution legislation for individual owners, and opens a set of measures meant to address the issue of restoring rights over property formerly belonging to ethnic or religious communities in my country.

At swearing in ceremony, Mr. Emil Constantinescu, the President of Romania, placed a particular emphasis on the protection of religious freedom and the need for an ecumenical approach of all worship-related issues. The Romanian leadership has acted consistently along these lines. A meeting with leaders and representatives of all religious denomination in Romania recently convened by our President gave new incentives and a fresh impulse to inter-confessional reconciliation and cooperation. Respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, tolerance, inter-ethnic and inter-confessional harmony are traits of today's Romanian society, in spite of singular problems which arise from time to time, as it happens in any democracy.

In closing, I would like to use this opportunity to again express our appreciation for the help and guidance Romania has been offered by you, Mr. Chairman, and by Co-Chairman Smith, by members of the Commission, and the U.S. Congress, and also by the United States administration. This help has contributed to the tremendous democracy progress in my country. It has contributed to building trust that early NATO membership for Romania and other Central and East European nations who fulfill the criteria for admission would further consolidate respect for and advancement of the human rights.

In concluding, I would like also to thank representatives of the Romanian-American community from New York, Washington, New Jersey and Ohio, who took the time to be here with us and support the Romanian case.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Vondra.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY ALEXANDR VONDRA, AMBASSADOR OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Amb. VONDRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, the distinguished members of the Commission.

Having come to the United States as a new ambassador only a few weeks ago, and still remembering well the many hearings in the Czech parliament during my previous tenure, I must confess it is a new experience for me to speak before this Commission. Frankly, I do not remember either the U.S. or any other foreign representative testifying before the Czech parliament in a similar way. However, taking into account the important role of the Helsinki Commission in monitoring and encouraging compliance with the Helsinki Accords during the past decades, and also taking into account the importance of NATO enlargement, I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you the Czech Republic human rights record.

It was the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act that inspired the foundation of Charter 77 as the leading pro-democracy movement in former Czechoslovakia just 20 years ago. Charter 77 persistently drew attention to the inconsistencies of the Communist legal system with its international obligations. The price the signatories of Charter 77 paid for their activities was not low, often imprisonment or at least tellers of joke. The moral and material support coming from abroad was essential for us in dissent during the most difficult times, and was instrumental also in the overthrow of the Communist totalitarian regime.

Let me, therefore, use this opportunity to thank all our supporters, especially here in the United States, for their longtime support of the human rights activities and movement in Central and Eastern Europe and, of course, in my country in particular. Since then, the situation has changed fundamentally.

However, the commitments to share the fundamental values and principle of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law remains as the endless task for all of us, even the accession of the Czech Republic into NATO is understood as a vitally important part of the very same determination to safeguard democracy and freedom. And the overwhelming public support for the Charter 77 first spokesperson and once also a prisoner, President Vaclav Havel, is the proof of its lasting legacy in the Czech political life now. By coincidence, President Havel is visiting the U.S. Senate just this afternoon. Let me use this opportunity to invite you to meet him personally in the afternoon.

The Czech Republic emerged as a new independent and sovereign state on January 1st, 1993. After the peaceful dissolution of the former Czechoslovak Federation. The new state is firmly built on the principle of democracy, rule of law, market economy, and the protection of fundamental freedoms and human rights. The constitution of the Czech Republic adopted in December 1992 sets forth in Article 10 that was ratified and promulgated international treaties on human rights and fundamental freedoms to which the Czech Republic has committed itself are immediately binding and are superior law. The Charter Of Fundamental Rights And Freedom is an integral part of the Czech Constitution.

The constitution guarantees the division of legislative, executive and judicial powers. I would particularly like to stress the role of the constitution court as an independent guarantor of fundamental

freedoms and human rights in my country. Non-governmental organizations, including the influential Czech Helsinki Committee and various other human rights groups, operate freely and are frequently consulted in the process of drafting new legislation. Independence of media is of vital importance to guarantee freedom of speech. There are 14 channels, two public and two private, and more than 60 private radio stations broadcasting in my country. The national TV channel NOVA is privately owned partially by American investors. A wide variety of newspapers, magazines, journals are published without any government interference.

Shortly, after its creation, the Czech Republic received full international recognition and became a member state of the U.N., the Council of Europe, and the OSCE. Prague is currently hosting meetings of high ranking officials of the OSCE. The national minorities in the Czech Republic are not very large, and with an exception of the Polish minority, do not make territorial coherent communities. The Slovaks account for 3 percent, Poles, Germans and Romas together for less than 1.5 percent of the population. However, the government has established a special commission for minorities on which all minorities have their representation. The commission advises the government on the minority policies and allocated the subsidies for minority periodicals, TV and radio programs, cultural activities and educational programs.

In recognition of high standards of human rights protection and of the general progress made since 1989, the Czech Republic was elected as a member of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in 1996. The representative of the Czech Republic has the privilege to serve as the chairman of the Commission's 1997 session.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly touch upon the profound transformation of the Czech economy. The program of radical economic reforms launched in 1991 was aimed at the integration of the national economy into the global market through privatization, liberalization and deregulation. It introduced an essential legal and institutional framework of market economy and resulted in radical structure changes without any serious social tensions and hardships. Since 1991, the government has operated on a balanced budget. Over 65 percent of the Czech Republic's GDP is currently generated by the private sector. A key element in the success of the Czech economic reform was a program of rapid privatization carried out by a variety of means, including the restitution of properties to their original and legitimate owners.

Apart from its having a positive impact on the economy, the restitution was also undertaken as an item of moral obligation and justice to mitigate the wrongs committed in the past. Over half a century, the Czech people underwent the Nazi occupation, the Communist nationalization and oppression, and a Soviet-led invasion. Unfortunately, there is no easy way to correct all the wrongs that have been done. It is impossible to turn the clock back completely after 50 years. In spite of that, both the speed and the scale of the restitution carried out in the Czech Republic are unparalleled to any other Central and East European country. With regard to the victims of the Holocaust and Nazi persecution, parliament in 1994 approved a law providing for financial payment for Czech victims on the basis of the so-called Auschland Doctrine. The Czech citizens are excluded from the compensation program undertaken by Germany.

Finally, in January of this year, the Czech-German declaration was signed, along with the mutual accord not to burden the future relations between the two countries with political and legal issues originating in the past. The document declares that a special fund will be established for the victims of the Nazi persecution.

My country supports the recent international accord to identify the state of the properties of the Holocaust victims. I'm glad to inform you that under the auspices of the President Havel a special commission for documenting the history of the Holocaust, including the issue of the Jewish property, was established in May of 1997. This commission is prepared to cooperate with the Holocaust Museum and the religious organizations and churches. A recent decree of the government on the restitution of certain church properties allows for the further transfer of the property of the Jewish communities in my country.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me underline that the Czech Republic strongly supports the NATO's enlargement. It will definitely bring more stability and security to Central and Eastern Europe which, in turn, will lead to a more stable political, social and economic environment in Europe, which, in turn, will lead to more—this development further consolidates basic freedom, provides for a better protection of human rights, and enables new members to sustain the final costs incurred by the enlargement process. By participating in the NATO-led IFOR and SFOR operation in the Balkans, the Czech Republic has proven its ability to contribute to the security in Euro-Atlantic area.

The fall of communism and the dissolution of the Soviet Union presented a unique opportunity to overcome the dividing lines created in Yalta. If this opportunity is lost, Europe and the United States is beginning the next millennium facing threats very similar to those they failed to deal with a century ago. Therefore, I strongly support your view, Mr. Chairman, that NATO must remain open also with regard to those countries which are participating during this hearing. Thank you so much.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. Ambassador Petric.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY DR. ERNEST PETRIC, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA

Amb. PETRIC. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Smith, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to appear at this hearing and, Congressman Smith, thank you very much also for your kind words about my country in your opening statement. Let me also use this opportunity to express my country's thanks to this Commission which played, in the time of the breakup of Yugoslavia and war in parts of the former Yugoslavia, a very important and very encouraging role. At that time, if you have been following the work of this Commission, its impact was exceedingly important.

Slovenia is hopeful to become a member of NATO in the first round of its enlargement and thus rejoin formally and institutionally the part of the world to which it has belonged throughout its history and with which lofty values it has incessantly shared. Slovenia considers NATO as the pillar of present and future European security, and a framework of U.S. presence in Europe which remains a guarantee for long-term stability on the European soil.

Slovenia, historically and culturally a part of the Western world, and now a new and thriving democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, is willing and ready to contribute to NATO's mission in Europe and the world.

Slovenia is fully qualified for NATO membership, and we are repeatedly being told in the European capitals, as well as here in Washington, that Slovenia fulfills the membership criteria, which include an exemplary level of protection of human rights and rights of minorities. We are told that should the merits themselves be the prevailing element in NATO decision on enlargement, there should be no objections preventing Slovenia to be among those invited at the NATO summit in Madrid to join NATO in the first round.

Slovenia is a stable, multiparty democracy with a new, vibrant, and growing economy, well on its way to joining the European Union among its first new members. It is a common and unequivocal conclusion reached by foreign governmental and non-governmental observers alike that human rights and rights of minorities, as well as democratic procedures, are fully respected in Slovenia. Amnesty International and other human rights promoting groups have literally no objections or critical remarks concerning Slovenia's human rights performance.

The last United States Department of State Report on Human Rights states, *inter alia*, in its chapter on Slovenia: "The third multi-party general elections ... held in November, represent a further consolidation of a vigorous, open and democratic system ... Constitutional provision for an independent judiciary are respected by the government in practice. The police are under the effective civilian control. The country has made steady progress toward developing market economy. Privatization continues and trade has been reoriented to the West ... The currency is stable, fully convertible and backed by substantial reserves. The economy provides citizens with a good standard of living. The government fully respected the human rights of its citizens, and the law and judiciary provide adequate means of dealing with individual instances of abuse ... Minorities are generally treated fairly in practice."

The constitution of Slovenia provides extensive protection of human rights, and the rights of minorities, including their constitutionally provided representation in the parliament. An ombudsman deals with human rights problems, including citizenship cases.

At the peak of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia gave refuge to more than 80,000 mainly Muslim refugees, with hardly any international assistance. The overall number of refugees at that point amounted to 4 percent of Slovenia's population. Slovenia gave citizenship to close to 200,000 non-Slovenes (Croats, Serbs, Muslims, Herzegovinians, et cetera) who had residence in Slovenia at the time of the breakup of Yugoslavia.

Slovenia's armed forces are under strict civilian control, and no doubts about this have been expressed either by NATO or any other observers. Slovenia has successfully cooperated in the Partnership For Peace Program, and continues to do so. It has successfully concluded an "individual" dialog with NATO. It has also offered several facilities at the disposal of NATO and SFOR, and is currently joining the operation of the Multinational Protection Force in Albania.

Slovenia's relations with its neighbors are good and productive. With Italy and Hungary, Slovenia is developing an ambitious trilateral cooperation, including cooperation in the military as well as numerous other fields of mutual interest. Bilateral relations with Italy, Austria and Hungary are excellent. Italy strongly supports Slovenia's early membership in NATO, as does Hungary.

Relations with Croatia are normal and were, to a certain degree, burdened only by practical problems resulting from the breakup of Yugoslavia and the fact that there was no fixed border between the two newly independent states before. Now more than 99 percent of the border is fixed and agreed upon, whereby, the remaining problems are dealt with by diplomatic and expert commissions. Slovenia has signed an association treaty with EU, and Slovenia is one of the partners in the CEFTA, the Central and East European Free Trade Association.

As of yet, no NATO member has expressed opposition to Slovenia's early membership, nor raised objections as to Slovenia's qualifications or merits. Several NATO allies, such as Italy, Canada, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Greece, and Iceland explicitly support Slovenia. Russia is not concerned about Slovenia's NATO membership, and has never voiced its opposition to our candidacy.

Slovenia was not a member of the Warsaw Pact, and its early NATO membership would prove that NATO enlargement is not only directed eastwards, or towards Russia, but is sincerely meant as an effort to enhance the overall security and stability in Europe. Strategically and geopolitically, Slovenia's membership would enable territorial linkage, landbridge, between Italy and Hungary, which would otherwise, assuming Hungary becomes a member, remain an isolated NATO "island." Slovenia's membership would also expand stability towards the Balkans. Slovenia could be a useful asset for any future NATO activity in the Balkans, should such a need emerge.

Slovenia's armed forces are being built from scratch since its independence in '91, and are not burdened with outdated Warsaw Pact hardware or mentality. All newly acquired military hardware has to be, as stipulated by law, compatible with NATO standards. Slovenia's relatively highly developed economy (by statistical data on the level of "poorer" EU members) enables Slovenia to carry the costs of joining NATO. Domestic consensus about NATO membership is not questionable. In April, all political parties represented in the Sloven parliament signed a binding declaration unanimously supporting government policy of joining NATO, including the absorption of costs of NATO membership.

To conclude, by its political stability and rooted democracy, including a high level of respect for human rights and rights of minorities, a relatively developed economy, good relations with all its neighbors, and a geopolitical position, Slovenia could be a clear asset to NATO. It would serve as a proof to other candidates, including the Former Yugoslav republic, that merits including respect for human and minority rights is the paramount element which really matters and opens doors into the North Atlantic community of Western democracies.

Slovenia also strongly supports the principle that the enlargement of NATO should remain an open and transparent process. NATO should not keep its doors shut to any prospective candidate that fulfills the criteria for membership and is willing and able to carry out the responsibilities stipulated by the Washington Agreement.

Thank you.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Let me note that I think that there's no doubt that all three nations have made tremendous progress in human rights in the respect for minority communities, the ethnic communities within their country. I'm not going to get specific. There's no doubt also that there still are some existing problems. We hope that enlightened leadership, and maybe economic progress that will be made, will make it possible to deal in a more enlightened way with some of the various groups.

But there is one thing that I share with you that is not good, and I can't say that you have made too much progress, right across the board, and that is the area of restitution. It makes little sense to have laws applied or enacted, and then to have administrative policies that defeat the intent of the law. You pass the law that says people who have lost their properties unfairly due to the Nazis or due to the Communists will now have an opportunity to reclaim them. And I know this is not easy, it's difficult. But then, to have those laws thwarted by the construction of arbitrary and difficult, if not impossible processes, that are administered by the finance department in one case, and I don't want to personalize this, but you know we all know who I'm talking about, what government, it's just not acceptable. It's not acceptable.

Am I getting through, Mr. Ambassador? Am I getting through? Okay. Now, you can say, we're a sovereign country, we do what we want, that's fine. But then don't claim to the world that you're adopting another process.

Secondly, I find it absolutely repugnant that those people who fled persecution and came to the United States, notwithstanding that it was the United States who adopted a policy of denying dual citizenship, and it was this country, and we were at fault back in 1928, and that law has, at this point, been declared unconstitutional, but it is still looked upon as grounds and enforced by Czechoslovakia. That's wrong. Absolutely wrong.

If people fled communism or fled the Nazis and went to any other country, it's okay. They can still make claim for restitution. But if they came to the United States, they can't? Why is that? On one hand, you say, we want to be your allies, your friends, your *paisanos*—that's supposed to make you laugh a little, loosen up, loosen up, relax—but, on the other hand, you apply a standard which discriminates against those people who sought sanctuary in the United States. Now, that's not a very friendly policy.

Now, I just have to tell you that. I guess I'm not supposed to say that because we're supposed to be diplomatic, and everything is supposed to be hunky dory, you know, wonderful. But, you know, I can't. I didn't take this job to make believe that everything is right and is a beautiful, beautiful thing, when that is not right. That is—you know, I don't understand it. And something has to be done. I find it personally offensive.

And I would say to you that Congressman Smith has taken S.Con. Resolution 19, and had it included, and I commend the congressman for addressing this problem, in the authorization bill that will be coming before the Senate and the House—has it passed that?

Mr. SMITH. This week it's scheduled to come before the House.

Senator D'AMATO. And this week will be passed as it relates to the State Department reauthorization, in which he addresses this. You cannot do this kind of thing. It is wrong. Now, I mentioned it to one, but it applies across the board. So let us try in the spirit, and I understand that you are the ambassadors here, but bring this message back. It's not a threatening one, it's one of sadness. It is sad at this point in time that we look back on history and see all of the torment that people went through, the martyrdom, the killings, the mass executions, that all of our people have suffered—your people. Your people, your citizens who fled persecution.

By gosh, let's not say that we're going to make restitution on one hand, but keep others because they went to a different country, and in this case the United States, from having an opportunity to make claim. Let's see to it that the laws that you have enacted are followed and that you don't have some powerful political group or force that keeps them from being lived up to. And that's something that we all have to work at in every country, and no country is perfect, including the United States.

So I don't want to say that, you know, everything is right here. We're always—we're struggling to see to it, to assure our citizens that their rights—we've had our share of problems. But it's something that I think is important and, again, as it relates to people who came here for sanctuary, they certainly shouldn't be placed in a different category than people who went to Canada, or who went to England, or who went to France, or who went to any place else.

So I address that not in the spirit of personal confrontation, but in the spirit of a personal challenge. A challenge to each and every one of us to try to do better so that we deal in a more enlightened way with those past wrongs to see if we cannot make whole or in some way make up to those people and bring about restitution where it is called for.

Chairman Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to join with you in expressing that concern. We have, at previous times, expressed our concerns about the citizenship law in the Czech Republic and our hope is that there would be some movement on this. As a matter of fact, Ambassador Petric mentioned that there is a human rights ombudsman that helps resolve citizenship problems, and my hope would be that, Ambassador Vondra, your government would see the worth and validity of such an ombudsman. Because not only are there problems relating to restitution and properties, but the citizenship law remains a problem and a sticking point with many of us.

I think the law is particularly onerous and disconcerting when it comes to the status of orphans, and those who are in foster care. Many of them are Roma. There have been reports that have come to my desk, and the desk of other members of the Commission that continually underscore that these are the stateless children. There is a very difficult process; four ministries—Justice, Interior, Labor and Education—that are involved with the process of citizenship. Our hope would be that perhaps through the idea of an ombudsman or very vigorous oversight by the government, this problem could be rectified. No one should be without a country or a state, and particularly an orphan who has a difficult time—even if his or her orphanage becomes the legal guardian—to become a state person. The next thing you know, they are being deported.

I join with Chairman D'Amato in raising these two issues in the spirit of friendship and concern, and I would hope that there would be some movement on that. Perhaps you would want to respond, Mr. Ambassador?

Amb. VONDRA. Well, I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, Czechoslovakia was mentioned during this comment, so I would like to use the opportunity to respond in the Czech name. I think that there are two major areas which were raised by Mr. Chairman and by Co-Chairman. One is the restitution, and the second the citizenship law. Let me start with the restitution, which I think is a rather complex problem. And I think that nobody is going to argue that there is the ideal solution, that there is the ideal situation. But, I would like to stress that the Czech—in the balance, the Czechoslovak government and the parliament took into account the seriousness of this problem, and perhaps it was just the Czech society which started this process.

Maybe, to stress one specific issue, now we are all speaking about the restitution, but when we started with the legislation, it was the first in the whole area of the Central and Eastern Europe, it was 1991, with a special bill with regards to the individual persons. The title of the bill or of the law is not on the restitution, it's an act on extrajudicial rehabilitation. So the feel of it from the very beginning was based on the knowledge that really there is no way how to correct every wrong committed in the past, but there is the strong will, strong political will to mitigate these wrongs with regards to both the individual people and to some communities. And during the past 5 or 6 years, the Czech parliament has adopted two special laws. One was 1991, and the second was in 1994, on the restitutions with regards to the individuals.

With regards to the communal property and that's mostly about the Jewish property, we approved the two special decrees issued by the government in 1994, and a third one was issued just a month ago. And according to these decrees, more than 100 of the Jewish property, including the famous Jewish museum, was returned into the hands of the Jewish community. There are the basic elements of the restitution program in my country.

There is no doubt that the legislation which started the process in the whole Central and Eastern Europe was the pioneer legislation. And I'm not going to advocate it is 100 percent fine. But now it seems to me that thanks to the fact that we started with the process, we drafted the legislation, we approved it, we are paying the tax, because of the wideness of the range with which the whole legislation is dealing. Because we have the legislation, not only for the communities, we didn't establish only the foundation to have some compensation, we had the legislation program of natural restitution, according to which many properties were returned to many individuals. And this, I think, is still unique.

Of course, there are those who are feeling discriminated against because of the range, and not being granted, and I know that it's partly about the Czech citizens living in the United States because of the problem of this so-called Treaty on Naturalization signed in 1928. But that's somehow—and even more, I think that my government and the Czech parliament is reacting to that discussion.

Let's take the examples. First of all, 2 years ago, the constitutional court abolished this condition for permanent citizenship to obtain the property back. You are discussing one specific case, not personalized, but we know who is touched by that. I read all the records. I can't state here 100 percent comfortable with the development with regards to that one person. And I sent this to Prague because I am here, the ambassador, to fill the duties.

But I would like to stress one thing, it's the decision of the ministry of finance which is just now in the court. So let's await the decision of the court. That's the legitimate approach. And my personal feeling, but of course I cannot prejudge the decision of the court, is that there will be some development. And, even more, the constitutional court which discussed 2 years ago the condition on the permanent residency did not discuss the condition on the citizenship yet. So let's give the chance to the court.

So we are, to sum up this problem, we are doing many things. We did many things. We are doing many things. We are reacting. But, again, there is not any ideal solution after all what has been done in the past. And maybe let's say also one thing, that a Czech Republic or the former Czechoslovakia was a country which was occupied by Germany. It was not the part of...

And now the citizenship law. In this area, I would like to stress that my government does not identify itself with the conclusion expressed in some document of this Commission. You know, my government has examined the concern which has been presented by your Commission, by other organizations, as Council of Europe, the OSCE and others, and this has led to the amendment of the Czech citizenship law in April 1996. At that time, I was the deputy minister in Prague, and was personally involved in amending. And there is some special amendment which is establishing the possibility to waive the condition of the so-called clean criminal record. This condition is not extraordinary. All citizenship laws in Europe have established this condition. All 300 Slovak citizens who sought that waiver were permitted one.

And you know, to know something about—to discuss this problem of the citizenship law—it will need to understand the complexity of the problem of the division of the country. And I would like to show one thing only, and that's about the substance of the problem. During the past 5 years, almost

400,000 Slovak citizens obtained Czech citizenship. Please, this is in a country which has 10 million inhabitants, no more. It's not the power. And almost half a million foreign citizens obtained Czech citizenship.

So, and even we are reacting, as I stress, there is this amendment. To sum up this problem, I would like to state very clearly, this amendment is meeting the approval of the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe considers this law satisfactory and that's also the opinion of the various NGOs, both abroad and in my country. I personally discussed all the human rights, both abroad and in my country, both in the government and in the opposition, as well as in the various NGOs, and I don't think it is a problem.

So, thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Just to respond very briefly, and then I have one brief question for Ambassador Geoana.

Human Rights Watch issued a report, "Czech Republic Children Harmed By Czech Citizenship Law," and they make a number of very constructive suggestions on how the problem could be rectified, and they have a number of statistics. As a matter of fact, they say, there may be as many as 1,400 stateless children in Czech institutions today. And that's....

Amb. VONDRA. Lie.

Mr. SMITH. It's a lie?

Amb. VONDRA. It's not true. It's not true. That's the position of some people who are giving you information. That's not true. There are not any person who would not have the citizenship. And all who are looking for the Czech citizenship, they have the citizenship.

Mr. SMITH. How do you respond to the suggestion that an ombudsman be established to handle these questions? In the state of New Jersey, we have a public advocate because, despite our long history of democracy, there are always people who are wronged, and need a way, particularly when it's a class action case, of finding a way to find a remedy. It seems that might be one way of helping to resolve this as you make this transition, so I hope you would consider that.

Let me ask a question of Ambassador Geoana. Control of the military by a civilian is one of the most important aspects of an emerging democracy so that it's out of the hands of a person wearing stars on his lapel. After the November 1996 election, Victor Babiuc became the Minister of Defense. What kind of parliamentary oversight is there with regards to the military? What interface exists? As you know, there's an absolute tug-of-war between the U.S. executive branch and Congress, which is very constructive. Even though at times the incoming and outgoing rhetorical displays between the two are numerous, the process is very, very good because things are put on the table. This leads to transparency in the military and we keep a good handle on what the military is and is not doing.

Amb. Geoana. Thank you so much. This is an important element of our overall strategy of reform of the Romanian society and the Romanian army. And it goes beyond the NATO membership issue. It is a—we're not doing and implementing civilian control and parliamentary control merely for the sake of NATO membership. We're doing it for the sake of transparency and normality in a tiny democratic society.

We have undertaken a serious set of measures in this respect. We have started with what we call to civilize the armed forces. So since 1994, the MINISTER OF DEFENSE was a civilian, Minister Babiuk, who was recently appointed after the elections, is also a civilian minister. And we continue to have this. There's a Deputy Defense Minister as well.

I would like just briefly to note that recently the Chairman of the Joint Chief Of Staffs of the Romanian Army was replaced, he's a young general. He was trained in the U.S. and the U.K. So we hope that this fresh blood will further strengthen the reform within the military. The Romanian parliament has two commissions in each chamber, in the lower house and in the senate dealing with armed forces. They are, I would say, in full control, not only over the budgeting process for the military, but also in terms of overseeing how the military is doing in terms of fulfilling its tasks.

In our system, we have also a body which is similar to the National Security Council over here and it's chaired by the president in which the speaker of the house and the president of the senate and also the MINISTER OF DEFENSE, and also the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff are members, full members, of that committee. So, when and if there is, let's say, a problem in terms of making major decisions with respect to our military forces—our participation into Albania, by the way, it was decided in this format.

I would say that we have come a long way. We were among the first ones to implement civilian control and oversight over the military, and also our friends in the Pentagon are saying that Romania has accomplished a great deal. There's lots of things to be done. But we are definitely on the right track, and parliamentary and civilian control over the military is an important element and a reality in Romania today.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

I'm sure my time has expired, but I want to thank our three ambassadors. I want also to acknowledge Father George David from St. Basil's Romanian Catholic Church in Trenton, who actually made the trip down today. During the heyday of the Ceausescu regime, I very often turned to him for insights as to what was going on in Romania. I'm very happy to acknowledge his presence and also he brought several of his parishioners with him.

Senator D'AMATO. Congressman Christensen.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Yes. I just want to ask Ambassador Geoana a couple of questions. I've got a cold so I apologize for the nasally sound. During your testimony you talked about the protection of religious freedom and the need for an ecumenical approach of all worship related issues on page 4 of your testimony. Are you familiar with the recent press release for the Baptist Union of Romania? I wanted to find out what was your understanding of that issue, and if it's being resolved? According to the president of the Romanian Baptist Union, is it Pastor Talos, is that proceeding as the press release states, or what's your understanding of the situation there, and with the various Baptist believers who are beaten, it sounds like, by a group of people that were intoxicated?

Amb. GEOANA. Yes, I also have received, and I have just in front of me the press release from Mr. Talos. I was checking in Bucharest this morning. The situation is totally under control. The people are having some local functions, public functions, were released from their jobs, including the head of the local police station, and also the teacher of the local school had some influence in instigating the people under the alcohol influence for doing such gestures.

Once again, this is something we deplore, and we very vigorously, let's say, react upon the thing. I stated that Romania is not a perfect democracy, and these incidents are happening, unfortunately, and perhaps will continue to happen. The problem is to act swiftly and to implement law immediately and to ensure this new spirit of the Romanian society. The most encouraging sign and perhaps also a fact of this incident in Romania was the fact that the president of Romania convened three days ago a large, if you want, religious oriented meeting with all the heads of religious denominations in Romania, with the Orthodox Patriarch, with the Byzantine Greek, let's say, Bishop, with the Baptist church, with Jewish community, even with the small Moslem group that we have, 3,000 people of Moslem religion in Romania, and we have launched back home a major national reconciliation program. This is the word, the key word, of the new leadership of Romania, reconciliation with ourselves, with our past, with our differences, and to learn from the American experience that diversity makes strengths and not weaknesses.

So, we are acting extremely swiftly when something like this happened, and I'm particularly pleased to see that the new spirit of tolerance and ecumenical approach has happened. And I'm happy to state that among the Romanian-Americans being here with us in the audience from Ohio, they came especially for the hearing, we have Pastor Clintock is a Baptist pastor having activity also in Romania, and we are working very closely with all religious groups in American and in Romanian for really establishing a new atmosphere.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. In reading this press release, it talked about that the Romanian president was disapproving of the practice of aggressive proselytizing. What would be his definition of proselytizing?

Amb. GEOANA. As it is stated a little bit below, we believe and the president believes that every individual in Romania has the right to choose its own religious affiliation, and also he has, as a group, as an individual, should be given full right for promoting their own religious ideas, but not at the detriment of the others. So when we speak about proselytes, and when we're speaking in general, be it from the Protestant groups or be it from the Orthodox church, which sometimes, as it's stated over here, also had a tougher approach, or be it with the reformats of Hungarian origin, or be it with Byzantine Catholics in Transylvania and in Romania. So, the president is addressing and asking all the heads of the religious denominations to refrain from aggressive acts which might be interpreted as proselytes.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Was this an isolated incident, do you think, or are there other things like things going on?

Amb. GEOANA. This hasn't happened in years in Romania. So it's a local incident. We deplore it and we think....

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. They said in their press release that it was incited by Orthodox priests. Is that your understanding?

Amb. GEOANA. From what we've heard, this might have been the case. An inquiry was ordered by the ministry of interior in Romania. We're waiting for the results. But from the administrative standpoint, as I said, the local police chief and the local teacher that had some role were destituted immediately. For the role of the Orthodox priest over there, we have to wait and see until the inquiry is finished, and afterwards to see how the Patriarch of Romania will react upon this.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you for your testimony today, Ambassador Geoana. I really appreciate it.

Amb. GEOANA. Thank you.

Senator D'AMATO. I'm wondering, Ambassador Petric and Ambassador Geoana, if you'd like to comment with respect to the impact of a possible renewal of conflicts in Bosnia, Herzegovina, that whole area. What impact would it have on your country? What would be the—well, what impact would there be? How do you see that playing out?

Amb. PETRIC. Slovenia is, I would say, out of the zone of instability, and the impact on us of renewed fighting southeast from Slovenia would be indirect only, meaning a new wave of refugees. It would mean deteriorating the already rather meager economic relations which are there now, and which we're building slowly with Bosnia, Serbia, and others. It would probably mean, also, in case of foreign investment, a kind of bothersome image for foreign investments to come to the region because of insecurity. So there would be negative impacts.

We believe that in spite of the fact the Balkans is loaded with problems like Bosnia, not to name the others, the only way to handle it is to have a foreign presence there, as it is now, SFOR. We are not sure whether the circumstances will not require that SFOR or another form remains there for some longer time, and we believe that the most important thing is to give these people a chance with all kinds of development programs to turn towards activities which are oriented to peace.

I was mentioning the positive involvement of U.S. Congress in the area, I'm proud to say that last year we had in Slovenia staged together with you a prayer breakfast, to which the Romania president at that time joined, and so believe that a lot of activities are necessary there. Although we had some hesitations, we also strongly support now the Southeast European Cooperation Program launched by the U.S. administration, and we believe that enlarging NATO, bringing Slovenia and Romania and other countries in the region, if they fit, into the Western community, would be a very clear signal to Croatia and to the others, that you can make it, that you can achieve your goal, which means reintegration into Western Europe.

So we believe that being too, I would say, narrow-minded, in a way, by thinking we must get out of Bosnia next year and not let those countries which are close to the Balkans involve us in NATO and other European structures those countries which are close to the Balkans. That would be the wrong signal. That will probably ask for more trouble, and probably we soon have a need to intervene again in a few years.

I don't know whether I was clear enough. I understood that your question concerns what impact a return of the war in Bosnia would have on Slovenia. Yes, it would have a negative impact. However, the war would not involve Slovenia. We have no problems, either with Serbia, or with Croatia, or with Bosnia, except succession problems. We came to an agreement on how to share the debt of former Yugoslavia; that's decided and done. We still have not come to an agreement on how to divide the assets. That can last for a long time—The discussions that are going on.

To conclude, Slovenia is out of the critical zone, but could be used as an important player in the region and also as a convenient departing position, as I said in my opening statement, for future NATO involvement in the area if NATO action will be required.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador Geoana?

Amb. GEOANA. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of preoccupation for us. We consider the situation in Bosnia has to be taken very seriously until the withdrawal of the SFOR in next June. And we have to think of various forms of making sure that the tragedy over there won't start again.

Senator D'AMATO. What happens when SFOR—let's suppose there is a withdrawal next June, what do you think takes place?

Amb. GEOANA. First of all, I think that some form of international presence in Bosnia is needed. If this will be with or without American participation, this is something we have to figure out. We believe that Europeans also have a role and should play a role in this, and I also believe that the countries in the region, and Romania is the largest country in that region, we have a duty and a responsibility, perhaps and hopefully within NATO, to play a role. We have to identify a set of military, economic and human rights measures, a sort of network of decisions, complementary decisions, of trying to help the populations and the people of Bosnia of not being tempted to start all over again.

Once again, I think that only military solutions without economic and human right will never work. This is the experience of Romania. Perhaps this is the experience of Albania today. Romania is present in Bosnia, Romania is present in Albania, Romania has expressed its willingness to participate in the peacekeeping operations in the former republic—the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and in Cyprus. I believe that America and Europe, they need strong allies in that region. We can take part of the burden and we can be part of the answer to the problems of that region.

Senator D'AMATO. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. Chairman Smith, if you have any....

Mr. SMITH. I simply want to thank our three very distinguished ambassadors for their presentation. I sense that Ambassador Vondra perhaps bristled a little bit at being here. We had the same kind of reaction from the ambassador from Poland, but I want to assure you that the entire exercise is helpful, as the Congress is getting more, not less, involved, since, to a large extent, the Congress holds the purse-strings with regards to NATO. As a matter of fact, our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights oversees the operational account of the U.S. budget for NATO, and that also will be considered on Thursday.

I think it's a matter of accountability, and sovereignty doesn't negate accountability. And I know sovereignty is important. And we have problems in this country as well. And, in a way, we often showcase our problems to the exclusion of what's positive in this country. So I can understand some of the sense of not wanting to be put on the spot. But it is only because we care about the disenfranchised. When Charter 77 was the leading light in Czechoslovakia, every opportunity we had in bilaterals, multilaterals with the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, Chairman D'Amato and I, and Steny Hoyer, and Frank Wolf, and others raised that issue until we were blue in the face, because we just felt the people in Charter 77 and the interests that they represented were being disenfranchised, and we had an obligation as human beings to do so. So that's where we're coming from. And I wanted to assure you of that.

And also, Ambassador Petric, you have to know probably your most aggressive supporter is Congressman Jim Oberstar, a Democrat from Minnesota, who continually when we talk about NATO enlargement says, why not Slovenia. And makes a very persuasive case. And his voice is being heard, I can assure you, on the House side especially. But I want to thank you for your very fine testimony, and again this is in the spirit of cooperation and just trying to do what's best for NATO and for human rights and peace.

Thank you.

Senator D'AMATO. In closing, I'd like to make several observations. I don't think there was any doubt coming into this hearing of the strong commitment and feeling, basically, in the Congress and by this COMMISSION as it relates to the Czech Republic, and Slovenia, as it relates to being part of the enlargement in the first round of NATO. That is our feeling. I would be less than candid if I didn't say that last February, if one were to look at the Chairman's remarks as it related to Romania, there were some very real questions.

I would say that there has been extraordinary progress as it relates to the implementation of human rights, respect for it, the opening up of the society, the creation of the rule of law in its practical sense and application, not just on paper, and that Romania has made great progress in meeting the legitimate hopes and aspirations of its people and people who want freedom. I'm particularly pleased and hope that this progress continues as it relates to the respect for the minority community, and the Hungarian community. And that seems to have been moving in the right direction.

So, I am very strongly supportive, because I think it is essential that the group, those of you who are here today, your countries that you represent, Mr. Ambassadors, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, and Romania, that it is important that there be that integrated approach. It will make NATO much more effective. It will add to your security. I believe it will, in the fullness of time, bring about even greater progress in the area of democracy, in the area of human rights, in the area of respect and mutuality for each other and for those other countries in the region, and particularly the very vexing problem that still remains in Bosnia and that area. It is essential that you be part of NATO in dealing with this problem in the fullness of time, because you have all been candid in your expressions that this is not a situation that is going to be dealt with quickly or easily. It is complex. It is difficult. And I think it will require a united European approach in terms of the European communities being there, whether the United States has a presence or a more limited presence or not, that is something in the fullness of time we will be looking at.

So I just think it is essential to the stability of that region, and I want to commend all of you and thank all of you for coming. And, again, make no mistake about it, I am very strongly supportive of Romania being included in that first round as well as the Czech Republic and Slovenia. Thank you so very much.

We stand in recess.

[Whereupon at p.m., the commission adjourned.]

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE ALFONSE M. D'AMATO

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

MAY 13, 1997

Welcome to the second in a series of Helsinki Commission hearings on the subject of NATO enlargement. Today, the Commission will hear from official representatives of the Czech Republic, Romania, and Slovenia on their country's views on the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO is scheduled to announce at its July 8th and 9th summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, which candidate states will be invited to engage in negotiations leading to accession of these states to the Washington Treaty by 1999. Each of the states that have expressed interest in consideration for accession are participating states in the Organization For Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We have invited an official representative of each state to present their government's position to the Commission to help meet the Commission's responsibility to the Congress and the American people to oversee implementation of the Helsinki Accords and subsequent Helsinki process documents, with a particular emphasis on human rights and humanitarian affairs. Congress and NATO have both recognized the significance of candidate states' compliance with OSCE principles in various official documents.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is intended to focus specifically on how well these candidate states have implemented OSCE agreements and complied with OSCE principles. We will ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance into NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas, who will examine those issues more thoroughly and with greater expertise.

As I said at our first hearing, I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think that, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet the standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it is very important that the United States, and our NATO allies, make very clear to those states not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so that they can join when they are ready.

We must, with our allies, establish a clearly defined process for achieving membership. If we don't, we run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the eastern European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

We must not create in eastern Europe a gray zone between NATO and Russia where the old "spheres of influence" and "balance of power politics" could give rise to lasting political instability,

poverty, and isolation. Also, this means that any NATO - Russia “charter” must not create a group of “second class” NATO members whose security guarantees are diluted and undermined.

Ambassador Geoana from Romania, Ambassador Vondra from the Czech Republic, and Ambassador Petric from Slovenia are here this morning to present their governments’ positions on NATO enlargement. I extend to each of you a warm welcome and say that we look forward to hearing your views.

While we will ask direct questions concerning OSCE compliance and implementation during the course of this morning’s hearing, and these questions may address some matters that are sensitive and sometimes controversial in the domestic politics of your countries, this does not mean that we are critical of your bids to join NATO. It does mean that we are very serious about candidate states actually meeting the established standards, including their OSCE commitments.

I am personally a supporter of including each of your countries in NATO. I think that the Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Romania should each be included in NATO.

This morning, you each have the opportunity to explain to this Commission, to Congress, and to the American people why your country should be invited to join NATO. We are very interested in hearing these explanations directly from official representatives of candidate countries.

I want to re-emphasize what I said at our first hearing, addressing the question of Russia and her security concerns. NATO enlargement does not threaten Russia’s security. An eastern Europe without NATO would threaten Russia’s security.

An eastern Europe without NATO could become a black hole of unrest, poverty, ethnic conflict, and extremism of the worst kinds. This would likely attract overt and covert Russian intervention in the affairs of the states in this area, pulling Russia into rebuilding its military machine and deploying it westward, and triggering U.S. and allied reaction. Neither the U.S. nor Russia want that to happen.

Perhaps the best part of this enlargement process is not the military security guarantees that go with it to successful candidate states, but the leverage that the enlargement process exerts for basic changes in each candidate state that will result in better, safer, and more prosperous lives for each of their citizens.

One of the countries whose Ambassador appears before us today is proof of the effectiveness of this leverage. Last year, Romania had a government composed of former Communists and showed the influence of extreme nationalists. The Commission was very skeptical about Romania’s declared candidacy for NATO membership.

Then, last fall, Romania had a national election, and established a pro-reform democratic government. Since then, that government has embarked on a crash program of privatization and reform intended to address all of the shortcomings we felt would prevent Romanian accession to NATO. While that program is still very new, there is every sign that not just the government, but the Romanian people, are serious about pressing through with it to a successful conclusion

This is a very significant fact, but it is not enough, in my view, to push Romania into automatic membership in the first group of states to join NATO. There is still a chance that reform might fail. The same elements in Romanian society that kept the previous government in power are still there, and

have not changed their views on their neighbors, on national minorities, or on human rights. So there is still a risk that Romania may not move firmly into the column of Western democracies.

However, I strongly urge the United States and our NATO allies to take another, closer look at Romania for early NATO membership. I believe that Romania's reform efforts show enough promise and Romania's new political leaders have demonstrated both enough political will and popular support to justify in part this new look.

My call for more serious consideration of Romanian candidacy is based in part upon another major consideration. NATO remains a military alliance. A quick look at the map of eastern Europe would show that an enlarged NATO that stopped with Hungary and Slovenia would leave a huge opening for trouble.

Without a firmly established process for accession for states that aren't selected at Madrid, the area Winston Churchill called the "soft underbelly of Europe" could become NATO's—and the West's—weak southeastern flank. A military alliance with obvious vulnerabilities fails its first test—to deter aggression. With a solidly pro-Western Romania in NATO, the historic Danube valley is closed as an aggressor's invasion route. Without Romania, the heart of Europe lies open to attack at the end of a broad, inviting road.

When we think about Romania—and later Bulgaria—in the context of NATO enlargement, these facts on the ground cannot be forgotten.

Now, I will turn to my distinguished Co-Chairman, Congressman Chris Smith of New Jersey, for any remarks that he might wish to make.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

MAY 13, 1997

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you, again, for your leadership in organizing this extremely important series of hearings on the human rights aspects of NATO enlargement, and I join you in welcoming our distinguished witnesses. Who would have thought, a mere eight years ago, that we would be welcoming the Ambassadors of the countries represented here today to discuss their inclusion in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The fact that we are here is a testament to the desire for freedom that burns in the hearts of all mankind, and to the sacrifices of those who made that freedom a reality.

I want to make clear at the outset that I support NATO enlargement. I believe that the process we address here today is a crucial factor in all of our efforts to consolidate the growth of democracy and free market economy in Europe, as well as to ensure peace and stability now and for future generations. As Americans we harbor no doubt that the peace and security of Europe is a vital security interest of the United States, as we recall the sacrifices of our countrymen throughout this century in efforts to secure that peace.

Accession to NATO is not an end in itself, but rather part of a larger, long-term process which, for those countries involved, includes accession to European and other international organizations as well. All of the countries who have expressed an interest in being considered for accession to NATO are participating states of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. Our leaders met in Lisbon, Portugal in December of last year and, reaffirming the OSCE principles set forth in the Helsinki Final Act, adopted a Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century. Significantly, the NATO Alliance specified in its enlargement guidelines that prospective members will have to have demonstrated a commitment to, and respect for, OSCE norms and principles. I believe therefore, Mr. Chairman, that it is both appropriate, and required by our mandate, that the Commission review the human dimension aspects of NATO enlargement, and provide a unique forum in which prospective candidates can make their cases.

Each candidate comes to the NATO table as an equal. Each will set their own timetable and make their own arguments for accession based on their unique circumstances. Each prospective member has a great deal to contribute to the future success of the Alliance. I believe it is important to point out that, having made the decision to expand, NATO is indeed looking for significant contributions from all new members, regardless of when they join—there will be no two-tiered or second class status. Mr. Chairman, I believe the end result of this process is a “win-win” outcome for all of us. NATO enlargement is not only good for the United States and its NATO allies, but it is equally good for all prospective members, as well as for those countries who choose not to join. The positive societal and economic changes that will emerge in each country as the process moves forward will create a safer and more prosperous environment for all of our citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the testimony of our distinguished witnesses.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

HEARING

MAY 20, 1997

The hearing took place in Room 538 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. at 10:00 a.m., the Honorable Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman, presiding.

Commissioners present: Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman; Hon. Jon Christensen.

Witnesses: H. E. Branislav Lichardus, Ambassador of the Slovak Republic; H. E. Györy Bánlaki, Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary; and H. E. Stefan Tafrov, Ambassador-at-Large of the Republic of Bulgaria for NATO Accession.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CO-CHAIRMAN CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

Mr. SMITH. The Commission will come to order.

Good morning. Today we continue our valuable series of hearings on human rights and the process of NATO enlargement. I look forward to the testimony from our three distinguished witnesses: the Ambassador of Slovakia, the Ambassador of Hungary, and the Bulgarian Ambassador-at-Large for NATO.

As the NATO summit in Madrid nears, I believe it is increasingly important that the United States clarify its position regarding the NATO process for accession by all states which meet the criteria. While those states which qualify should be invited in July to begin negotiation for accession, others need time to implement critical political reforms or time to allow courageous economic reforms to affect the system.

In some cases, the political will to meet the criteria outlined in the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, which we passed, simply has not been harnessed. That will has not been demonstrated. The United States as a leader within NATO has a responsibility to formulate and enunciate a process so countries which need more time are assured of what prospects lie ahead.

Without a doubt, Hungary is one of the leading candidates for NATO membership with respect to meeting relevant criteria, including its OSCE human rights commitments. They have made tremendous progress in the post-Communist economic transition and lead the region in foreign investment.

On the military front, Hungary has cooperated with NATO with respect to Bosnia, providing a staging post at Taszar base near its border with Croatia. Finally, Hungary has worked to improve relations with Romania and Slovakia, two neighbors with substantial Hungarian minorities.

With respect to Slovakia, I remain committed to the goal of her integration into trans-Atlantic institutions. I believe a strong, democratic Slovakia in the heart of Europe is in the interest of the peoples of both countries.

For that to happen, however, there must be credible evidence that meaningful reform is taking root in Slovakia. Unfortunately, we are seeing evidence that the positive and needed progress being

made in a number of other East Central and countries—the Baltic States, Slovenia, and Romania all come to mind—is simply not being made in Slovakia.

I hope that Prime Minister Meciar's government will take concrete measures to restore international confidence in Slovakia's democratization process. These are objectives which the people of Slovakia want and deserve, and are a prerequisite for membership in NATO.

Finally, Bulgaria is currently in the midst of a critical period in her history but at the same time a hopeful period. Bulgaria has experienced dramatic change in the last 6 months. A severe economic crisis led to massive street protests in January which forced the ex-Communist Bulgarian Socialist Party to give up rule.

Pre-term elections were held just last month, which resulted in a decided victory for the reformist Union of Democratic Forces. The new, reform-minded parliament began work just two weeks ago, and a new government is about to be named, a government which I understand is committed to sweeping economic reform and to joining NATO and the EU. Bulgaria deserves our support in this difficult transition.

I'd like to ask my good friend Mr. Christensen, distinguished member of the Helsinki Commission, if he has any opening remarks at this time.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I do not.

Mr. SMITH. Okay. I would like to now introduce our three distinguished guests: Ambassador Lichardus of Slovakia. Branislav Lichardus in 1956 obtained a degree in medicine *summa cum laude* from Comenius University in Bratislava.

Since 1957, he has been a staff member of the Institute of Experimental Endocrinology of the Slovakia Academy of Sciences in Bratislava and later completed his internship in the Department of Medicine at Rayon Hospital.

From 1961 to 1962, he continued his Ph.D. studies at the Institute of Cardiovascular Diseases in Prague. In 1963, he received his Ph.D. degree in physiology and pathophysiology at the Slovakia Academy of Sciences in Bratislava.

His main field of study was renal, neural, and hormonal regulation of the body fluid systems. So he's a very accomplished individual. He's the author of more than 400 papers regarding to this particular field of study.

He was named Ambassador of Slovakia to the United States and arrived in March of 1994, when he presented his credentials to the President.

Next we have Ambassador of Hungary, Györy Bánlaki, who is a graduate of the Woodrow Wilson High School in Washington, D.C., attended his freshman year at Howard University, and earned a doctorate in economics in 1972. In 1981, he was at the U.S. Desk, later head of the U.S. Desk, First Secretary, Consul General, and then Ambassador for the Republic of Hungary to the United States of America here in Washington.

He's the founder and President of the Sawyer Miller Group, a Hungarian-American joint venture for strategic communications. We welcome him here as well.

Ambassador Tafrov, the Bulgarian Ambassador-at-Large for NATO, between 1983 and 1987 worked as editor and head of the department at the ABC Literary Weekly and from '87 to '89 worked as the head of a department of a magazine known as Contemporary.

Between 1990 and '91, he was head of the International Information Department of the Democracy newspaper, head of the International Department of the Union of Democratic Forces, and the foreign political adviser to the President of Bulgaria, from 1991 to '92 was First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and since January of '95, Ambassador Extraordinary to the Court of St. James; since mid March, Ambassador-at-Large for NATO.

Ambassador Lichardus, would you begin? Again, we thank you for being here today. And the Commission awaits your testimony.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY BRANISLAV LICHARDUS, AMBASSADOR OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Amb. LICHARDUS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Christensen, thank you for the invitation to testify before you concerning Slovakia's readiness to join NATO.

We take this unprecedented event as a part of our ongoing dialogue with the United States on many aspects of changing post Cold War reality. Slovakia, as you know, is one of Europe's youngest countries. During the recent past we have gone through two unique transformations.

First, like the other countries asking for admittance into NATO, we have been transforming ourselves from a Communist system, to a free market, democratic society.

But, in addition to that complicated process, we have also gone through the creation of an entirely new governmental structure after the creation of an independent Slovak Republic in 1993, building our new institutions from scratch.

I can assure you that democracy is alive and well in Slovakia, which is a parliamentary democracy, respecting human rights and freedoms. For one thing, we have had free and fair elections, which no international authority has ever questioned in terms of validity.

While there have certainly been disagreements among various authorities, our courts, if necessary, have justly handled these disputes, and all parties have abided by their rulings.

I am most concerned by the misperceptions of Slovakia that I have read and heard since I arrived here in March of 1994. From these reports, one would get the impression that Slovakia is an oppressive state with no free speech and a nonexistent civil society. I am here to tell you that one must really stretch reality in order to arrive at those conclusions.

If you come to our capital, Bratislava, you will see about 15 daily newspapers sold at newsstands, of all political persuasions. These papers range from those which support the government to those which are adamantly opposed to it, and they exist with no restrictions. In fact, I would describe the print media in Slovakia as vibrant.

In addition, there are 20 private radio stations throughout the country, which broadcast freely. There are two private television stations, and a proposal to privatize one of the state-owned stations is being considered.

The growth of the involvement of our citizens in enthusiastically building the civil sphere has been a wonderful thing to observe. There are now over 12,000 citizen associations, 79 political parties, and over 500 trade union or employee organizations.

Under communism, people had no true public life. Everything was part of the political establishment, no matter how minor it may have seemed. The growth of this space between the political and the private has been the greatest change.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you have expressed concern over various developments in Slovakia, and I would like to address these concerns directly. At this point, however, I am pleased to inform you that recently—I would like to stress, and I think that this is very important information at this point—that recently it has been the prime minister who invited the ranking leader of the opposition to consider together the recommendations of the European Commission for refining our political system.

In your statement on the floor; that is, there was the statement of the Chairman D'Amato, of the Senate last month, you claimed that Slovakia is, I quote, "showing signs of regression toward authoritarian, if not totalitarian, relations between the state and its citizens." Mr. Chairman, this statement disappoints me because of its extreme nature.

As one who has lived under totalitarianism, I can tell you that Slovakia is nowhere near such a state. I understand and recognize what it means to be an oppressed citizen, and such oppression is now gone from Slovak society.

You have raised specifically the case of Frantisek Gaulieder, who was removed as an MP from our parliament after resigning from membership in his party. The differing interpretations as to whether this matter was handled appropriately under our new constitution is now before the Constitutional Court.

As I am certain you are aware, the constitution is not always perfectly clear about all matters even in well-established democracies. Our Constitutional Court in its short existence has already developed a reputation of independence and justice. It has ruled both in favor and against the government on many occasions. Everyone involved has complied with these rulings.

The next issue is the claim that there is a large increase in violence in Slovakia. Our newly formed police force is somewhat overburdened by the increase in crime and is trying to respond as quickly as possible. I am pleased to inform you that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been helpful in providing our police force with advanced training.

Slovakia has also been overly criticized for its policies toward ethnic minorities. However, these policies have not been separated from recommendations and legislative initiatives in the international arena.

The Slovak Republic has been visited by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Mr. van der Stoel, on several occasions. As he concluded, there is no real threat to minorities in Slova-

nia. My country was among the first states implementing the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Protection of National Minorities.

About 11 percent of the citizens in our country have Magyar ethnic backgrounds. In areas where there is a high concentration of ethnic Magyars, the Hungarian language is a valid language of instruction at all levels of education.

In those areas, official signs are in Hungarian and the Hungarian language is freely used throughout daily commerce. The one exception is that in all official business in which the government may or does take part, there must be a copy of legal documents in the Slovak language. This is important for legal consistency.

Since the first days following the revolution, the rights of minorities have been a primary concern. We will continue to do whatever is necessary to make certain that minorities in Slovakia are treated fairly. As a matter of fact, there is hardly another country in Europe which would treat ethnic minorities in such a generous way as traditions in our country imply. Hundreds of schools, dozens of churches, newspapers, theaters and cultural institutions speak for themselves.

There is another ethnic group which deserves a special attention: Roma, or Gypsies. In many other European countries alike, this group poses a socioeconomic, rather than an ethnic, problem. The government has taken steps to ensure that access to education for all Roma begins at an early stage. I have some documents here to show you that we have books for Roma children for the first grade and for the next grade and that the Roma language is going to be established as one of the minority languages used in Slovakia.

Thus, I would not describe this policy, especially in recent years, as inactive. I hope that their distinct culture will become better known to a wider audience.

Last year, for example, I had the privilege of opening an exhibition of Roma children artistic creations in Palm Beach, Florida. The travelling exhibition of truly magnificent young artists from Slovakia came to Florida via Japan, India, and Austria. It impressed me as well as eager buyers, who were bidding well over 500 U.S. dollars for individual pieces. One of those pictures is in our conference room at the embassy. I welcome you to have a look at it.

I would also like to mention three periodicals and a live theatre group, which is unique to Central and Eastern Europe, the only one I think in Central and Eastern Europe. Another two theaters are in Russia.

Through government labor offices, there are retraining and educational programs offered to those who are unemployed or less skilled. Success of these programs, however, depends also on the attitudes of the Roma people themselves.

This is one of the problems. The Office of Legal Protection for Ethnic Minorities in Kosice funded through the EU PHARE program, among other things, monitors violence against minorities and provides legal services and protection.

I mentioned this institution because over the past few years, the emergence of skinheads and other racist groups have troubled many countries in our region. In Slovakia, some of these groups have clashed with the Roma community.

As opposed to what has been reported, the government has acted against such behavior, and those who have been caught have been sent to prison. While they do exist, these hate crimes are actually rather infrequent. But our government is sensitive to the problem and denounces such acts.

In conclusion, I am honored to declare that the officially voiced, officially voiced, orientation of the Slovak government in the sphere of European security is characterized by striving to obtain membership in NATO and the European Union.

If Slovakia is left out of the first round of NATO expansion, it will create an uneven degree of security in Central and Eastern Europe. This will not contribute to regional stability and will considerably extend the border of NATO new members with non-NATO countries. At the same time, it will disturb the territorial coherence of the Alliance.

Our civilian-controlled military is as updated and as reformed as those of other leading candidates for entry. And, despite reports to the contrary, our public supports Slovakia's potential membership. Polls have consistently shown a majority of Slovak citizens want to enter NATO.

We even have a group of citizens who have organized a "Race for NATO," in which young people of Slovakia bike, run, and walk across our country to educate the public and rally support for NATO membership.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the process of NATO expansion will remain open and Slovakia will continue to work towards more secure, more stable and more prosperous Europe.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. SMITH. Ambassador Lichardus, thank you for testimony.

I'd note for the record that Chairman D'Amato will be joining us a little late, as he had to testify before the Judiciary Committee.

Many members and many people know the unique nature of this Commission is that every 2 years the baton of leadership shifts from Senate to House, House to Senate. I was Chairman for the last 2 years, and now Mr. D'Amato is serving as Chair, and I serve as Co-Chair. So he will join us momentarily.

Mr. Ambassador, please make your presentation now?

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY GYÖRY BÁNLAKI, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY

Amb. BÁNLAKI. Mr. Co-Chairman, Mr. Christensen, I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity to speak about the issues of human rights in Hungary in the context of our aspirations to join the North Atlantic Alliance.

It is a distinct privilege to do so before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, a well-known and widely respected body of the United States Congress, which, ever since its inception has shown a great interest in the progress of Central and Eastern Europe, a region that due to historic

imperatives and not to its own choice had for a long time found itself on the wrong side of the great divide between freedom and authoritarianism.

Having endured alien ideologies forced upon us and outright foreign occupation, Hungary, along with other nations of this region, is now free again to choose the path of her future development. We have unequivocally made our choice by deciding to seek to join the integration structures of the Western community.

On the other hand, both NATO and the European Union, the two most important of these institutions, have committed themselves to enlarge so that they could embrace the new or reborn democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, including Hungary.

A nation that has recently celebrated the 1,100th anniversary of its presence in the heart of Europe, Hungary has played a unique role in the gradual disintegration and eventual collapse of communism. In 1956, its desperate revolt against foreign occupation and the inhuman practices of dictatorship turned into a national revolution and a brief but bloody struggle for independence, civil liberties, and human rights.

The resistance of the Hungarians was eventually crushed by tanks. Hundreds were executed, and hundreds of thousands left the country. But, through their sacrifices, they put the first nail into the coffin of communism.

That hard-earned status allowed Hungary to be at the cutting edge of reform in Central and Eastern Europe, relentlessly widening the constraints and loosening the straitjacket of Communist ideology, providing a continuous erosive and fermentation process.

In 1989, Hungary once again set an example by dismantling the Iron Curtain and then allowing East Germans to flee to the West, a step that launched a process and unleashed forces that led to the fall of the Berlin Wall in a mere ten weeks.

Ever since the first free elections in Hungary in the Spring of 1990, much attention has been focused on the issues of human rights. True, it did not have to start building a network of laws and institutions from scratch as certain elements of human rights protection had already been grudgingly introduced in the period of the gradual dismantling of one-party rule. Yet it fell to the new National Assembly to do the arduous work of establishing a complete system of legislative acts aimed at human rights protection, setting up a structure to deal with any possible attempt of rights violations and allocating the funds necessary to make this system work.

Hungary now has a stable and well-functioning parliamentary system that has been proven to be an effective and powerful legislative branch of government. It has full control over the executive branch, and, together with the very influential and vocal constitutional court, ensures that all principles of democracy are strictly adhered to and that a system of checks and balances has evolved.

It is a testimony to Hungary's political stability that elections have been held in the time frames set by the respective laws, with no need to hold by-elections and with a high-level participation of the electorate.

The parties represented in the National Assembly cover the whole traditional mainstream political spectrum. However, it is worth mentioning that no extremist political grouping, either from the right or the left, were able to gain a single seat in the National Assembly either in 1990 or '94.

Merely nominal in the years of dictatorship, local government has developed into a strong independent system of political institutions. Hungary has consciously put a premium on strengthening these structures so as to reinforce the concept of citizen participation in decision-making, one of the basic principles on which a genuine civic society can be based.

Hungary's printed media is fully privatized, free of any government control or unlawful outside influence. At the same time, it is fully aware of the responsibility to prevent the publication of things that could be seen as offensive to ethnic or religious groups and to human dignity.

The electronic media's privatization continues, and very soon there will be more private national and local TV and radio stations fiercely competing for the attention of the public.

Hungary is home to several hundreds of thousands of people belonging to various ethnic communities: Germans, Slovaks, Romanians, Serbs, Croats, and so on. The laws adopted by the National Assembly reflect the strong dedication and full determination of the country to offer them as many opportunities to develop their respective cultures and national identities as possible. When needed, extra measures of protection for their specific interests have also been introduced.

Soon, each of the 13 individually recognized larger ethnic groups will have their own freely elected special representatives in the National Assembly. In addition to that a parliamentary ombudsman for ethnic and national minorities has already been quite active in drawing the attention of the Assembly to the concerns of these groups.

Special measures have been, shall be, and will be taken to improve the situation of Hungary's sizable Roma population. Divided into distinct subgroups, they experience many problems of adjustment into Hungary's rapidly developing free market economy.

It has been established as one of the greatest tasks of the government to support the development and to broaden the opportunities of this community, the members of which struggle with past underdevelopment, vestiges of discrimination, remnants of mistrust, and an often self-destructive attitude to the prevalent values of society.

The government has taken a firm stand against any form of bias or discrimination against the Roma, has encouraged initiatives to strengthen mutual tolerance, has introduced a series of measures to defend them from the fallout of economic restructuring, and to help them maintain their valuable ethnic heritage, an important element of Hungary's culture and civilization. The introduction and election of Roma self-governments across the county served this purpose.

There are no legal impediments to Roma aspirations. The challenge is to fill the possibilities and opportunities offered by the legal framework with substance.

Hungary has taken decisive steps to overcome the tragic legacy of the Holocaust. A number of laws on compensation were adopted and implemented, and it has been tried to offer at least a partial compensation for the suffering that the victims of the Holocaust or their relatives had to endure.

Recently, the government, after lengthy negotiations with the various national and international organizations representing the interests of Jewish communities, set up a public foundation with the sole aim of compensation of Jewish communal property lost prior to and during Hungary's occupation by

the Nazis. It has been hailed as the most comprehensive act of communal property restitution in the whole of our broader region.

At present, Hungary is proud to have the largest, most vibrant, and active Jewish community in Central and Eastern Europe, a community that is now going through a true cultural and religious revival and revitalization.

Mr. Chairman, let me mention here that last week Hungary has also concluded what we regard a major agreement with the Vatican on the restitution of important and large-scale assets to the church that had been confiscated earlier to the tune of the value of \$820 million.

Beyond the internal and international efforts, Hungary attaches great significance to the respect for human rights in other regions of the world.

Hungary has been a co-sponsor of many U.N. resolutions and other initiatives in this field. As a practical example, Hungary, in cooperation with the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, has provided shelter for thousands of refugees of the tragic war in the former Yugoslavia.

Changes of Hungary's borders in the 20th century have turned about one-third of those with a Hungarian mother tongue into citizens of other countries.

Since 1945, Hungary has never raised any territorial claims against any of its neighbors. The commitment not to do so has been strengthened in numerous international documents, such as the Helsinki Final Act and most recently in the bilateral treaties signed and ratified with Ukraine, Slovakia, and Romania.

These treaties reinforce the notion that Hungary sincerely seeks a historical reconciliation with the peoples of the neighboring countries and wants the ethnic Hungarians living in them to stay loyal citizens of their respective countries, hoping for them to be given all the opportunities to exercise their rights, use their language, protect their heritage and culture, and maintain cross-border contacts.

This attitude has been well-received by Hungary's neighbors, and we have experienced a welcome development in our bilateral relations with these countries, especially with Romania.

Mr. Chairman, in my presentation, I have focused primarily, as you requested, on the human rights dimension of our aspiration to join NATO. Let me make a brief passing reference to other important developments.

A tough, responsible economic stabilization program introduced 2 years ago has finally created a promising and realistic base for further sustainable growth.

Our two-way trade with the United States has reached a billion dollars. U.S. investment in Hungary is more than \$5.5 billion. Our bilateral security relationship has seen unprecedented growth. American AWACS aircraft up in Hungarian air space for years, thousands and thousands of men and women of the U.S. military having served or gone through the Taszar logistics and staging base in Southwestern Hungary, visits by more than 50 American military delegations led by a two-star general or higher or by an equivalent within one year, and an FBI Academy in Budapest are the highlights of this growth.

Mr. Chairman, we are fully aware of the fact that the transformation of our country, although we did it ourselves, could not have been possible had it not been for the steadfast support and assistance of our many friends in the West, especially in the United States.

This is why, ending my introductory presentation, I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to you not only for your honoring interest in and attention toward Hungary's progress but also for the help that the American people, the U.S. Congress, this Commission, in particular, and the administration have been rendering to Hungary, a country that is determined and committed to turn its close strategic partnership with the United States into a genuine alliance based on the values, interests and objectives that our two nations have come to share.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. I appreciate your remembering that the Commission has been very steadfast and vigilant throughout the years, particularly for the Hungarian minorities that were oppressed in places like Romania during the darkest and bleakest days of the Ceausescu regime. That was always part of our push when we met with the Romanian leaders.

Of course, the government now has done an absolute 180 degree turn, and they have a freely elected and a very progressive government in place. But, during the dictatorship of Ceausescu, we, in a bipartisan way, always spoke out very vigorously on behalf of the Hungarians who were repressed in Romania.

I invite our third and final witness this morning, Ambassador Tafrov of Bulgaria.

STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY STEFAN TAFROV OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA, AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR NATO ACCESSION

Amb. TAFROV. Thank you, Mr. Co-Chairman.

Mr. Co-Chairman and Mr. Christensen, I am greatly honored to meet this distinguished Commission and to inform you of the foreign and security policy agenda of my government and to discuss with you the major issues concerning Bulgaria's membership in the North Atlantic Alliance.

First, I would like to inform you of the prompt and significant progress achieved by the Bulgarian democracy in implementing the reformist agenda steered by President Stoyanov and his caretaker government. In an amazingly short time, we were able to reverse the extremely negative course of economic developments and to deal effectively with the most urgent problems. There are already encouraging signs of economic and financial stabilization of strongly reduced inflation and strengthening of the national currency.

Privatization and structural reform are well on track. Active preparation is underway to establish without unnecessary delay a currency board. The standby agreement reached with the IMF and the successful meeting with the G-24 held in Brussels provide additional reassurance of the international support for the reforms.

These encouraging results met the support of the nation in the general elections held on April 19. These elections, held, as previous ones, in full accordance with the high OSCE standards, confirmed that democracy and the rule of law in Bulgaria are firmly based and functioning and changes in the

country are irreversible. As you are aware, the United Democratic Forces (UDF) received the absolute majority of seats in the newly elected parliament, gaining 52 percent of the national vote, thus providing for the establishment of a strong executive in Bulgaria. In fact, the government, the new government, is going to be voted by our parliament tomorrow.

Thus, the unity of purpose, represented by the president, the new reformist parliamentary majority, and the government, will be an important pillar and guarantee for the stable course and the Atlantic choice.

The new parliament started its work with a general agreement on united parliamentary action on several major issues. In a declaration on national salvation offered by the UDF coalition and approved on May 8th, after several rounds of consultations among all parliamentary forces, the National Assembly endorsed the basic principles to lead the country out of the current economic crisis.

A major issue in the Declaration is the parliamentary support for Bulgaria's foreign policy steps towards an early full membership in NATO.

In this context, I would like to stress that the decision to apply for membership in the North Atlantic Alliance was not a goal in itself. It was embodiment of shared values and an inextricable part of the policy towards genuine reform.

The accession to the European Union and NATO will be an efficient instrument for the modernization of the country. Indeed, the speedup of market reforms and the search for stable security are only two sides of the coin.

The progress towards an early NATO membership will enhance a more favorable climate for economic reform, trade, and investment, and will help our record of positive achievements continue to grow. I would like to emphasize this on the very eve of the 50th anniversary of the far-reaching Marshall Plan, from which we were forcefully excluded.

The very prospect of joining the Euro-Atlantic institutions has been an essential driving force for the implementation of the reforms in Bulgaria and one of the main incentives for Bulgaria's constructive foreign policy over the last 7 years.

Bulgaria is looking forward to the bold and responsible decisions to be taken at the Madrid Summit and is ready to contribute to the success of NATO enlargement.

The committed effort of Bulgaria to join the Alliance at an early stage and the favorable response by our Western partners and future allies gives us every reason to expect equal treatment and equal starting opportunities alongside other prospective members. Bulgaria is prepared to assume all obligations and enjoy all rights under the Washington treaty.

The membership in the Alliance will not only provide a reliable source of guarantees for Bulgaria's national security but will also enhance its capabilities to contribute to the stability and security in the region.

Over the last 7 years, the climate of religious and ethnic tolerance in Bulgaria has been praised internationally. With its policy of good neighboring and balanced relations with all countries in the region, Bulgaria is already a net producer of regional stability and security. It has no territorial, border,

ethnic, or religious disputes with any of them. I would like to mention, in particular the excellent ties with Greece and Turkey, including in the field of security and defense.

Building on this positive record and in full compatibility with the regional initiatives of the U.S. government, Southeastern Europe Cooperative Initiative, and the European Union, Bulgaria will continue to promote its initiatives for stability, security, and cooperation in Southeastern Europe conceived as an additional vehicle for the effective involvement of the country and whole region in the European and Euro-Atlantic integration.

Another important development in this ongoing process will be the regional meeting of defense ministers to be hosted by Bulgaria later this year. We are glad that the U.S. Department of Defense and NATO will be actively involved in the planning and the proceedings of this meeting.

We are convinced that the early accession of Bulgaria to the Alliance would further strengthen the security and stability in Southeastern Europe and NATO's southern flank.

Geostrategically, the enlargement to the Alliance to the Southeast would link the northern flank to the southern one, giving the latter additional guarantees against latent risks.

It would certainly contribute to the greater coherence of the Euro-Atlantic security and defense area and for an appropriate balance in the policies and priorities of the transformed Alliance. It would assure the safety of trans-regional infrastructure and energy systems.

It is important, therefore, to provide for a geographically balanced approach to NATO enlargement which would contribute to a more equal level of security and stability in different regions, thus minimizing the risk of new dividing lines or gray zones on the continent.

In this context, we believe that the security of NATO and indeed all of Europe would only benefit from an equal treatment of applicant countries from the Black Sea region.

The defense potential of Bulgaria, according to our assumptions, provides appropriate basis for self-sustained capabilities. And, thus, the country would be a real net contributor to the Alliance's collective defense.

We have developed a positive record of committed involvement in peacekeeping, which we will further enhance. The participation in IFOR and SFOR as well as the forthcoming Bulgarian contribution to the international effort to restore stability in Albania are a tangible proof of our readiness to contribute to the allied efforts in securing peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Without prejudging the decisions to be taken in Madrid, we expect from the Summit a clear and firm commitment that the Alliance will remain open and that the first invitations are only the beginning of the process, which should continue without undue delay.

This commitment could find an expression in the establishment of a clearly defined timetable and procedures for further enlargement. It makes sense to expect further invitations to be extended immediately after the conclusion of accession negotiations with the first countries invited or after their actually joining the Alliance in 1999 at the latest.

The Madrid Declaration could also contain a recognition of the efforts made by applicant countries and an invitation for their continued active participation in the process of enlargement through intensive dialogue, including at 16 plus 1, leading to accession.

Bulgaria looks forward to an early follow-up of the intensified dialogue, which should have a pre-accession agenda and focus on the preparation for membership, gradually assuming elements of accession negotiations. The process might involve periodic assessment and relevant guidance on the preparation effort. This would provide for the enlargement to be a continuous stream process, rather than a sequence of waves or groups of new members.

Transparency and predictability should remain among the main principles of the enlargement, including in the decision-making process within the Alliance and in consultations with countries outside the Alliance.

We welcome the recent agreement on a NATO-Russia document to establish a strategic partnership. We are convinced that NATO enlargement will ultimately contribute to democratic Russia's security by projecting stability and underpinning democratic reforms to the East.

In order to become an important element of the new European architecture, NATO relations with Russia should take into account the legitimate concerns of all European countries.

We expect that these relations will be as transparent as the NATO enlargement itself. In any event, the forthcoming and any later enlargement of NATO should be excluded from the agreement and future consultation with Russia.

Bulgaria is firmly set to develop mutually beneficial relations with Russia on the basis of sovereign equality, including an open and constructive dialogue on European security.

Bulgaria should not be regarded as a country that for cultural, historical, or economic reasons was destined to be part of the Russian sphere of influence. Ever since the restoration of Bulgaria's independence in 1878, the history of the Bulgarian-Russian relations has been multilayered and contradictory.

One of the aspects of the forced Sovietization of Bulgaria between 1944 and 1989 was the invention of a real mythology about the so-called peculiar nature of the ties between Bulgaria and Russia.

We are encouraged by the recent statements made by Russian leaders concerning Bulgaria's sovereign will to seek membership in NATO in the sense that this fact should not affect adversely the overall development of our bilateral ties. This statement has been supported so far by the practice, and we consider it a realistic one.

We also welcome the steady development of a special relationship between the Alliance and Ukraine. Developing mutually beneficent economic and political ties with Ukraine is high on Bulgaria's foreign policy agenda.

Bulgaria is firmly committed to assume the responsibility and its share of the costs of the membership in the Alliance. As President Stoyanov stated in his address to the nation, while membership in NATO will not be cost-free, the burden of remaining outside the Alliance will be much higher, if not unbearable. We understand that security does have a cost and are determined to provide for the necessary investment.

As an important part of the democratic reform, we have undertaken significant steps towards the establishment of civilian control over the armed forces based upon a legal framework and increased transparency within the defense establishment. This major effort still has to be completed.

Work has already started in order to review the legal basis for the defense and the armed forces, the national security and defense policy, and the existing practices.

The preparation for an early accession to the Alliance is a truly national effort and it enjoys the active support by the Bulgarian public. I would like to mention, in particular, the valuable contribution of the Atlantic Club of Bulgaria, which will host this October the General Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association.

May I avail of this opportunity to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the distinguished members of this Commission an invitation to attend this important meeting.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Mr. SMITH. Ambassador Tafrov, thank you for your fine testimony.

Let me begin the questioning. First of all, with regards to the preparations for membership, we all know that there is the Alliance study. The NATO enlargement study contains a listing of what prospective members should be all about: have demonstrated commitment to and respect for OSCE norms, human rights; a commitment to promoting stability and well-being and economic liberty; democratic and civilian control of their military, and have an adequate number of resources dedicated so that each country can be a full and complete partner with NATO.

Yet, the more this Commission looks into the process, it seems as if many of the countries in question are left out of the process. There is no process with real predictability. The process seems to be not unlike what will happen in a few hours when the Federal Reserve Board Chairman meets to discuss what the short-term rates will be. There's mystery and a lot of intrigue about how one really gets into NATO.

And, if you could, if you would like to comment on the process, how well you think your country is doing, particularly as it relates to because you did address many of the human rights questions that we asked you to address this issue of civilian and democratic control, whether or not your parliaments will have adequate checks and balances on what the military provides.

One of the hallmarks of this nation is that the Executive Branch proposes a budget, and yet we have the ability to go through line after line after line of the defense and every other budget. There is oversight and also more eyes and ears focusing on each line item.

Please touch on that, if you will? And, Ambassador Tafrov, especially, since many of the old guard are still ,or are in the process of being phased out, please address these issues because civilian control has to be a big issue in your country?

Amb. TAFROV. Thank you very much, Mr. Co-Chairman. As I mentioned in my presentation, of course, civilian control is very high on the agenda. And, of course, the improvement in this has started under the caretaker government of these last months indeed.

We realize that, as some other candidate countries, we have a lot of work to do still in this field. We are aware of that. We have plans with our NATO allies, including the United States, to get some technical assistance in helping us to train more civilian people in being able to help us in this.

Also, over the last 7 years, a number of our militaries have been trained in the NATO countries, including in this country. The wish of President Stoyanov certainly and also of the new government is to promote these officers in higher positions so that they bring the new NATO culture to the high military ranks.

I must say that our militaries by tradition are really very professional, very neutral. We are very satisfied with their performance over the last 7 years. They are highly professional, very loyal to the democratic institutions. We have no fears of any kind regarding them.

The new thing which is going to be introduced by the new government is more transparency in the budgeting process of the military budget, of course, because the whole process of the budget will be overhauled, including the military one. It is one of the improvements we are looking for.

So as far as military reform is concerned, special attention will be given. In short, special attention is going to be given by the new government, which is now being formed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ambassador?

Amb. BÁNLAKI. The first part of your question, Mr. Chairman, related to the process—

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Amb. BÁNLAKI.—And our observations. I think we are on the whole clear as to how it is expected to proceed. Probably we can call it conventional wisdom.

July 8th and 9th the first round members shall be issued invitations to start accession negotiations, probably sometime in September. The talks are expected to conclude by or before Christmas. Then the lengthy process of ratification follows.

Thus, we have every hope and confidence that on a very symbolic day, for several reasons, April 4th, 1999, Hungary will become a full member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The reason I'm mentioning April 4th as a symbolic date, by coincidence, this used to be the national day of pre-'89 Hungary designating, depending on the angle, the liberation of Hungary from Nazi occupation or occupation by the Soviets.

Whichever way you look at it, April 4th has been this day for decades. I think it will be highly appropriate and symbolic, if on that date in 1999 we do become members. It will have signified this once-in-a-lifetime of a nation opportunity of renewal and a fresh start and the change.

In terms of the civilian control aspect, I think we have made the necessary transformations to meet the criteria. It is a lengthy process. Civilian experts on military affairs or new high-level military officers in large numbers are very difficult to produce, but we have achieved quite a few things in the past few years.

Something like 27 generals have been retired in the last 2 years. At the moment, seven of the top ten soldiers in Hungary are graduates of Western high-level military institutions. It just so happens that the number one military leader, the top man, is a graduate of Army War College in Carlisle. His deputy, the number two, is a graduate of National Defense University, Washington, D.C.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Amb. LICHARDUS. Mr. Co-Chairman, first of all, with your kind permission, we will add two short addenda to my official statement for the recorder. The first one will be about the Jewish minority in our country.

And we would like to stress in there that Slovakia was the first or among the first countries in OSCE to adopt a comprehensive legislation regarding restitution of Jewish property. The "Act on Moderation of Property Injustices Towards Churches and Religious Communities" was adopted by the Slovak parliament in 1993.

The second amendment will be about the bilateral treaty with Hungary. We consider this treaty as an important factor of stability in Central and Eastern Europe. We are closely cooperating with Hungary on the implementation of this document.

The group of experts has had already several sessions on that matter. We probably will have four committees in order to implement this treaty, which was the first of its kind in Europe.

And now concerning our military preparedness for NATO membership, I must stress that our military activities are unequivocally praised by the United States and also by NATO in Brussels.

Civilian control of the military is established by the CONSTITUTION. Minister of Defense is a civilian person as well as his deputy. The Slovak parliament exercises supervision and control of the military budget and military doctrines through Defense and Security Committee. The committee has 12 members, 7 from the coalition, 5 from the opposition.

Our activities in the Partnership for Peace Program are really very extensive. I would like to say, for example, that the North Atlantic Council approved the Individual Partnership Program of Slovakia in NATO in 1995.

In 1996, we participated in 225 events, including seminars and 6 military exercises, which included 3 command staff exercises and 2 field exercises. Some of them took place also on the territory of Slovakia.

We were the first country to pass the Partnership for Peace Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), which provides a mechanism for sending Slovak troops abroad and stationing, for instance, of foreign troops in Slovakia for military exercises.

I would like to say that we are part of a peacekeeping force in former Yugoslavia. We are in the very sensitive place of Eastern Slavonia. We will supervise the events that we expect will happen in that very hot territory.

Also, I would like to mention the Mil-To-Mil and PfP [Military to Military and Partnership for Peace] Programs. Slovakia has established close ties with the National Guard of Indiana. In 1996, the National Guard organized 20 out of 66 events and plans for 1997 include another 86 events.

Slovakia has concluded agreements on military cooperation with all neighboring countries: Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, and Ukraine; seven NATO members: U.S.A., Canada, Belgium, France, U.K., Netherlands, and Germany. The plan for 1997 is to sign agreements with Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Denmark, and Norway.

Our 1997 defense budget represents 7.17 percent of the total state budget and 2.6 percent of GDP. What we are paying for PfP Program is approximately four percent of our total military spending.

Now, inter-operability of the Slovak Armed Forces—we cannot afford to buy new equipment right now. But we have equipped our MIG-29s with IFF [Identification Friend or Foe] system and avionics according to ICAO standards at a very high cost. Plans for 1997 call for the same upgrade in eight additional jets, and in MI-24 choppers.

Now, very briefly, military cooperation between Slovakia and the United States. On September 23, 1996, the Slovak Minister of Defense and representative of the U.S. Embassy opened the Consolidated Military Assistance Office (CMAO) in Bratislava. So, American soldiers are on our territory, despite the existence of number three question in our forthcoming referendum.

Now, the last thing I would like to mention is that under the CFE, Slovakia delivered on its pledge to reduce its military forces to a level required by the treaty. We have now 40,607 troops and 11,000 civilian employees.

Slovakia has established an exchange of classified military information with the U.S. It is based on the “General Agreement on Security of Military Information,” which was signed by the U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry and his Slovak counterpart, J. Sitek.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask a question about the referendum, which you have scheduled for May 22nd or 23rd.

Amb. LICHARDUS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. And I believe in Hungary, about a year or so later you are constitutionally required to hold a referendum. Is that true?

Amb. BÁNLAKI. The constitution does not require any such thing.

Mr. SMITH. But you will be holding—

Amb. BÁNLAKI. We are likely to hold one, but there is no decision as to when or what the exact content of that will be.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask, Ambassador Lichardus, regarding your proposed referendum. Of the questions, the third has to do with the stationing of nuclear weapons, which is likely to elicit a “no” vote from the people.

As I think you know, standard NATO practice is not to put nuclear warheads or nuclear devices in new countries that become part of NATO. That question is coupled with a question regarding the stationing of foreign troops on your territory.

The first question on the referendum is very direct: Should Slovakia join NATO? The other two are likely I think to elicit a “no,” which could send a confusing message to NATO itself and to other countries that are concerned about NATO enlargement.

Amb. LICHARDUS. Mr. Co-Chairman, I’m sure it will be much better to discuss this on Saturday morning, when we know more about what really is going to happen.

There are, as a matter of fact, four questions, the first one: NATO, yes or no? According to the polls, we expect that the majority will vote for NATO.

Then there are two additional questions, the first one concerning the nuclear arms. This is unpredictable. The third one, which is not vaguely established, is the question of military forces on our territory. The question does not define what kind of military forces, but we believe that the answer to that question probably will be positive.

As a matter of fact, the parliament passed a resolution suggesting to the people of Slovakia: Vote for the membership in NATO. There are a lot of activities on TV, radio, in the media and so on which try to explain to our population that NATO is probably the only future for us when we speak not only about security but also about a prevention of conflicts, genuine conflicts, in Europe or probably unpredictable conflicts, which may arise from the fact that the arms of mass destruction may be in the hands of some irresponsible governments, NATO should protect us against terrorism, should protect us against mafias, and so on and so on.

Mr. SMITH. Ambassador Bánlaki, is it true that only about 50 percent of the Hungarians support accession into NATO?

Amb. BÁNLAKI. No. I put it in quite a different context. Of those who have an opinion and who would go to vote, two-thirds support it. And, as a background, let me explain.

I referred in my statement to 1956. If you recall, in 1956, neutrality—which 40 some years ago in the framework of the Alliance systems and the Cold War, neutrality was the major foreign political demand of that revolution.

So there is a lingering, if very outdated, notion that neutrality is something good coupled with the fact that if you look with Hungarian man of the street eyes at a neutral country, Switzerland or Austria, it is also coupled with prosperity.

But whatever neutrality might mean in 1997, it is quite another thing. So I would attribute it to the transformation process and an education process. The communication strategy, just as we have initiated it on the European Union, on accession will have been very soon underway.

I’m sure that by the time this comes, by the time it is explained that in a security alliance system your defense expenditures are lower than if you are outside and all the facts are known, NATO membership will be very widely accepted and supported. There has been an initiative by an extreme left wing party to have a referendum on this subject, but the overwhelming position of all parliamentary

parties on this was that you can genuinely ask a question only when you know what is involved, when you do have an invitation, and when you know what is how much and what the specifics are.

So thinking of the seven-party consensus in parliament—and I don't want to mention this in a light tone, but this is probably the only issue in the sphere of politics in which the seven parties can form a consensus—they are in consensus on support for NATO enlargement.

Very recently, a delegation of the seven parliamentary caucus leaders of the parties headed by the speaker of the house went to Brussels and manifested their support.

So, whatever the outcome of the 1998 elections and whatever combination of a coalition will become the government, support for NATO is strong.

Let me just mention for the record as I had the opportunity to introduce him to you at the beginning of this session that the parliamentary leader and the majority leader of the Hungarian parliament, Mr. Szekeres, is here in this chamber with us.

Mr. SMITH. Please be recognized.

(Applause.)

Amb. TAFROV. Mr. Chairman, may I just shortly ask about: There won't be referendum in Bulgaria because, simply for legal reasons, our constitution provides for the ratification of international treaties like the Washington Treaty. It's a treaty like this ratified by a majority of two-thirds.

Also, on two occasions, Bulgarian voters could express their views on NATO membership by electing President Stoyanov last November with 60 percent of the vote and only a month ago by electing a new parliament, which voted a declaration in favor of Bulgaria joining NATO by more than two-thirds of the vote. The exact figures are 175 for NATO membership, 27 against, and 32 abstained.

The Socialist Party, which is the ex-Communist party, holds the view that a referendum should be held, but it won't happen because it's a minority view.

And the Socialist Party itself is divided over the NATO membership. There are Socialists who are for, and there are Socialists who are reluctant. But it's largely a minority view.

Now, the free and fair elections were held also on this subject. Bulgarians indicated very clearly what their preference was. So there is a consensus in society about our candidacy.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Let me ask one final question before yielding to my good friend Mr. Christensen. Ambassador Lichardus, one of the issues of very deep concern to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe is the intolerance that members of the ruling coalition parties show towards those who are in opposition—and that includes journalists.

There have been a number of opposition political party leaders and journalists who have been victims of violent crimes. It seems very little has been done to resolve those crimes. They often are dismissed based on lack of evidence. There seems to be a pattern that we have observed.

The murder of Robert Remias in April of 1996 was something that we were all very concerned about in terms of political violence.

One of the things that we are looking for and I think the people intimately involved with the NATO process is a whole sense of reconciliation and tolerance, with a capital “T.”

My question is: Could you speak to this issue? What is the government trying to do to mitigate these problems?

Amb. LICHARDUS. I mentioned in my statement that the prime minister invited one of the heads of the opposition to a table to discuss the issues of refining our policy. So this may be a beginning of something new in our country.

It is true that the process started in parliament several months ago, that we are reconstructing the committees of the parliament in a way that more voice should be given to the opposition.

So I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this process was launched in Slovakia. And I personally feel that it will continue as we have our vision of NATO membership in the future and certainly the membership in the European Union. We are aware of the fact that political criteria for the European Union not differ from the criteria for the membership in NATO.

Now, concerning issues of violence, it is true that there is violence in Slovakia but probably not very much different from other countries in the region or some other countries anywhere in the world.

There are still some unexplained problems with Remias, Kovac, Jr. I would like to inform you that all these cases have not been closed and that the government, for example, offered a reward, one million Slovak crowns, to find people responsible for the death of Remius.

So I certainly believe that sometimes it may take time to solve some criminal problems. You have the same experience in your country. This is a worldwide experience.

And, in the meantime, there is a space for speculations. Such speculations are going on, unfortunately, also in our country.

But also I would like to focus your attention at the fact that probably when speaking about violence toward the people in the opposition, you should take into account that there is sometimes violence also against the people in the coalition. So both, let’s say, political personalities on both sides are sometimes the target of violence.

Now, for example, the President of our constitutional court also received some letters, threatening letters. In his statement, he said, “During my 4 years as the President of the Constitutional Court, I have not observed any serious objections which should disqualify me or the Slovak Constitutional Court. I do not know what attacks Mr. Senator”—he addresses the floor statement of Senator D’Amato—“is thinking about. If Mr. Senator is thinking about some anonymous threats towards me, they have been investigated by the police in accordance with appropriate laws.” So I would like to express my personal view that this is going to be under control in the future as well.

And now, when speaking about the media, I wouldn’t say that there is violence against journalists. It’s true that several journalists left the daily *Slovenska Republika*. Other journalists, who worked for

Navodna Obroda—another one of the newspapers—were not dismissed, but they left due to some personal changes—you may know the *Navodna Obroda*— was purchased by a concerned Steel Mill Kosice Holding that changed the working environment. Some of the journalists decided to quit.

Also the information regarding accreditation to the Government Press Office. You recall that the office revoked accreditation to four journalists for four days. But after some discussion, it was decided to remedy it. I'm sure that the situation will not repeat itself.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Christensen?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Co-Chairman.

I wanted to say congratulations, first of all, to Ambassador Tafrov. Tomorrow I'm told you're going to be the new foreign minister. Is that right? Deputy?

Amb. TAFROV. First Deputy.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. First deputy foreign minister tomorrow. Congratulations.

Amb. TAFROV. Thank you.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. On Page 4 of your testimony, I wanted you to explain to me one of the statements in the third to last paragraph. You state, "One of the aspects of the forced Sovietization of Bulgaria between 1944 and 1989 was the invention of a real mythology about the so-called 'peculiar' nature of the ties between Bulgaria and Russia." Would you further explain that?

Amb. TAFROV. I think it should have said, rather, special. We have been having these last several decades, we Bulgarians, the reputation of the closest satellite to the Soviet Union. We don't like this reputation.

What I'm saying there is that it is a mythology which was created on purpose by the Bulgarian Communist s and, of course, with the Soviets in order to legitimate this status quo under communism. It's not the truth historically.

In fact, the Bulgarian-Russian relations are much more complex. After we acquired our independence in 1878, there was a period in which Russia tried to impose its influence on Bulgaria. The Bulgarian political class reacted very vigorously to this. Bulgaria remained an independent state. These pages of history were forgotten on purpose during communism. That's what I mean. There's a whole mythology thing how close Bulgaria and Russia have always been and Bulgaria and people going to the Soviet Union said this.

Russia is a very important country. And, of course, we enjoy very good bilateral relations, as you know. We were encouraged by the reaction from the Russians when we decided to join NATO, which was generally mild. They understand that they can't stop us.

It's a choice. It's a fundamental choice we have made. And, in fact, as President Stoyanov put it, it will go only to improve our bilateral relations with Russia because it is going to make them much clearer, much more predictable. It's already happening, I must say.

So the Bulgarian-Russian relations in the future will only be improved by a Bulgarian membership in NATO.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Examining the former Soviet Union and looking at the issue of corruption, how do you plan to proceed in terms of moving Bulgaria forward in terms of economic opportunities and more towards the capitalistic model versus what's gone on in terms of the corruption inside dealing with the former Soviet Union? How do you plan to move your country towards a capitalistic model versus corruption?

Amb. TAFROV. Well, corruption is a problem for most transition countries. It is a problem for Bulgaria. It is a problem which has been tackled by the caretaker government these last months in a very successful way, I must say. It's only the beginning. It is going to continue under the forthcoming government.

Unless you fight corruption, you can't get foreign investors. It's as simple as that. One of the main objectives of my government is to promote foreign investment to the country because we don't have foreign investment. We can't expect prosperity for our people.

So corruption is very high on the agenda of the government. And, as you may see from the declaration—I have a parliamentary declaration which was voted a week ago—it is one of the main points. Fighting organized crime, fighting corruption is very high on the agenda. That's where Bulgarians will judge the success or the failure of the government in its actions.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. What steps are you taking right now to rebuild the banking system in Bulgaria?

Amb. TAFROV. The banking system is being overhauled under the agreement with the IMF. The introduction of a currency board will bring more financial discipline to the country.

And the first thing to do is to—it has been already practically done—to cease giving licenses to not very serious banks. It was the main instrument through which the former government, the socialist government, in fact, favored its own political friends. It has already stopped.

The second, of course, is maybe to reduce the numbers of banks so that only the healthy ones remain. But, as I said earlier, the introduction of a currency board since next July, the first of July—everybody expects that to happen next July—will be, of course, a major improvement in the whole functioning of the banking system, bringing more transparency and more predictability.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Ambassador Lichardus, I'm new on this Committee. So I've been rather quiet in terms of just listening to the testimony of the former speakers we've had over the last two or three weeks.

And as a new member on this Committee, I've had an opportunity to listen to the ambassadors from the Baltic States. Last week we had an opportunity to hear from the Romanian ambassador. Today I had an opportunity to hear your testimony.

As a new person on this Committee, I have to say there is a dramatic difference from where some of the other ambassadors' testimony has been in terms of moving the country forward in terms of

NATO expansion and the opportunity to join the NATO versus what I've heard and what I've seen from other testimony concerning Slovakia.

What are the prospects for a change now? You've stated that there are things occurring in there, but how are we going to move Slovakia forward given its current head of state and the current government? What's your proposal? How are we going to keep up with Romania and the Czech Republic and some of your neighbors around your borders?

Amb. LICHARDUS. So, first of all, I would like to stress when speaking about military preparedness, Slovakia is prepared for the membership.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. What is your—

Amb. LICHARDUS. I just tried to explain it several minutes ago.

Yes, please?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. In terms of military preparedness—

Amb. LICHARDUS. For the membership.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. What is your armed services? How many people do you have right now?

Amb. LICHARDUS. We have 40,000. You were not here, sir, when I testified several minutes ago about our armed forces.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I'm sorry.

Amb. LICHARDUS. I just devoted about five minutes to this problem, but I can easily repeat it.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. No. Don't repeat yourself. I will—

Amb. LICHARDUS. Nobody protested. So I think that my statement was accepted.

Now, economically, Slovakia is prepared to be the member of NATO. I would like to say that 80 percent of our state property has been privatized and more than 70 percent of our exports come from private enterprises.

When speaking also about the economy from the point of view of future investment in Slovakia, unfortunately, the investment so far has not been very significant.

One of the reasons for that was that some investors, especially from Western countries, from the United States and so on, thought that the political situation was instable or that there was an not atmosphere for investing in Slovakia. But now—

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Ambassador?

Amb. LICHARDUS. Yes?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Do you really think that Slovakia has made the same advances towards democratization as the Czech Republic or Romania or Bulgaria or even Hungary?

Amb. LICHARDUS. Well, generally I believe that we should probably compare our advances step by step. But generally speaking, we are on the right track that was expressed, for example, in the discussion with the former Secretary of State Christopher, who told us: You are probably not 100 percent prepared, but we see that you are on the right track.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. You may be on the right track, but answer my question. Are you along down the track as far as your neighboring countries in your opinion?

Amb. LICHARDUS. Well, I would say that yes, we are. If you would like to discuss, let's say, the critical questions in which we are behind them, I would be prepared to do it.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. In what steps are you behind them, then? You've led with the question. So tell me which areas you're behind.

Amb. LICHARDUS. Well, I think that it is this problem with the parliament we have talked about. The parliament and the parliamentary committees are being at present under reconstruction. We need more cooperation in the parliament between the opposition and the coalition.

At the time, I think that there are signs that the time came that this is going to happen. I think it is one of the fields where I would say that we should improve, really, the situation in Slovakia.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Christensen.

Let me ask a general question. If any of your countries are not included in the first round, what will that do? Will that breed a kind of disillusionment? Is there a concern that the people may say, "Well, if they don't want us now, maybe never," or will it, on the contrary, perhaps prompt a more aggressive effort to initiate a process?

Part of our concern is that so far we're not sure what happens. Where is the Round 2? When does that take place, after 1999 or what? NATO has been largely silent on what it will prescribe for the future.

Mr. Ambassador?

Amb. TAFROV. Thank you.

Well, we believe that Bulgaria is ready to join the Alliance now, but we are realists. We are not among the countries which are quoted for the time being, unfortunately for us, among the first to join the Alliance.

What we expect from NATO in Madrid is a clear signal that the enlargement of the Alliance is an ongoing process and that in the foreseeable future there won't be a long pause. I want to stress that. Other countries have occasion to become members of NATO. We will be able to do so.

Frankly, the fact of an exclusion of Bulgaria, a durable exclusion of Bulgaria, from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is going to have a very negative impact on the process, on the reform process, in Bulgaria at a crucial moment for us. It is in a way for Bulgaria now or never. I mean, the success of the reform is at stake, really.

We don't want, however, to exaggerate these fears because Bulgaria will be democratic, a democratic country, whatever happens, because it is for the sake of—because it is the choice we made. But we still need a stable framework for this development.

We are a small country in a troublesome region. We have also the feeling that over these last 7 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, with our behavior in Southeastern Europe, it has contributed to meet NATO purposes, which is to stabilize the region.

We were part of the coalition during the Gulf War. We respected the embargo against former Yugoslavia, by the way, losing a lot of money because of that because we were physically cut off from the rest of Europe. You have just to look at the map and see that we were really physically cut off. But, nevertheless, we stuck to that line because it was the only way to behave.

So we have the feeling that we enjoy excellent bilateral relations with our NATO members, equally good relations with Greece and Turkey, including in the military sphere.

And, Mr. Co-Chairman, I must say that, regarding our neighbors, a process has been underway over these 7 years with historical reconciliation with them, which can be compared with what happened between countries like, for instance, France and Germany after World War II.

War is not any longer a thinkable instrument of resolving differences between Bulgaria and its neighbors. We live in what is called a security community in real life. So a NATO membership will only just institutionalize this actual situation.

So the answer is yes, not including Bulgaria in the foreseeable future will have adverse consequences for my country. We are a country which may be one of the countries which lost the most after Yalta. At that point our economy and our society were at least as advanced—it is a country with roughly the same size in population like Greece. We traditionally compare, we have always compared, ourselves with Greece.

Now we are behind Greece economically and in other terms, and it is due to the fact that we were on the wrong side after Yalta. It was not our own choice. We were simply occupied by the Soviet troops, and Greece didn't have that.

If there was a gray zone in the Southern Balkans, I can tell you it will be much less easy to stabilize the whole region. It's obvious for everybody. From purely a geographic or a strategical point of view, you need to connect the Southern flank, which is very important, with the rest of the Alliance.

And, of course, you have the country which is bordering the two actual NATO members with Bulgaria. So it makes sense also from that point of view. So we have a number of arguments.

If you allow me one other last, but not least, important point, we are at pride with our record as far as tolerance vis-a-vis national minorities is concerned.

We are at the end of the day the country, European country, which along with a country like Denmark saved its Jews from deportation during the World War II. It is one of our brightest pages of our recent history. The Bulgarians saved 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from that deportation. The whole nation stood against the intent of the Germans to deport them to Auschwitz.

And when the Communist regime during its last years started a campaign against the Bulgarian citizens of Turkish origin, the disgust of the Bulgarians vis-a-vis this policy was such that we reacted very, very strongly. And the first thing to do after the fall of the dictator in '89 was to restore the rights of the Bulgarian Turks.

I must say that we are one of the very good examples in the region in dealing with ethnic minorities in times when elsewhere there was ethnic cleansing. So we have provided a very, very positive example.

We are very proud with that, and our fellow citizens of Turkish origin are very active, very well-integrated in our national life, including the political life of the country.

So we are proud with our record in that sphere. We believe we have already contributed to this and give examples to others.

Mr. SMITH. At the risk of sounding presumptuous, perhaps your new government should consider making you the foreign minister, as Mr. Christensen—

Amb. TAFROV. I don't disagree.

Amb. BÁNLAKI. Mr. Co-Chairman, as I said earlier, we are approaching the Madrid summit with cautious confidence of being invited in the first tranche. So I very much hope that your question is a theoretical question. But, nevertheless, it obviously needs answering.

Let me say that I personally would be a little bit puzzled about the transparency of the process if we were not invited and also a little puzzled by how meeting the criteria is judged.

But, having said that, it would not and could not change the fundamentals of our commitment to the values we have talked about, which we do, not for the sake of NATO, but for the sake of our future and our vision for Hungary's development and modernization for the next century.

So basically no change would come aside from possible internal political reverberations as inevitable, but it would not change our commitment to the same values. It would not change the interest that we hold as a nation. It would not change the common goals that we, as I said, share.

Perhaps to illustrate the thinking, again, as I said, aside from deep personal dissatisfaction and also possibly being fired if this happens but also I think of our OECD membership, which I think is a major landmark for Hungary's aspiration to be included in the family of nations of Western democracy, that process perhaps illustrates how it has happened.

The Czech Republic became the first from the region to be admitted in January last year. I would have liked to see us being the first and not our Czech friends. But it did not make us turn our backs on OECD.

We were told what items were still missing, what we had to do. We saw that this is a transparent process. And in 4 months' time we became members.

At that time I'm sure our Polish friends would have liked to see themselves first or second and not ourselves, but they also were told what criteria are yet to be done. And they became members of OECD in a few months' time, the end of the summer.

Now, if you look back 20 years from then—and perhaps this has to do with the whole process of NATO enlargement. If you look back 20 years from now, who will know or care whether one country became a member in January, the other in April, and the third in September.

So, of course, we are very much, particularly in this profession, looking at the watch as to when this happens, but this is a historic process. A lot of things are in limbo.

Perhaps one brief thought, how to put all of this in perspective, what is going on in all of our countries. Just think how many books have been written on how to make socialism out of capitalism. It started with Karl Marx and went down all the way. You can fill libraries with it.

Not a single book has ever been written about how to make capitalism out of socialism. Why? Probably because it was not anticipated. So the pages of that book are being written today in Hungary, in Slovakia, in Bulgaria, and all the region.

And, if you have ever written a book, some of the pages, some of the manuscript are not neat and clear print. Sometimes you tear up the first page and throw it out and write a new one. So this is an exciting, exhilarating process.

And most of these nations got a new, certainly Hungary got in 1989-90 a new, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity in the life of a nation, for renewal. Some have managed to manage this process with greater success, with greater speed and greater efficiency than others, but there are ups and downs. Those are natural.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Mr. Ambassador, Ambassador Lichardus?

Amb. LICHARDUS. This reminds me of something. There was a question years ago: What is socialism? The answer is socialism is the arduous transition from capitalism to capitalism. So I would believe that this is also true for our country.

If we are not invited in Madrid, it will be certain disappointment for those who are for the membership in NATO. It is more than 60 percent of our population. But we believe and we know that this is not the end of the process. We believe that a door will be open and that it will depend on us whether in the future we will qualify for the membership or not.

As far as I know, the government declared, our Minister of Foreign Affairs declared, that we will try to persuade our Allies to be eligible for NATO in the future.

And I would also like to say something about a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which objected to a recently emerging foreign and domestic speculation that nonacceptance of Slova-

kia into NATO will result in worsening of bilateral relations with its neighbors; in particular, with Hungary, or will negatively influence the rights of Hungarian national minority in Slovakia. It is not going to happen in Slovakia.

Mr. SMITH. Let me just say my definition of socialism versus capitalism. In socialism, if you have two cows, you milk one and you ration the milk. In capitalism, if you have two cows, you sell one and you buy a bull.

I have one final question. I do appreciate your answers and your being with us for the last two hours, Mr. Ambassadors.

On religious freedom, which has always been something that the Commission has been very, very articulate and, I think, aggressive on throughout the many years that this Commission has been in place, there is a concern.

I know Bulgaria is in a transition. The Alliance for Salvation has called for a new constitution. But, like many of the countries in Central and Eastern Europe, registration of religious bodies is still required, if my information is correct. There are some, like Jehovah's Witnesses and some of the evangelical groups, that have been denied or are given a very hard time about registration.

Is there any review underway to eliminate registration altogether so that the government doesn't approve or disapprove the registration based on its acceptance of their philosophy?

Amb. TAFROV. As far as Bulgaria is concerned, Mr. Co-Chairman, we make our legislation like most European legislation, make a distinction between churches and religious denominations. It's a matter of legal culture, if you wish. So only churches have to be registered, while all other religious denominations don't need to be registered because a church is considered as something more complex. It's something which has its own bodies and its own structures and so on.

While under our constitution, our current legislation, the religious beliefs of our citizens are personally private matter. And nobody, certainly not the state, can interfere with this choice. Effectively, churches have to be registered, but it's a relatively easy process.

You mentioned Witnesses of Jehovah which were denied such a registration, and you're right on the ground that this particular church prevents those who are members of it to blood transfusion. Our Ministry of Health was against for medical reasons.

And also they prevent or the members of the church are prevented to serve in the Army and we have conscription in Bulgaria. So there is a conflict with the current legislation. So they were denied this right to register, effectively.

But now, of course, all of this policy will be under review with the new government. And, as a de facto situation in the country, Evangelical denominations, in particular, have become much more widespread since the fall of communism in Bulgaria. We haven't currently, by the way, in Sofia a big gathering of evangelicals, some Evangelical churches. I know that Mr. Deychakiwsky attended one recently, and he can witness about the situation.

At any rate, the impression which is given of some—not intolerance because I can't say—doesn't come from the state but from a very minor group of the population. The basic reason of that is that

under communism, religion was considered something wrong. And, of course, there is a lot of work to do to educate people in religion, in understanding religion, in knowing more about religion.

And, by the way, as one of the most important items of the problems of the new government is introduce religious education in the schools. It means not education in a given religion but to educate people about the different religions, to get to understand them better, which will, of course, improve dramatically the situation hopefully.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much. I'd like to thank again our three distinguished ambassadors for your testimony. It is very helpful for this Commission to hear from you directly. We will continue this dialogue through staff and through ourselves, members of the Commission and the ambassadors. I thank you very, very much.

This hearing on NATO enlargement is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was concluded at 11:59 a.m.)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE ALFONSE D'AMATO

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

MAY 20, 1997

Welcome to the third in a series of Helsinki Commission hearings on the subject of NATO enlargement. Today, the Commission will hear from official representatives of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Slovakia on their country's views on the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Ambassador Lichardus from Slovakia, Ambassador Bánlaki from Hungary, and Ambassador Tafrov from Bulgaria are here this morning to present their governments' positions on NATO enlargement. I extend to each of you a warm welcome and say that we look forward to hearing your views.

NATO is scheduled to announce at its July 8th and 9th summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, which candidate states will be invited to engage in negotiations leading to accession of these states to the Washington Treaty by 1999. Each of the states that has expressed interest in consideration for accession are participating States in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

We have invited an official representative of each state to present their government's position to the Commission to help meet the Commission's responsibility to the Congress and the American people to oversee implementation of the Helsinki Accords and subsequent Helsinki (OSCE) process documents, with a particular emphasis on human rights and humanitarian affairs. Congress and NATO have both recognized the significance of candidate states' compliance with OSCE principles in various official documents.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is intended to focus specifically on how well these candidate states have implemented OSCE agreements and complied with OSCE principles. We will ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance into NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas, who will examine those issues more thoroughly and with greater expertise.

As I said at our earlier hearings, I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think that, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet the standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it is very important that the United States, and our NATO allies, make very clear to those states not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so that they can join when they are ready.

We must, with our allies, establish a clearly defined process for achieving membership. If we don't, we run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the eastern European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

We must not create in eastern Europe a gray zone between NATO and Russia where the old “spheres of influence” and “balance of power politics” could give rise to lasting political instability, poverty, and isolation. Also, this means that any NATO - Russia “charter” must not create a group of “second class” NATO members whose security guarantees are diluted and undermined.

While we will ask direct questions concerning OSCE compliance and implementation during the course of this morning’s hearing, and these questions may address some matters that are sensitive and sometimes controversial in the domestic politics of your countries, this does not mean that we are critical of your bids to join NATO. It does mean that we are very serious about candidate states actually meeting the established standards, including their OSCE commitments.

I am personally a supporter of including each of your countries in NATO. I think that Hungary, Bulgaria, and Slovakia should each be included in NATO when each country meets the standards for membership.

Hungary is universally, and I think, correctly considered to be an automatic candidate for a first round invitation to join NATO. Hungary has met the conditions for membership, and through her association with the NATO efforts in Bosnia, both IFOR and SFOR, and her participation in the Partnership for Peace program, is clearly capable of making an immediate contribution to the security of the other members of NATO.

Bulgaria and Slovakia are each in different situations that I will discuss in more detail later in this statement.

This morning, you each have the opportunity to explain to this Commission, to Congress, and to the American people why your country should be invited to join NATO. We are very interested in hearing these explanations directly from official representatives of candidate countries.

I want to re-emphasize what I said at our earlier hearings, addressing the question of Russia and her security concerns. NATO enlargement does not threaten Russia’s security. An eastern Europe without NATO would threaten Russia’s security.

Last Friday, the North Atlantic Council gave its approval to the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and The Russian Federation, which was negotiated between the NATO Secretary General Javier Solana and the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, Mr. Yevgeni Primakov. This Founding Act will be formally signed by the Secretary General of NATO and Heads of State and Government of NATO and Russia in Paris on May 27, 1997.

Agreement on the Founding Act marks a level of formal acceptance by Russia of NATO enlargement. It does not mean that all Russian policy makers or opinion leaders agree with NATO enlargement. It is a major step forward on a job that is not yet complete.

Disagreement in Russia over NATO enlargement appears to be in part based upon political opportunism by nationalists and Communists nostalgic for the Soviet Union. It also appears to be based upon the fact that a significant number of nationalists and Communists do not yet accept the idea that Russia’s future lies in becoming an integrated member of the European and Western community of nations at the end of Russia’s present reform process. It also means that these same groups do not accept democracy, capitalism, or human rights as we understand them as the direction in which Russia’s internal development and international relations should follow.

Until these significant dissenting forces in Russia come to believe that NATO is not a threat to Russia, we will have work to do. Also, the security guarantees that go with NATO membership will continue to be important.

However, for the long term, perhaps the best part of this enlargement process is not the military security guarantees that go with it to successful candidate states, but the leverage that the enlargement process exerts for basic changes in each candidate state that will result in better, safer, and more prosperous lives for each of their citizens.

One of the countries whose Ambassador appears before us today is proof of the effectiveness of this leverage. Last year, Bulgaria had a government composed of former Communists and had not begun to undertake necessary reforms. The Commission was very skeptical about Bulgaria's candidacy for NATO membership.

Then, this spring, Bulgaria had a national election, and is establishing a pro-reform democratic government. That government plans to embark on a crash program of privatization and reform intended to address the shortcomings we felt would prevent Bulgarian accession to NATO.

This is a significant fact, but it is not enough to include Bulgaria in the first group of states to join NATO. We first need to see this reform program make concrete progress. However, I strongly urge the United States and our NATO allies to make certain that there is a clear process for Bulgaria to follow for early NATO membership. I believe that Bulgaria's reform efforts promise change in the right direction and Bulgaria's new political leaders have the political will and popular support to carry them through to success given enough time and encouragement.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about Slovakia. We all had high hopes that Slovakia's government would prepare that country to join NATO in the first round. In fact, when NATO enlargement was first seriously discussed, Slovakia was frequently mentioned as a likely candidate for early admission. However, Slovakia is alone among those states that might have been seriously considered for membership in showing problems in the human rights and democratization areas that more than justify waiting to see which direction Slovakia turns—towards democracy, freedom, free enterprise, and integration into European and Western institutions on the basis of shared values and aspirations, or toward ethnically based nationalism and a combination of thinly veiled authoritarianism and statism that is unacceptable to us and our allies.

Without going into detail, the problems include the unsolved kidnaping of President Kovac's son; the equally unsolved murder of Robert Remais, a potentially key witness in that case; the illegitimate stripping of his seat in parliament from a dissident deputy; the unsolved bombing of that deputy's house; the expulsion from media organizations of persons who did not agree with the government's official line; limitations on minority cultures and languages that particularly adversely affect the Hungarian and Romani minorities; and unexplained and unsolved beatings of leading figures in the political opposition.

These factors taken together have caused the Commission to write to Prime Minister Meciar concerning political violence and the need to resolve these cases fairly and quickly; to speak out on the floor about the situation in Slovakia, and to do a variety of other things to focus public attention on the problems in Slovakia. Until these problems are solved, we plan to press ahead with our public diplomacy on behalf of the human rights of Slovakia's people, working to assure them of the same future of

freedom, prosperity, security, and respect for their individual rights that awaits those states who are more advanced in their reform efforts.

Now, I will turn to my distinguished Co-Chairman, Congressman Chris Smith of New Jersey, for any remarks that he might wish to make.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROCESS OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

MAY 20, 1997

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your leadership in initiating this important and timely series of hearings on human rights and the process of NATO enlargement, and I join you in welcoming the Ambassadors of Hungary, Bulgaria and Slovakia. Who would have thought, a mere eight years ago, that we would be welcoming the representatives of these countries to discuss the possibility of their membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The fact that we are here today is a testament to the desire for freedom that burns in the hearts of all mankind, and to the sacrifices of those who made that freedom a reality.

Let me make clear at the outset that I support NATO enlargement. I believe that the process we are examining is a crucial factor in all of our efforts to consolidate the growth of democracy and free market economy in Europe, as well as to ensure peace and stability now and for future generations. As Americans we harbor no doubt that the peace and security of Europe is a vital national interest of the United States, as we recall the sacrifices of our countrymen throughout this century in efforts to secure that peace.

Last week President Clinton announced the conclusion of an agreement between the NATO Alliance and the Russian Federation. This historic agreement marks the beginning of a fundamentally new relationship between NATO and Russia, and defines the goals and mechanism of consultation and cooperation which will be undertaken. I believe this is a step in the right direction. Russia, whether or not she eventually applies for NATO membership, must be engaged and informed regarding the enlargement process. Russia must not, however, hold sway over Alliance decisions regarding admission of new members, and this is clearly stated in the new agreement.

Accession to NATO is not an end in itself, but rather part of a larger, long-term process which, for those countries involved, includes accession to European and other international organizations as well. All of the countries which have expressed an interest in being considered for accession to NATO are participating States of the Organization for Security and cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. Each candidate comes to the NATO table as an equal. Each will set its own timetable and make its own arguments for accession based on its unique circumstances. Each prospective member has a great deal to contribute to the future success of the Alliance. I believe it is important to point out that, having made the decision to expand, NATO is indeed looking for significant contributions from all new members, regardless of when they join—there will be no two-tiered or second class status.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the end result of this process is a “win-win” outcome for all of us. NATO enlargement is not only good for the United States and its NATO allies, but it is equally good for all prospective members, as well as for those countries who choose not to join. The positive societal and economic changes that will emerge in each country as the process moves forward will create a safer and more prosperous environment for all of our citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the testimony of our distinguished witnesses.

**STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY AMBASSADOR OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC,
H.E. BRANISLAV LICHARDUS**

MAY 20, 1997

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Commission,

Thank you for the invitation to testify before you concerning Slovakia's readiness to join NATO. We take this unprecedented event as a part of our ongoing dialogue with the United States on many aspects of changing post Cold War reality. Slovakia, as you know, is one of Europe's youngest countries. During the recent past we have gone through two unique transformations. First, like the other countries asking for admittance into NATO, we have been transforming ourselves from a Communist system, to a free-market, democratic society. But, in addition to that complicated process, we have also gone through the creation of an entirely new governmental structure after the creation of an independent Slovak Republic in 1993, building our new institutions from scratch.

I can assure you that democracy is alive and well in Slovakia, which is a parliamentary democracy, respecting human rights and freedoms. For one thing, we have had free and fair elections which no international authority has ever questioned in terms of validity. While there have certainly been disagreements among various authorities, our courts, if necessary, have justly handled these disputes, and all parties have abided by their rulings.

I am most concerned by the misperceptions of Slovakia that I have read and heard since I arrived here in March of 1994. From these reports, one would get the impression that Slovakia is an oppressive state with no free speech and a non-existent civil society. I am here to tell you that one must really stretch reality in order to arrive at those conclusions.

If you come to our capital, Bratislava, you will see about fifteen daily newspapers sold at newsstands, of all political persuasions. These papers range from those which support the government to those which are adamantly opposed to it, and they exist with no restrictions. In fact, I would describe the print media in Slovakia as "vibrant." In addition, there are 20 private radio stations throughout the country which broadcast freely. There are two private television stations and a proposal to privatize one of the state-owned stations is being considered.

The growth of the involvement of our citizens in enthusiastically building the civil sphere has been a wonderful thing to observe. There are now over 12 thousand citizen-associations, 79 political parties, and over 500 trade-union or employee organizations. Under communism people had no true public life. Everything was part of the political establishment, no matter how minor it may have seemed. The growth of this space between the political and the private has been the greatest change.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you have expressed concern over various developments in Slovakia, and I would like to address these concerns directly. In your statement on the floor of the Senate last month, you claimed that Slovakia is, I quote, "showing signs of regression toward authoritarian, if not totalitarian relations between the state and its citizens." Mr. Chairman, this statement disappoints me because of its extreme nature. As one who has lived under totalitarianism, I can tell you that Slovakia is nowhere near such a state. I understand and recognize what it means to be an oppressed citizen, and such oppression is now gone from Slovak society. At present, I am pleased to inform you that the Prime Minister has invited the ranking leader of the opposition to consider together the recommendations of the European Commission for refining our political system.

You have raised specifically the case of Frantisek Gaulieder. He was removed as an MP from our parliament after resigning from membership in his party and after a simple majority vote in the parliament based on the letter of his resignation. The differing interpretations as to whether this matter was handled appropriately under our new constitution, is now before the Constitutional Court. As I am certain you are aware, The Constitution is not always perfectly clear about all matters even in well established democracies. Our Constitutional Court, in its short existence, has already developed a reputation of independence and justice. It has ruled both in favor and against the government on many occasions. Everyone involved has complied with these rulings.

The next issue is the claim that there is a large increase in violence in Slovakia. Our newly-formed police force is somewhat overburdened by the increase in crime and is trying to respond as quickly as possible. And I am pleased to inform you that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been helpful in providing our police force with advanced training.

Slovakia has also been overly criticized for its policies toward ethnic minorities. However, these policies have not been separated from recommendations and legislative initiatives in the international arena. The Slovak Republic has been visited by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Mr. van der Stoel on several occasions. As he concluded, there is no real threat to minorities in Slovakia. My country was among the first states implementing the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Protection of National Minorities.

The bilateral treaty with Hungary ratified in 1996 has laid a solid foundation for broader Slovak–Hungarian cooperation. The parties to the treaty have decided to establish joint committees to deal with specific issues of mutual cooperation. The Slovak Republic has submitted to the Hungarian party an analysis of the living conditions of the Magyar national minority in Slovakia. This document is considered to be a starting point for the bilateral dialogue. Hungary is expected to provide a corresponding document on the situation of the Slovak minority there.

About eleven percent of the citizens in our country are of Magyar origin. In areas where there is a high concentration of ethnic Magyars, the Hungarian language is a valid language of instruction at all levels of education. In those areas, official signs are in Hungarian and the Hungarian language is freely used throughout daily commerce. The one exception is that in all official business in which the government may or does take part, there must be a copy of legal documents in the Slovak language. This is important for legal consistency.

Since the first days following the revolution, the rights of minorities have been a primary concern. We will continue to do whatever is necessary to make certain that minorities in Slovakia are treated fairly. As a matter of fact, there is hardly another country in Europe which would treat ethnic minorities in such a generous way as traditions in our country imply—hundreds of schools, dozens of churches, newspapers, theaters and cultural institutions speak for themselves.

Jewish culture after years of silence and neglect has been revived again. The Slovak Republic was one of the first countries in CEE to adopt comprehensive legislation regarding restitution of Jewish property. The Act on Moderation of Property Injustices Towards Churches and Religious Communities was adopted by the Slovak parliament in 1993. Actually, the first act of this kind came just before Christmas of 1990, only a month after the fall of communism when the Slovak Parliament passed a resolution in which its members apologized officially for injustices committed against Jews and Carpathian Germans in World War II.

In his recent trip to Slovakia in April of 1997, the Commissioner of the U.S. Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, Mr. I. Stolberg, stated that the future of Jewish heritage and culture in Slovakia is solely in the hands of the community there and abroad. In 1994, the Museum of Jewish Culture opened in Bratislava, publishing a specialized journal "Acta Judaica Slovaca". In 1996 a new Institute of Judaism was opened at Comenius University in Bratislava.

There is another ethnic group which deserves special attention—Roma (Gypsies). In Slovakia, as in many other European countries, the status of this group represents a socio-economic rather than an ethnic problem. The government has taken steps to ensure that access to education for all Roma begins at an early stage.

Thus, I would not describe Slovakia's policy toward Roma, especially in recent years, as "inactive". I hope that their distinct culture will become better known to a wider audience. Last year for example, I had the privilege of opening an exhibition of Roma children's artistic creations in Palm Beach, Florida. The travelling exhibition of truly magnificent young artists from Slovakia impressed me, as well as the eager buyers, who were bidding well over 500 USD for individual pieces.

The Roma language is cultivated in three periodicals and a live theater group, Romathan, which is unique to Central and Eastern Europe. Through government labor offices there are retraining and educational programs offered to those who are unemployed and less skilled. Success of these programs, however, depends also on the attitudes of the Roma people themselves. We encourage wide participation in these programs and hope that they will succeed to the benefit of their recipients.

The Office of Legal Protection for Ethnic Minorities in Košice funded through the EU PHARE program monitors violence against minorities and provides legal services and protection. I mentioned this institution because over the past few years, emergence of skinheads and other racist groups has troubled many countries in our region. In Slovakia, some of these groups have clashed with the Roma community. In contrast to what has been reported, the government has acted against such behavior, and those who have been caught have been punished. While they do exist, these hate crimes are rather infrequent. Nevertheless, our government is sensitive to the problem and denounces such acts.

In conclusion, I am honored to declare that the officially stated policy of the Slovak government in the sphere of European security is characterized by a clear intention to obtain membership in NATO and the European Union. If the Slovak Republic is left out of the first round of NATO expansion, it will create an uneven degree of security in Central and Eastern Europe. This will not contribute to regional stability and will considerably extend the border of new NATO members with non NATO countries. At the same time, it will disturb the territorial coherence of the Alliance.

Our military is civilian controlled and has been extensively updated and reformed. Slovakia is a very active participant in military cooperation programs such as partnership for Peace as well as international peacekeeping. And, despite reports to the contrary, our public supports Slovakia's potential membership in NATO. Polls have consistently shown that a majority of Slovak citizens support this idea. We even have a group of citizens who have organized a "Race for NATO" in which young people of Slovakia bike, run and walk across our country to educate the public and rally support for NATO membership.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the process of NATO expansion will remain open and that Slovakia will continue to work towards a more secure, more stable and more prosperous Europe. Thank you.

**POSITION OF THE SLOVAK MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
CONCERNING THE ISSUES RAISED BY
THE U.S. COMMISSION FOR COOPERATION AND SECURITY IN EUROPE**

WASHINGTON, MAY 20, 1997

The Slovak Republic is a parliamentary democracy with functioning democratic institutions and a democratic Constitution protecting human rights and freedoms of its citizens. Slovakia has had free and fair elections which no international authority has ever questioned in terms of validity. Equally important is the fact that Slovak society is governed by the Rule of Law.

The developments in the Slovak Republic are fully comparable with other countries in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and in some respects have put Slovakia among the leaders of the region (GDP growth, inflation). The 1996 Human Rights Report of the U.S. Department of State on Slovakia, while pointing out some imperfections, states that "the Government generally respected most of the human rights of its citizens". These reports were quite similar in nature when evaluating the situation in a few other CEE countries. However, they have not received as much attention from the U.S. OSCE Commission as shown by the strongly worded statements about Slovakia issued by the Commission's Chairman in April of 1997.

Reports of political violence in Slovakia have focused disproportionately on cases involving figures tied to the political opposition. It is necessary to emphasize that there are several other cases of violence which remain unsolved than just those mentioned in the statement of the Chairman of the OSCE Commission. To illustrate this reality we want to point out attacks carried out against coalition deputies, K. Konarik, A. Matejka and J. Slota. We consider it unfair that some cases receive all the attention (M. Kováč Jr., R. Remiáš, F. Gaulieder, M. Toman) and some others, against people who happened to be members of the opposition, do not. Yet all the cases have not been closed.

In recent years the police and judicial system in the region of CEE have had to face increased levels of criminal activity. Coping with this tide poses a great challenge and danger to any democratic society. The issue of violence is a very disturbing one to all Slovaks. It is in the highest interest of the Government of the Slovak Republic to bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. Financial rewards for information leading to successful solution of the most serious cases have been offered by the government (100,000 Slovak Crowns in Mr. Gaulieder's case and 1 million in the cases of Mr. Remiáš and the murder of a policeman in Ilina).

Receiving death threats and bomb attack warnings is hardly unique to Slovakia. Slovak institutions treat these matters seriously and appropriately. In 1996 there were 663 telephone calls threatening death or a bomb attack and among their subjects were political leaders, MPs, judges, policemen and other publicly active persons regardless of their political persuasions. Addressing this topic, Mr. Milan Èiè, President of the Constitutional Court, has stated that "...during my 4 years as the President of the Constitutional Court, I have not observed any serious objections which should disqualify me or the Slovak Constitutional Court. I do not know what attacks Senator (d'Amato) is thinking about. If the Senator is thinking about some anonymous threats towards me, they have been investigated by the police in accordance with appropriate laws."

Removal of Mr. Gaulieder from the Parliament was decided by the vote of a simple majority in the parliament based on the letter in which Mr. Gaulieder announced his resignation. The legal framework and procedure were based on following provisions:

- Article 81 par. 1 of the Constitution stating that an MP can give up his mandate
- Act on MPs No. 45/89 Col., Art. 9 according to which an MP can give up his mandate in writing
- Rules of Procedure of the National Council (Act. No. 44/89 Col.), Art. 31, par. 5,

Since there are differing interpretations as to whether this matter was handled appropriately under the Constitution, this case is now before the Constitutional Court to determine whether Mr. Gaulieder should have lost his mandate. The decision of the Court will be fully respected by the executive as well as the legislative branch in Slovakia.

FREE SPEECH, FREEDOM OF MEDIA

There are 11 national and seven regional dailies published in Slovakia. These papers range from those which support the government to those which are adamantly opposed to it, and they exist with no restrictions. The print media in Slovakia can be described as “vibrant.” In addition there are over 20 private radio stations throughout the country which broadcast freely. There are also two private television stations and a proposal to privatize one of the two state-owned channels is being considered.

“Alleged political interference” with the work of journalists has been disputed by the Chief Editor of the daily *Slovenska Republika*, Mr. E. Fašung, who in his reaction to the OSCE Commission Statement said that none of the journalists had been dismissed. The ones who left did so by their own choice either because of their ambitions or a more lucrative offer. Mr. Fašung admitted that some of the departures might have been caused by personal relations but certainly not by political reasons.

The daily *Národná Obroda* stated that journalists were not dismissed but they left due to personal changes. Former Chief Editor, Ms. Tatiana Repková left because of management misunderstandings after she had clashed with the Board of Directors of the daily’s majority owner, NOFRA Co. After she was dismissed, another five journalists left with her.

The dispute between the journalists and the Government Press Office started on November 19, 1997 was resolved three days later when the representatives of professional associations of journalists and the Press Office reached a five–point agreement in which the Press Office cancelled its previous decision and it was also decided that any further violations prior to establishment of the Press Council (to deal with ethical issues) will be solved between the Press Office and journalists’ employers

GOVERNMENT’S MINORITY POLICY

...banning the playing of the of non–Slovak national anthems... Use of state symbols of the Slovak Republic is stipulated in the State Symbols Act No. 63/1993 Col. which deals exclusively with organs of public administration and other state institutions (legal persons). There is no law in Slovakia which would ban playing an anthem or use of state symbols of another state. Use of state symbols of another state by a local self–government or state institutions (schools) is first of all viewed as political not

cultural expression and perceived as act of disloyalty by Slovak public, in some areas even as a sign of irredentism.

Minorities living on the territory of the Slovak Republic enjoy a high standard of minority rights. The existing legal norms and standards related to this issue are in compliance with international standards. The Government Council on National Minorities serves as an advisory and recommendation body to the government. It consists of 11 representatives of minorities (one for each minority) and 11 experts of different agencies dealing with minorities. The Council has recently adopted a non-binding recommendation to the Slovak government stating that as far as the use of minority language is concerned, there are no further legislative norms necessary to add to the existing framework. However, the Slovak Parliamentary Committee on European Integration has requested the Vice Chairman of Government for Minorities, Mr. Jozef Kalman, to continue to work on the minority language law. In April of 1997, Ms. Katarina Tothova, the Vice Chairwoman of the Government, acting on behalf of the Prime Minister, has formally requested the European Commissioner, Sir Leon Brittan, to provide EC experts to assist in this matter.

“Reductions in government provided subsidies” to support minority culture.

The Slovak Republic provides subsidies to 11 national and ethnic minorities. Conditions for development of culture, identity and the mother tongue of minority are being provided as follows:

- to legal persons for organizing cultural events (in the period of 1992–96 government provided over 100 mil. Slovak Crowns/or 3 mil. USD))
- to publish periodic literature (131 mil.SC)
- to publish non-periodic literature (over 39 mil.)
- to support operations of minority culture providers financed from the state budget (theatres, museums, ensembles, libraries, regional cultural centers—390 mil SC). Through the funds of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Culture, the government contributed in this period as much 661, 782, 500 SC.

The fundamental principle guiding the distribution of funds is not the number of minority members but the quality of proposed projects. Quality is judged by the Commission for Minority Cultures where the minorities and representatives of state institutions dealing with minorities vote on projects together. Reductions for the Magyar minority culture are due to a reduced state budget and to the fact that the government is required to create equal conditions for development of all minorities. The present situation shows that from a long term perspective the Czechs, Ukrainians and Magyars have sufficient conditions for development of their identity.

JEWISH MINORITY

The Slovak Republic was one of the first countries in CEE to adopt comprehensive legislation regarding restitution of Jewish property. The Act on Moderation of Property Injustices Towards Churches and Religious Communities was adopted by the Slovak parliament in 1993. Actually, the first act in that direction came just before Christmas of 1990, only a month after the fall of communism. The Slovak Parliament passed a resolution in which its members apologized officially for injustices committed against Jews and Carpathian Germans in World War II.

In his recent trip to Slovakia (April of 1997) the Commissioner of the U.S. Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, Mr. I. Stolberg stated that the future of Jewish heritage and culture in Slovakia is solely in hands of the community there and abroad. In 1994 the Museum of Jewish Culture opened in Bratislava, publishing a specialized journal "Acta Judaica Slovaca". In 1996 a new Institute of Judaism was opened at Comenius University in Bratislava.

ROMA MINORITY

Government "inaction" and threat to Romany communities—the government in its official statements strongly supports constitutionality and civic and human rights of all Slovak citizens regardless their nationality (such as Statement from the Special Session of the Government issued by the Council for Nationalities dated August 10th, 1995, Statement of the Vice Chairman of Government and Chairman of the Government Council for Nationalities regarding the attack against Roma in iar nad Hronom).

The State guarantees the same rights to all Slovak people and in the case of the Roma population it has to deal with their difficult socioeconomic situation. This aspect is more important for the identification of the true problem than an ethnic approach (Roma nationality is claimed by only 80,000 people in Slovakia but NGOs put this number at about 400,000).

The Roma have their representatives in the Council for Nationalities and other advisory and decision making organs of the Ministry of Culture. In 1995 a position of the Special Envoy of the Government for Citizens in Need was created to address specifically the issue of the Roma population. On April 30, 1996, the Envoy initiated Govmt. Resolution No. 310 which summarizes steps which are going to be taken in order to deal with the problem of education, poverty, crime and others.

The Resolution deals specifically with measures aimed at containing occurrences of racial hatred against Roma. Perpetrators of these heinous crimes are prosecuted according to Slovak laws. For instance, the murder of a Roma youth, Mario Goral, which drew the attention also of the U.S. OSCE Commission has not gone unpunished. On February 12, 1997, the Regional Court in Banska Bystrica condemned the three persons convicted of this crime to 7.5 years, 28 and 8 months with no parole.

In these cases the state organs cooperate with the Office of Legal Protection for Ethnic Minorities in Kosice (funded by the EU—Phare program) which monitors violence against minorities and provides legal services and protection. Racial attacks on Roma population which has recently appeared in the city of Prievidza have been addressed by increased numbers of police patrol and close scrutiny of skinhead groups. Skinhead movement which has been behind several incidents with Roma are neither registered nor truly organized movement in Slovakia.

There are 10 political organizations and 39 civic associations of Roma. Their unique way of life has caused great difficulties in coping with a new situation of diminished welfare and social support. With no or little education the Roma are disproportionately hit by economic reform and also in crime statistics. Therefore the labor offices throughout the country have adopted an extensive program of job training programs and maintenance jobs with the city councils (parks, streets, playgrounds, etc.)

ROMA EDUCATION

The government has taken steps to ensure that access to education begins at an early stage. In 1996, 13 elementary schools opened classes for first graders with language and social handicaps (mostly Roma). The codification of the Roma language is now under preparation and the first school books in

Roma language have been published. Experiments in vocational schools with traditional Roma crafts have been aimed at attracting Roma students to prepare them for better paying jobs. In 1997 in Levoca's Pedagogical School there will an opening of a class for teachers in Roma kindergarten. Universities in Presov and Nitra have opened separate Departments of Roma Culture.

There are three periodicals in Roma language (weekly "Romano li'l Nevo", and monthly "Lulud'i" and "Roma"), theater (Romathan) and cultural-educational organization (Roma-Gemer). The Dept. of Roma Culture in Museum of Local Culture in Humenné will soon become an independent institution.

Cases of violence and racial hatred remain isolated—official crime statistics for 1996 show 4 cases of political hatred, 24 cases of racial hatred, xenophobia in three cases and one anti-Semitic case.

These negative occurrences of extremism have been by far outweighed with enormous growth of the involvement of Slovak citizens in enthusiastically building the civil sphere. There are now more than 12,000 citizen-associations, 79 political parties, and more than 500 trade-union or employee organizations.

THE RULE OF LAW

As a young country with a Constitution only 5 years old, the Slovak Republic has just started to establish its record of Constitutional rulings, inevitably needed for complete separation of powers. This issue remains the most controversial in Slovak politics and sometimes creates a perception that the country is not capable of handling its own challenges. However, the rulings of the Constitutional Court have proven otherwise.

Since its foundation in 1993 until March of 1997, the Court has considered 237 petitions. Seven petitions to rule on compatibility of new legislation passed in the parliament and the Constitution of Slovakia came from the President. In four cases the Court ruled that new laws were unconstitutional and they were then either scrapped or amended. Fifteen petitions came from the MPs. While there have certainly been disagreements among various authorities, the Constitutional court has justly handled these disputes, and all parties have abided by its rulings. The latest ruling of the Court was issued on May 14th, 1997 when the Court ruled not to accept a petition of the Government of Slovakia regarding the unconstitutionality of referendum on direct election of the President.

The Rules of Procedure for the Slovak Parliament adopted in January 1997 established a proportionate representation on the Committees for Select Intelligence, Military Intelligence and Mandate and Immunity Committee. The latter has been formed and now it has 11 coalition and 8 opposition members. The other two committees are in the process of choosing the members of opposition. On September 12, 1996 a new Committee for European Integration was created in the same manner. Out of 18 members, seven represent the opposition. In the joint Committee for the European Parliament there are 23 MPs. Ten of them represent the opposition.

The Slovak Republic reiterates its commitment to continue on the path of democratic reform and transatlantic and European integration. Open dialogue on all levels of executive as well as legislative and judicial power and a dialogue which should include the top representatives of the Slovak Republic will remain the preferred way to address the challenges lying ahead.

THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC AND NATO EXPANSION (MAY 1997)

NATO membership has been an unequivocal goal of the Slovak Republic since its independence in 1993. The present Slovak government in the Program Document passed in December of 1994 stated that “the orientation of the Slovak Republic in the sphere of security is characterized by a striving to obtain membership in NATO and the Western European Union. We consider the North Atlantic Alliance to be the most effective security organization in operation. At the same time, our participation in this Alliance is regarded as an opportunity for obtaining true security guarantees”.

Despite the widely recognized and great strides of the Slovak military towards interoperability with NATO forces and the country’s remarkable economic performance, representatives of the Alliance view Slovakia’s domestic political situation as a reason to delay their endorsement of its place among the first group of candidates.

There is a concern, however, about the consequences of regional security fragmentation. On May 14, 1997, the Spokesman of the Slovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement saying that “The Ministry of Foreign Affairs does not hide the opinion that if the Slovak Republic is left out of the first round of the expansion [of NATO], this will eventually create an uneven degree of security for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and thus will not contribute to strengthening of regional stability. At the same time, however, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs rejects emerging foreign and domestic speculation that nonacceptance of the Slovak Republic into NATO will result in worsening bilateral relations with neighbors, in particular with Hungary, or will negatively influence the rights of the Hungarian national minority in Slovakia...The Slovak Republic has a continuous interest in development of good relations with its neighboring countries, including Hungary, based on equality and mutual respect which does not arise from political opportunism but objective needs and interests of both countries and the region of Central and Eastern Europe”.

The people of the Slovak Republic have been given an opportunity to express their opinion about the future of their security in a referendum which is scheduled for May 23, 1997. On March 19th, 1997, the Slovak Parliament passed a resolution recommending a “YEA” vote on membership in NATO. Also NGOs and the media have been conducting a widespread campaign explaining this step to the public. On May 13, 1997, the Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, Pavol Hamzik, in an interview with the Slovak Press Agency (TASR) stated that from a political point of view integration of Slovakia into the Alliance will secure conditions for continuation of economic and political transformation and for obtaining strong collective security guarantees and preservation of sovereignty. He pointed out that “Membership means also a share in decision making processes about the most important issues concerning the future of united Europe. Another important factor is a creation of essentials for professionalization of the Slovak Armed Forces. The interest in joining NATO means an understanding of prevailing development tendencies on our continent.... We need to think about why the prevailing majority of Western European states is in NATO and why the others are striving towards this membership “.

Positive results from comprehensive negotiations between Russia and NATO have cleared the way for the same expectations at the Madrid Summit in July. The Slovak Republic believes that the process of NATO expansion will remain open. It will continue to work towards the goal stated at the end of the bipolar world—towards a more secure, more stable and more prosperous Europe.

**STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY
H.E. AMBASSADOR STEFAN TAFROV,
AMBASSADOR-AT-LARGE OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA
FOR NATO ACCESSION, TO THE
CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

WASHINGTON D.C., 20 MAY 1997

I am greatly honored to meet this distinguished Commission to inform you of the foreign and security policy agenda of my Government and to discuss with you the major issues concerning Bulgaria's membership in the North Atlantic Alliance.

First, I would like to inform you of the prompt and significant progress achieved by the Bulgarian democracy in implementing the reformist agenda steered by President Stoyanov and his caretaker Government. In an amazingly short time, we were able to reverse the extremely negative course of economic developments and to deal effectively with the most urgent problems. There are already encouraging signs of economic and financial stabilization, of a strongly reduced inflation and strengthening of the national currency.

Privatization and structural reform are well on track. Active preparation is underway to establish without unnecessary delay a currency board. The standby agreement reached with the IMF and the successful meeting with G-24 held in Brussels provide additional reassurance of the international support for the reforms.

These encouraging results met the support of the nation in the general elections held on April 19. These elections, held as previous ones in full accordance with the high OSCE standards, confirmed that democracy and the rule of law in Bulgaria are firmly based and functioning, and changes in the country are irreversible. As you are aware, the United Democratic Forces received the absolute majority of seats in the newly elected parliament thus providing for the establishment of a strong executive in Bulgaria. Thus, the unity of purpose, represented by the President, the new reformist parliamentary majority and the government, will be an important pillar and guarantee for the stable course of reform and the Euro-Atlantic choice.

The new Parliament started its work with a general agreement on united parliamentary action on several major issues. In a Declaration on National Salvation, sponsored by the UDF coalition and approved on May 8, after several rounds of consultations among all parliamentary forces, the National Assembly endorsed the basic principles to lead the country out of the current economic crisis. A major issue in the Declaration is the parliamentary support for Bulgaria's foreign policy steps towards an early full membership in NATO. It reflects the prevailing consensus on accession to the Alliance, with only the Socialist Party insisting on a referendum on the issue—a proposal that was turned down by all other parliamentary groups.

In this context, I would like to stress that the decision to apply for membership in the North Atlantic Alliance was not a goal in itself. It was embodiment of shared values and an inextricable part of the policy towards genuine reform. The accession to the European Union and NATO will be an efficient instrument for the modernization of the country.

Indeed, the speedup of market reform and the search for stable security are only two sides of the coin. The progress towards an early NATO membership will enhance a more favorable climate for economic reform, trade and investment and will help our record of positive achievements continue to

grow. I would like to emphasize this on the very eve of the 50th anniversary of the far-reaching Marshall Plan from which we were forcefully isolated.

The very prospect of joining the Euro-Atlantic institutions has been an essential driving force for the implementation of the reforms in Bulgaria and one of the main incentives for Bulgaria's constructive foreign policy over the last 7 years.

Bulgaria is looking forward to the bold and responsible decisions to be taken at the Madrid Summit and is ready to contribute to the success of NATO enlargement. The committed effort of Bulgaria to join the Alliance at an early stage, and the favorable response by our western partners and future allies gives us every reason to expect an equal treatment and equal starting opportunities alongside other prospective members. Bulgaria is prepared to assume all obligations and enjoy all rights under the Washington Treaty.

The membership in the Alliance will not only provide a reliable source of guarantees for Bulgaria's national security but will also enhance its capabilities to contribute to the stability and security in the region. Over the last 7 years the climate of religious and ethnic tolerance in Bulgaria has been praised internationally. With its policy of good-neighborly and balanced relations with all countries in the region Bulgaria is already a "net" producer of regional stability and security. It has no territorial, border, ethnic or religious disputes with any of them. I would like to mention, in particular, the excellent ties with Greece and Turkey, including in the field of security and defence.

Building on this positive record, and in full compatibility with the regional initiatives of the US government (Southeastern Europe Cooperative Initiative) and the EU, Bulgaria will continue to promote its initiatives for stability, security and cooperation in Southeastern Europe conceived as an additional vehicle for the effective involvement of the country and the whole region in the European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Another important development in this ongoing process will be the regional meeting of Defence Ministers to be hosted by Bulgaria later this year. We are glad that the US Department of Defence and NATO will be actively involved in the planning and the proceedings of this meeting.

We are convinced that the early accession of Bulgaria to the Alliance would further strengthen the security and stability in Southeastern Europe and NATO's southern flank.

Geostrategically, the enlargement of the Alliance to the Southeast would link the northern flank to the southern one giving the latter additional guarantees against latent risks. It would certainly contribute to the greater coherence of the Euro-Atlantic security and defence area and for an appropriate balance in the policies and priorities of the transformed Alliance. It would assure the safety of transregional infrastructure and energy systems.

It is important, therefore, to provide for a geographically balanced approach to NATO enlargement which would contribute to a more equal level of security and stability in different regions thus minimizing the risk of new dividing lines or grey zones on the continent. In this context, we believe that the security of NATO and, indeed, of whole Europe would only benefit from an equal treatment of applicant countries from the Black Sea region.

The defence potential of Bulgaria, according to our assumptions, provides appropriate basis for self-sustained capabilities and thus the country would be a real net contributor to the Alliance's collective defence. We have developed a positive record of committed involvement in peacekeeping which we'll further enhance. The participation in IFOR/SFOR, as well as the forthcoming Bulgarian contri-

bution to the international effort to restore stability in Albania are a tangible proof of our readiness to contribute to the Allied efforts in securing peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Without prejudging the decisions to be taken in Madrid, we expect from the Summit a clear and firm commitment that the Alliance will remain open and that the first invitations are only the beginning of the process which should continue without undue delay. This commitment could find an expression in the establishment of a clearly defined timetable and procedures for further enlargement. It makes sense to expect further invitations to be extended immediately after the conclusion of accession negotiations with the first countries invited, or after their actual joining the Alliance in 1999, at the latest.

The Madrid Declaration could also contain a recognition of the efforts made by applicant countries and an invitation for their continued active participation in the process of enlargement through intensive dialogue, including at 16+1, leading to accession.

Bulgaria looks forward to an early follow-up of the intensified dialogue which should have a pre-accession agenda and focus on the preparation for membership, gradually assuming elements of accession negotiations. The process might involve periodic assessment and relevant guidance on the preparation effort.

This would provide for the enlargement to be a continuous stream process rather than a sequence of "waves" or "groups" of new members.

Transparency and predictability should remain among the main principles of the enlargement, including in the decision-making process within the Alliance and in consultations with countries outside the Alliance.

For Bulgaria, the membership in NATO has no alternative. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council to be established soon will certainly occupy its legitimate place in the European security architecture. All countries, present and future NATO members, as well as those that are unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all should actively participate in the implementation of this initiative. The EAPC, however, could not serve as a compensation for the candidates waiting to be invited for accession negotiations.

Bulgaria respects the legitimate interests and aspirations of other candidates. The enlargement should not boost unfair competition among these candidates. On the contrary, it should encourage the solidarity and cooperation among them for the attainment of the common goal.

We welcome the recent agreement on a NATO-Russia document to establish a strategic partnership. We are convinced that NATO enlargement will ultimately contribute to democratic Russia's security by projecting stability and underpinning democratic reforms to its East.

In order to become an important element of the new European architecture, NATO relations with Russia should take into account the legitimate concerns of all European countries. We expect that these relations will be as transparent as the NATO enlargement itself. In any event, the forthcoming and any later enlargement of NATO should be excluded from the agreement and future consultation with Russia.

Bulgaria is firmly set to develop mutually beneficial relations with Russia on the basis of sovereign equality, including an open and constructive dialogue on European security.

Bulgaria should not be regarded as a country that for cultural, historical and economic reasons was destined to be part of the Russian sphere of influence. Ever since the restoration of Bulgaria's independence in 1878 the history of the Bulgarian-Russian relations has been multilayered and contradictory. One of the aspects of the forced Sovietization of Bulgaria between 1944 and 1989 was the invention of a real mythology about the so-called "peculiar" nature of the ties between Bulgaria and Russia. We are encouraged by the recent statements made by Russian leaders concerning Bulgaria's sovereign will to seek membership in NATO in the sense that this fact should not affect adversely the overall development of bilateral ties. This statement has been supported so far by the practice and we consider it realistic one.

We also welcome the steady development of a special relationship between the Alliance and Ukraine. Developing mutually beneficent economic and political ties with Ukraine is high on Bulgaria's foreign policy agenda.

Bulgaria is firmly committed to assume the responsibility and its share of the costs of the membership in the Alliance. As President Stoyanov stated in his address to the nation, while membership in NATO will not be cost-free, the burden of remaining outside the Alliance will be much higher, if not unbearable. We understand that security does have a cost and are determined to provide for the necessary investment. A special working group is continuing to study the costs of the membership. The government has recently endorsed the necessary funding of the National Programme on preparation for accession to the Alliance for 1997 and estimates for the next 2 years. They include projects to improve communication equipment, modernize air space management, transform military education and training along NATO standards and increase forces and assets available for PfP activities and for joint operations with the Alliance and other Partners. Thus, Bulgaria is firmly on the track of successful implementation of improved interoperability with NATO to provide for a close and effective work with the Alliance in all aspects of military doctrine and activities.

As an important part of the democratic reform, we have undertaken significant steps towards the establishment of civilian control over the armed forces based upon a legal framework and increased transparency within the defence establishment. This major effort still has to be completed. Work has already started in order to review the legal basis for the defence and the armed forces, the national security and defence policy and the existing practices.

The preparation for an early accession to the Alliance is a truly national effort and it enjoys the active support by the Bulgarian public. I would like to mention, in particular, the valuable contribution of the Atlantic Club of Bulgaria which will host this October the General Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association. May I avail of this opportunity to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the distinguished members of this Commission, an invitation to attend this important meeting.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we appreciate very much this opportunity to discuss the essentials of NATO enlargement and Bulgaria's strategic goal and endeavours for an early accession to the Alliance.

Thank you for your attention.

**DECLARATION ON THE NATIONAL ACCORD
(TRANSLATED FROM BULGARIAN)
REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA
THIRTY- EIGHT NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

We, the representatives of the Thirty-eight National Assembly with the will to work for the benefit of Bulgaria,

declare our determination to overcome the political, economic and moral crisis in the country.

In the name of this, we shall continuously seek specific agreement between us on the major national issues,

RESOLVED that the common basis for an outcome of the crisis is the observance of the Constitution of the country and the respect for the rights of all citizens;

COMMENDING the National Political Consensus on holding early parliamentary elections which was achieved with the mediation of the President of the Republic on February 4, 1997;

REITERATING the Declaration of the Political Forces of February 11, 1997 on the principles of overcoming the crisis and the Decision of the National Assembly of February 13, 1997 adopted on that basis for the caretaker government to conduct negotiations and conclude agreements with other States, international organizations and financial institutions on external loans and on financial stabilization and social protection under terms and conditions not less favorable than the ones under the agreements ratified so far;

STATING our preparedness, in the atmosphere of a constructive parliamentary dialogue, to immediately pass the laws needed for the implementation of the Agreement with the International Monetary Fund stated in the Declaration of the Political Forces of March 18, 1997;

WE DECLARE THAT WE SHALL SUPPORT:

1. In principle, the agreements of Bulgaria with the international financial institutions, including the introduction of a Currency Board, as necessary for providing external support in the process of overcoming the economic disaster;

2. The fair distribution of the social burden of the reform process;

3. The accelerated and real restitution of the ownership of agricultural lands and the creation of conditions for their efficient use;

4. A decisive combat against crime, especially organized crime and corruption, regardless of political color, on all levels and in all powers of the State;

5. The opening of the files of politicians, senior magistrates and government officials in order to set off their dependence on foreign security services;

6. The full membership of Bulgaria in the European Union and all specific efforts in this respect;

7. The membership of Bulgaria in the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations.

The declaration was adopted by the 38th National Assembly on May 8, 1997 and the State Seal was affixed hereto.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT:

(Y.Sokolov)

**REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA GOVERNMENT PROGRAM
BY THE YEAR 2001**

(TRANSLATION FROM BULGARIAN)

PRESENTED BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ON MAY 21, 1997

**EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER V: “BULGARIA AND THE WORLD: INTEGRATION
AND SECURITY”**

Bulgarian foreign policy has as its goal to guarantee international conditions favorable to our transformation into a country with a modern market economy and a developed democracy.

...During our term of office, we will build on the initiatives of President Peter Stoyanov and the caretaker government in the spheres of foreign policy and national security in the following directions:

- Accelerated preparation for NATO membership.
- Specific steps for joining the European Union.
- Balanced regional policy.
- Consistent defense of the rights of our compatriots abroad in line with the international norms.
- Strengthening of our relations with the countries of Western Europe, the USA and Canada, to stimulate their investment and commercial interest in Bulgaria.
- Development of equal and mutually beneficial ties with Russia, Ukraine and the CIS, to enhance our capabilities to join the European Union and NATO.
- Development of relations with partners in the Middle and Far East, Latin America and Africa, to stimulate economic interest in Bulgaria.
- Effective participation in the activities of the international organizations.
- Optimization of the structure and organizational principles of the diplomatic service in keeping with the new foreign policy priorities and potential of Bulgaria...

...Joining the European Union and NATO is our strategic goal. Full membership in the European Union and NATO is our sovereign and categorical choice, based on a wide consensus in society, and is not an expression of passing political circumstances or foreign pressure...

...We shall work for an enhanced integration into the Euro–Atlantic structures, which is to lead Bulgaria to full membership in NATO. We will implement and update as needed the *National Program on the preparation for Bulgaria’s accession to the North Atlantic Alliance*. Specific tasks in this respect are:

- Effective participation in the enhanced individual dialogue with NATO on the enlargement, as well as in the framework of the Euro–Atlantic Partnership Council to be created and through the Partnership for Peace.
- Speedy application of the standards of NATO and its member–states in the field of security and defense policy. Adaptation of the national policy, structures and procedures in the field of security and defense in line with NATO standards and requirements while taking into account our national conditions.
- Implementation of measures to improve the interoperability among the armed forces of the Republic of Bulgaria and those of NATO and its member–states.
- Achievement of a capability for an effective operational cooperation in joint multinational operations under NATO command.
- Participation, within the constitutional provisions, together with NATO member-states and states leading candidates for NATO membership, in peacekeeping operation under a U.N., OSCE or WEU mandates, in cooperation when necessary with the European Union.
- Concluding or updating of bilateral military, military–technical or military–industrial cooperation and agreements with NATO member-states and states leading candidates for NATO membership.
- Strengthening of the civilian control over the military as a basic principle of democratic governance.
- Elaboration and implementation of a strategy for promoting Bulgaria’s candidacy to join NATO among the political circles and the public at large in NATO member-states, through combined efforts of the Bulgarian public institutions, civil society organizations and the Bulgarian communities abroad...

Two other major documents will incorporate the principles of Bulgaria’s future membership in NATO—the National Security Concept and the Military Doctrine of the Republic of Bulgaria.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION
BY THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA



АМБАСАДА НА РЕПУБЛИКА МАКЕДОНИЈА
EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA
ВАШИНГТОН, WASHINGTON, D.C.

No.22- 105/97
2 June 1997

The Honorable Alfonse M. D'Amato
Chairman
Helsinki Commission
House Annex, #2, Room 234
Washington, D.C. 20515


Dear Senator D'Amato:

I am pleased to submit a statement on "Why the Republic of Macedonia should become a member of NATO." I am requesting that this statement be incorporated in the Commission's report "Human Rights and NATO Enlargement."

The Republic of Macedonia has been a factor of peace and stability in the Balkan Region and by becoming a member of NATO, representing the southern tier, we feel we can make greater and lasting contributions to peace.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Ljupka Z. Acevska
Ambassador

3050 K Street N.W. Suite 210 Washington, D.C. 20007 Tel: (202) 337-3063 Fax: (202) 337-3093

“WHY THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA SHOULD BECOME A MEMBER OF NATO”

MAY 1997

Respected Members of the Helsinki Commission

We would like to present a statement on “Why the Republic of Macedonia should become a member of NATO”:

The Republic of Macedonia has clearly stated its wish and reasons for early inclusion in the NATO enlargement. As early as in the beginning of 1993, the Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia decided to seek membership in the Alliance. This decision was a result of our strategic orientation towards an active participation in the building of a wider security architecture of the Euro-Atlantic region. There is a definite wide political and social consensus in the country for a such an orientation.

The Republic of Macedonia sees NATO as one of the key points of the contemporary European security architecture. In this regard, the Republic of Macedonia considers that the actual NATO efforts to strengthen the cooperation for stability in the Euro-Atlantic region through a process of evolution, are coming at the right moment, when the necessity for urgent resolution of a number of conflicts and the elimination of potential ones in the transition countries are necessary.

That is the reason why the Republic of Macedonia considers its membership in the Alliance and the expansion of NATO in Southeastern Europe as a condition for a higher level of political relations, contribution towards world stability, and stronger possibilities for the establishment of democratic institutions. As a priority in the enlargement itself, the Republic of Macedonia considers the strengthening of the southern wing of NATO, namely the region of the southern Balkans, in which the Republic of Macedonia is a key country for the maintenance of stability and peace.

Having in mind these facts, it is our firm belief that the Republic of Macedonia should be included in the first round of NATO enlargement. Such a position is based on the following aspects:

1. The Republic of Macedonia geographically belongs to the Southern Balkans, which historically represents a potential source of instability with wider consequences. At the same time, if this region is placed in a opposite role and becomes a source of stability, it would solve many of the current misunderstandings which have been a constant cause for serious conflicts. This would be a real challenge in the process of NATO enlargement. To achieve this, it has to be emphasized that, the Republic of Macedonia is a country at the crossroads of the Balkans, has a key role in the process of balancing the peace, which, in turn, determines the stability in the wider region. At the same time it has to be taken into consideration that the Republic of Macedonia supports the NATO membership of other countries in the region, especially the immediate neighbors, within the framework of regional stability and acknowledges the common interest for membership in the Alliance .

2. The Republic of Macedonia is strongly committed to the accomplishment of the tasks considered as conditions for the inclusion in the Alliance. Today, the Republic of Macedonia is a member of Partnership for Peace program and the North Atlantic Council for Cooperation—NACC. Since the entry into PfP (15 November 1995) the Republic of Macedonia has fulfilled the foreseen procedure to take part in the cooperation in a relatively short time. We would especially like to point out that:

In June 1996—the Republic of Macedonia participated in a joint exercise in Albania (Baize) called “Peacemaker Eagle 1996” with seven NATO member countries.

- In October 1996—the Republic of Macedonia hosted and participated in the first part of the multinational headquarters exercise “Rescuer 1996” together with nine members of NATO and Partnership for Peace.

- In May 1997—the Republic of Macedonia hosted and participated in the practical part of the exercise “Rescuer—97”, together with military units from nine NATO countries, members and partners.

- Last year, NATO and the Republic of Macedonia mutually accepted our Individual Program for Partnership—IPP for 1996-1998. After one year’s successful accomplishments in accordance with the implemented procedure, the Republic of Macedonia submitted its analysis for the realization of the Individual Program for 1996.

At the same time, the Republic of Macedonia prepared a new, larger IPP for 1997-1998, which, at this moment, is in the process of approval. Until now, the Republic of Macedonia has realized three Individual Intensified Political Dialogues with NATO where we presented our documents for discussion. These were very positively evaluated from the NATO officials. The Republic of Macedonia is now in a procedure to join the Process of Planning and Analysis—PARP—for the period 1997-1999. In December 1996, the Republic of Macedonia presented its “Review for the overall inter-operativity for 1997” to the competent offices of NATO, also very positively evaluated. The Republic of Macedonia, in the framework of the cooperation with its partners and with NATO, has signed a number of appropriate agreements and arrangements. Among them, and of special importance, are the Agreement between the NATO- members and other states participating in PfP, in connection with the Status of their forces-SOFA and the additional Protocol of the Agreement, the Agreement for security arrangements between the Republic of Macedonia and NATO and the Agreement for the transit of the forces of IFOR and SFOR. The Republic of Macedonia has also accepted “The regulations for behavior of NATO”.

In accordance with its commitment for establishment of a small but well equipped and efficient army, the Republic of Macedonia has carried out a complete reorganization of its armed forces according to the standards of NATO. The Republic of Macedonia is also a regular participant at the common exercises of the partners.

The Republic of Macedonia has adjusted its capacity for the participation in the operations, training, and exercises in the framework of PfP and has created an army based on new models, without the influence of the old ones. (It has to be taken in account that in the process of withdrawal of the Yugoslav Army from the Republic of Macedonia all military equipment, weapons, and other material were taken away, leaving the Republic of Macedonia practically unarmed). The current legislature in the Republic of Macedonia (the Constitution and the Law for Defense) is an important contribution to the civil and democratic control of the army and transparent decision making.

3. The determined goals and principles for the NATO enlargement contained in “The Study for the Enlargement of NATO” are completely acceptable to the Republic of Macedonia, and to a large extent are already implemented in its domestic and foreign policy. We see the acceptance of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as a basis for real development of such a historical process as the enlargement of the Alliance is. The Republic of Macedonia is ready to accept the obliga-

tions based on the Washington Agreement on the unification of the efforts in the collective defense for the preservice of peace and security, with a strong determination in resolving international conflicts through dialogue and peaceful means.

We would also like to stress the following:

The Republic of Macedonia achieved its independence through a policy of peaceful self-determination and with its behavior in the international relations proved that it is a staunch advocate of peaceful settlement of disputes and a very important factor of peace and stability in the region and wider.

The Government of the Republic of Macedonia is firmly committed to the fulfillment of the undertaken economic and financial reforms, which are already showing the wanted results. After several years of suffering from the LTN sanctions against FR of Yugoslavia and the unilateral blockade from Greece, we now face a constant growth of output and growth of exports, which in fact is the main orientation of our economy. In close coordination and cooperation with the World Bank, the IMF and other international financial institutions the Government is leading the country towards the goal of becoming a developed country, and a full-fledged member of all significant international associations.

The Republic of Macedonia has invested considerable efforts in the development of good relations with its neighbors, where all open questions are solved through dialogue and maximum possible cooperation, without interference in the internal affairs of the countries. The examples of such a policy are “The Interim Agreement” with Greece, and “The agreement about the regulation and development of cooperation between the Republic of Macedonia and FR of Yugoslavia”. Both these, and a number of other agreements regulating specific relations with other Balkan countries, are the result of the normalization of relations and the development of full cooperation with the countries of the region. This does not mean development only on the bilateral plan, but it also has wider positive reflections on the Balkans and wider.

We see the good neighborly relations as a way of increasing the stability and security of all countries, which constitute a very important principle of our foreign policy. The Republic of Macedonia is active towards the achievement of a long-lasting stability of the region. Skopje will soon be the host of the international “Forum for Europeanization of the Balkans and the Development of Good Neighborly Relations”.

This Forum is a result of the resolutions for “Good-neighborly Relations Among Balkan Countries”, proposed by the Republic of Macedonia and adopted at the 48th and 50th session of General Assembly of the United Nations. The goal is a stable Balkans as a region of cooperation and peace by the year 2000.

The 51st General Assembly of the United Nations, also at the proposal of the Republic of Macedonia, adopted the resolution for the “Maintenance of International Security—Prevention of Violent Disintegration of States”. The presence of UNPREDEP in the Republic of Macedonia, the mission which was established at our initiative and in which 500 American soldiers are participating, with its preventive deployment, is a success story itself. The Mission is a unique example as a test and the development of the practice of preventive diplomacy. The success and experiences of this Mission were the basis for the organization of the international seminar “Agenda for Preventive Diplomacy—Theory and Practice” in 1996, a joint effort by the Mission of UNPREDEP and The Republic of Macedonia. Along with its contribution in the area for prevention of conflicts, this seminar resulted in the proposal for the establishment of a “Center for Preventive Diplomacy” in Skopje.

In relation with this, the proposal of The Republic of Macedonia for holding a “Seminar for Conflict Prevention”, was adopted and has become a part of the activity agenda of the Working Plan of the NACC for the year 1997. The seminar will be held in October 1997 in the Republic of Macedonia. We are certain that this seminar will have a large impact on the development and improvement of strategies aimed at the early prevention of possible conflicts. It also has to be pointed out that the NATO principle that enlargement is a gradual process with various phases of integration and cooperation, which will be based on the interaction of the multilateral institutions in Europe—EU, VVEU and OSCE, is completely in accordance with the determination of the Republic of Macedonia for its inclusion in the European integration processes.

The Republic of Macedonia considers the respect and promotion of human rights as one of the strongest indicators of the level of a state’s democratic development and its readiness to successfully join the international institutions and especially NATO. In accordance with its commitment to the full respect and promotion of human rights, the Republic of Macedonia is a state party to all fundamental U.N. conventions on human rights protection. On the regional level, the Republic of Macedonia has ratified the European Convention on Human Rights and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The Republic of Macedonia has signed and observes all relevant OSCE documents, basing its policy upon this significant political principles. The standards of these international instruments have already been incorporated in the national legislation, and their implementation is among the top priorities of the government. Being aware of the need for fostering and respecting diversity as a fundamental factor for the internal stability of the state, the Government of the Republic of Macedonia has been paying special attention to the protection and promotion of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities.

Consequently, the protection of minority rights has been regulated by a clear and comprehensive legal framework. The special treatment of minorities has been foreseen on the constitutional level, all of them having equal treatment and enjoying equal rights. The standards included in our national legislation fully correspond to the international standards for the protection of national minorities and their integration in all spheres of social life and in specific areas, such as education and local self-administration, culture and media.

This well-planned policy is a permanent commitment of the Government and is not of a temporary nature. Its basic objective is a society with a highly expressed feeling of integration, on the one hand, and the developed feeling of individual freedom and respect for all individual features, on the other hand. Also being aware of the fact that the development and promotion of inter-ethnic relations, the respect for the diversity and the strengthening of mutual confidence is a continuous process, and especially having in mind extreme manifestations and tragic consequences of inter-ethnic conflicts in the history of the Balkans, the Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia adopted the “Declaration on the Promotion of Inter-ethnic Relations in the Spirit of Tolerance, Dialogue, mutual Respect and Confidence”, by which the basic postulates of the Republic of Macedonia in the area of promotion of inter-ethnic relations have been reaffirmed.

More valuable than the adoption of this declaration is the fact that ethnic extremists rest on the margin of the society and do not have the support of the majority of the citizens of the Republic of Macedonia.

We are strongly convinced that there is always room to do more when the promotion of human rights and fostering of inter-ethnic relations is concerned, the Republic of Macedonia has managed to keep them as a constant priority, both on the domestic and international scene. This fact that has been

confirmed in a number of reports of the international monitoring and the cooperation with international organizations-experts have confirmed the correctness of the policy of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia. In conclusion we would like to state that since our independence in September 1991, the Republic of Macedonia has proven its commitment to democracy, market economy respect for human rights and orientation towards the Euro-Atlantic institutions. This has been our policy and our practice. We are convinced that the inclusion of the Republic of Macedonia in the first round of NATO enlargement will be a mutual political, strategic and logistical benefit.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY
REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT,
MICHIE STADIUM
WEST POINT, NEW YORK

MAY 31, 1997
10:20 A.M. EDT

The President: Thank you very much. Please be seated, relax. Thank you, General Christman, for those kind introductory remarks and for your truly extraordinary service to your nation throughout your military career. Here at West Point, and before, when we had more opportunities to work together on a daily basis, I have constantly admired your dedication and your ability.

General Reimer, Secretary West, Senator Reed, Chairman Gilman, Congressman Shimkus, Congresswoman Kelly, Congressman Sessions, former Congressman Bilbray, parents and families and friends of the cadets, and especially, to the Class of 1997, I extend my heartfelt congratulations.

This has been a truly remarkable class. As General Christman said, you wrote an unparalleled record of academic achievement in the classroom. I congratulate you all, and particularly your number one honor graduate and valedictorian, Adam Ake. Congratulations to all of you on your accomplishments. (Applause.)

Now, General Christman also outlined the extraordinary accomplishments of your athletic teams, and he mentioned that I had the privilege of seeing Army win its first 10-win season in football and reclaim the Commander in Chief's Trophy in Philadelphia. And he thanked me for that. But, actually, as a lifelong football fan, I deserve no thanks. It was a terrific game, and I'm quite sure it was the first time in the field of any endeavor of conflict where the Army defeated the Navy not on land, but on water. (Laughter and applause.)

I know that in spite of all of your achievements as a class and in teams, a few of you also upheld West Point's enduring tradition of independence. It began in 1796 when President Adams' War Department ordered the first classes in fortification. And the troops here thought they already knew all about that, so they burned the classroom to the ground, postponing the start of instruction by 5 years. (Laughter.)

Today, I am reliably informed that though your spirits are equably high, your infractions are more modest. Therefore, I hereby exercise my prerogative to grant amnesty for minor offenses to the Corps of Cadets. (Applause.) The cheering was a little disconcerting—now, the operative word there was “minor.” (Laughter.)

Men and women of the Class of '97, today you join the Long Gray Line, the Long Gray Line that stretches across two centuries of unstinting devotion to America and the freedom that is our greatest treasure. From the defense of Fort Erie in the War of 1812 to the fury of Antietam, from the trenches of Argonne to the Anzio in Okinawa, to Heartbreak Ridge, the Mekong Delta, the fiery dessert of the Gulf War, the officers of West Point have served and sacrificed for our nation.

In just the 4 years since I last spoke here, your graduates have helped to restore democracy to Haiti, to save hundreds of thousands of lives from genocide and famine in Rwanda, to end the bloodshed in Bosnia. Throughout our history, whenever duty called, the men and women of West Point have never failed us. And I speak for all Americans when I say, I know you never will.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to West Point and a special word of congratulations to the students in this class from other countries. We welcome you here; we are proud to have you as a part of our military service tradition. And we wish you well as you go back home. We hope you, too, can advance freedom's cause, for in the 21st century that is something we must do together.

Two days ago I returned from Europe on a mission to look back to one of the proudest chapters in America's history and to look forward to the history we all will seek to shape for our children and grandchildren. This week is the 50th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, what Winston Churchill described as the most unsordid act in all history.

In 1947, Americans, exhausted by war and anxious to get on with their lives at home, were summoned to embrace another leadership role by a generation of remarkable leaders—General George Marshall, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, President Harry Truman—leaders who knew there could be no lasting peace and security for an America that withdrew behind its borders and withdrew from the world and its responsibilities. They provided the indispensable leadership to create the Marshall Plan, NATO, and the first global financial institutions. They, in effect, organized America and our allies to meet the challenges of their time—to build unparalleled prosperity, to stand firm against Soviet expansionism until the light of freedom shown all across Europe.

The second purpose of my journey was inextricably tied to the first. It was to look to the future, to the possibility of achieving what Marshall's generation could only dream of—a democratic, peaceful and undivided Europe for the first time in all of history; and to the necessity of America and its allies once again organizing ourselves to meet the challenges of our time, to secure peace and prosperity for the next 50 years and beyond.

To build and secure a new Europe, peaceful, democratic and undivided at last, there must be a new NATO, with new missions, new members and new partners. We have been building that kind of NATO for the last 3 years with new partners in the Partnership for Peace and NATO's first out-of-area mission in Bosnia. In Paris last week, we took another giant stride forward when Russia entered a new partnership with NATO, choosing cooperation over confrontation, as both sides affirmed that the world is different now. European security is no longer a zero-sum contest between Russia and NATO; but a cherished, common goal.

In a little more than a month, I will join with other NATO leaders in Madrid to invite the first of Europe's new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to join our Alliance, with the consent of the Senate, by 1999—the 50th anniversary of NATO's founding.

I firmly believe NATO enlargement is in our national interests. But because it is not without cost and risk, it is appropriate to have an open, full, national discussion before proceeding. I want to further that discussion here today in no small measure because it is especially important to those of you in this class. For, after all, as the sentinels of our security in the years ahead, your work will be easier and safer if we do the right thing—and riskier and much more difficult if we do not.

Europe's fate and America's future are joined. Twice in half a century, Americans have given their lives to defend liberty and peace in world wars that began in Europe. And we have stayed in

Europe in very large numbers for a long time throughout the Cold War. Taking wise steps now to strengthen our common security when we have the opportunity to do so will help to build a future without the mistakes and the divisions of the past, and will enable us to organize ourselves to meet the new security challenges of the new century. In this task, NATO should be our sharpest sword and strongest shield.

Some say we no longer need NATO because there is no powerful threat to our security now. I say there is no powerful threat in part because NATO is there. And enlargement will help make it stronger.

I believe we should take in new members to NATO for four reasons. First, it will strengthen our Alliance in meeting the security challenges of the 21st century, addressing conflicts that threaten the common peace of all.

Consider Bosnia—already the Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, the Baltic nations and other Central and East European countries are contributing troops and bases to NATO's peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. We in the United States could not have deployed our troops to Bosnia as safely, smoothly and swiftly as we did without the help of Hungary and our staging ground at Taszar, which I personally visited. The new democracies we invite to join NATO are ready and able to share the burdens of defending freedom in no small measure because they know the cost of losing freedom.

Second, NATO enlargement will help to secure the historic gains of democracy in Europe. NATO can do for Europe's East what it did for Europe's West at the end of World War II—provide a secure climate where freedom, democracy and prosperity can flourish. Joining NATO once helped Italy, Germany and Spain to consolidate their democracies. Now the opening of NATO's doors has led the Central and East European nations already—to deepen democratic reform, to strengthen civilian control of their military, to open their economies. Membership and its future prospect will give them the confidence to stay the course.

Third, enlarging NATO will encourage prospective members to resolve their differences peacefully. We see all over the world the terrible curse of people who are imprisoned by their own ethnic, regional and nationalist hatreds, who rob themselves and their children of the lives they might have because of their primitive, destructive impulses that they cannot control.

When he signed the NATO Treaty in 1949, President Truman said that if NATO had simply existed in 1914 or 1939, it would have prevented the world wars that tore the world apart. The experience of the last 50 years supports that view. NATO helped to reconcile age-old adversaries like France and Germany, now fast friends and allies; and clearly has reduced tensions between Greece and Turkey over all these decades. Already the very prospect of NATO membership has helped to convince countries in Central and Eastern Europe to settle more than half a dozen border and ethnic disputes, any one of which could have led to future conflicts. That, in turn, makes it less likely that you will ever be called to fight in another war across the Atlantic. (Applause.)

Fourth, enlarging NATO, along with its Partnership for Peace with many other nations and its special agreement with Russia and its soon-to-be-signed partnership with Ukraine, will erase the artificial line in Europe that Stalin drew, and bring Europe together in security, not keep it apart in instability.

NATO expansion does not mean a differently divided Europe. It is part of unifying Europe. NATO's first members should not be its last. NATO's doors will remain open to all those willing and

able to shoulder the responsibilities of membership, and we must continue to strengthen our partnerships with non-members.

Now, let me be clear to all of you, these benefits are not cost- or risk-free. Enlargement will require the United States to pay an estimated \$200 million a year for the next decade. Our allies in Canada and Western Europe are prepared to do their part; so are NATO's new members. So must we.

More important, enlargement requires that we extend to new members our Alliance's most solemn security pledge, to treat an attack against one as an attack against all. We have always made the pledge credible through the deployment of our troops and the deterrence of our nuclear weapons. In the years ahead, it means that you could be asked to put your lives on the line for a new NATO member, just as today you can be called upon to defend the freedom of our allies in Western Europe.

In leading NATO over the past 3 years to open its doors to Europe's new democracies, I weighed these costs very carefully. I concluded that the benefits of enlargement, strengthening NATO for the future, locking in democracy's gains in Central and Eastern Europe, building stability across the Atlantic, uniting Europe, not dividing it—these gains decisively outweigh the burdens. The bottom line to me is clear: Expanding NATO will enhance our security. It is the right thing to do. We must not fail history's challenge at this moment to build a Europe peaceful, democratic, and undivided, allied with us to face the new security threats of the new century. A Europe that will avoid repeating the darkest moments of the 20th century and fulfill the brilliant possibilities of the 21st.

This vision for a new Europe is central to our larger security strategy, which you will be called upon to implement and enforce. But our agenda must go beyond it because, with all of our power and wealth, we are living in a world in which increasingly our influence depends upon our recognizing that our future is interdependent with other nations, and we must work with them all across the globe; because we see the threats we face tomorrow will cross national boundaries. They are amplified by modern technology, communication, and travel. They must be faced by like-minded nations, working together. Whether we're talking about terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or environmental degradation.

Therefore, we must pursue five other objectives. First, we must build a community of Asia Pacific nations bound by a common commitment to stability and prosperity. We fought three wars in Asia in half a century; Asia's stability affects our peace, and Asia's explosive growth affects our prosperity. That's why we've strengthened our security ties to Japan and Korea, why we now meet every year with the Asian Pacific leaders, why we must work with and not isolate ourselves from China.

One of the great questions that will define the future for your generation of Americans is how China will define its own greatness as a nation. We have worked with China because we believe it is important to cooperate in ways that will shape the definition of that great nation in positive, not negative, ways. We need not agree with China on all issues to maintain normal trade relations, but we do need normal trade relations to have a chance of eventually reaching agreement with China on matters of vital importance to America and the world.

Second, we are building coalitions across the world to confront these new security threats that know no borders: weapons proliferation, terrorism, drug trafficking, environmental degradation. We have to lead in constructing global arrangements that provide us the tools to deal with these common threats: the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Nonproliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and our efforts to further reduce nuclear weapons with Russia.

Now our great task is also to build these kinds of arrangements fighting terrorism, drug traffickers and organized crime. Three weeks from now in Denver I will use the summit of the eight leading nations to press this agenda.

The third thing we have to do is to build an open trading system. Our security is tied to the stake other nations have in the prosperity of staying free and open and working with others, not working against them. In no small measure because of the trade agreements we have negotiated, we have not only regained our position as the world's number one exporter, we have increased our influence in ways that are good for our security. To continue that progress it is important that I have the authority to conclude smart, new market-opening agreements that every President in 20 years has had.

Some of our fellow Americans do not believe that the President should have this authority anymore; they believe that somehow the global economy presents a threat to us—but I believe it's here to say, and I think the evidence is that Americans, just as we can have the world's strongest and best military, we have the strongest and best economy in the world—the American people can out-work and out-compete anyone given a free and fair chance. (Applause.)

Not only that, but this is about more than money and jobs. This is about security. The world, especially our democratic neighbors to the south of us, are looking to us. If we don't build economic bridges to them, someone else will. We must make it clear that America supports free people and fair, open trade.

Fourth, we have to embrace our role as the decisive force for peace. You cannot and you should not go everywhere. But when our values and interests are at stake, our mission is crystal clear and achievable—America should stand with our allies around the world who seek to bring peace and prevent slaughter. From the Middle East to Bosnia, from Haiti to Northern Ireland, we have worked to contain conflict, to support peace, to give children a brighter future, and it has enhanced our security.

Finally, we have to have the tools to do these jobs. Those are the most powerful and best-trained military in the world and a fully funded diplomacy to minimize the chances that military force will be necessary.

The long-term defense plan we have just completed will increase your readiness, capabilities, and technological edge. In a world of persistent dangers, you must and you will be able to dominate the conflicts of the future as you did the battlefields of the past.

Fifty-five years ago, in the early days of World War II, General George Marshall, the man we honored this week, spoke here at your commencement about the need to organize our nation for the ordeal of war. He said, we are determined that before the sun sets on this terrible struggle, our flag will be recognized as a symbol of freedom on the one hand and of overwhelming power on the other.

Today, our flag of freedom and power flies higher than ever, but because our nation stands at the pinnacle of its power, it also stands at the pinnacle of its responsibility. Therefore, as you carry our flag into this new era, we must organize ourselves to meet the challenges of the next 50 years. We must shape the peace for a new and better century about to dawn so that you can give your children and your grandchildren the America and the world they deserve.

God bless you and God bless America. (Applause.)

SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT

PREPARED STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

APRIL 23, 1997

AS RELEASED BY THE OFFICE OF THE SPOKESMAN
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTRODUCTION

Thank you Secretary Cohen. Mr. Chairman, I very much welcome this chance to testify on what is among the most significant foreign and defense policy issues of our time. With our appearance here today, the Administration really begins in earnest our effort to work in partnership with you to bring this historic effort in Europe to fruition.

By definition, my comments on NATO enlargement today will be preliminary. We have not yet chosen the first candidates for new membership. NATO's discussions with Russia and other nations are not complete. But the outlines and direction of our policy are clear. There is growing, bipartisan interest in the Senate, of which Senator Lott's NATO Observers Group is but further demonstration.

It is time to take our own dialogue to the next level, because if our policy is to succeed, it must have your support.

As I thought about what to say here today, I must say I was tempted to follow the advice James Reston, the legendary *New York Times* reporter and columnist, offered after watching Secretary of State Dean Acheson bring the NATO treaty to the Senate in 1949.

"There are many ways," Reston wrote, "in which a Secretary of State can present a treaty to the Senate, but the best way is to tell the Senators everything. This astonishes them, then bores them stiff, and eventually minimizes the ordeal."

That advice notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, I will summarize.

Let me begin by explaining the fundamental goal of our policy. It is to build, for the very first time, a peaceful, democratic and undivided transatlantic community. It is to extend eastward the peace and prosperity that Western Europe has enjoyed for the last 50 years. In this way, America will gain strong new partners in security and trade. And we will gain confidence that our armed forces will not again be called upon to fight on European soil.

Many organizations are doing their part to assure the prosperity and security of Europe. The European Union is expanding. The OSCE is promoting democracy and helping to resolve conflicts from the Caucasus to the Balkans. Many of the new market democracies are joining the World Trade Organization and the OECD.

But NATO is taking the lead, just as it has for the past half century. NATO is still the anchor of our engagement in Europe, the only organization in Europe with real military might, the only one capable of providing the confidence and security upon which our other goals depend.

The debate about NATO enlargement is really a debate about NATO itself. It is about the value of maintaining alliances in times of peace and the value of our partnership with Europe.

I am a diplomat. And I know that a diplomat's best friend is effective military force and the credible possibility of its use. That has been the lesson of the Gulf War and Bosnia and all through history. And that is a lesson we must remember in Europe, where we will still face threats that only a collective defense organization can deter.

No alliance has ever been more successful in deterring aggression than NATO. During its first 50 years, NATO also provided the security shattered European economies needed to rebuild. It helped former adversaries reconcile, making European unity possible. It brought the former fascist nations, first Italy, then Germany, then Spain, back into the family of European democracies. It denationalized European defense. It stabilized relations between Greece and Turkey. All without firing a shot.

NATO defines a community of interest that both preceded and outlasted the Cold War. That is why the United States, a united Germany and our other allies decided to preserve the alliance after the Berlin Wall fell. It is why neither we nor any current ally would even think about leaving NATO or settling for a watered down substitute, and why so many others now wish to join.

WHY WE ARE ENLARGENING NATO

Clearly, if an institution such as NATO did not exist today, we would want to create one. We would want to build the strongest possible partnership with those European nations that share our values and our interests.

Just as clearly, if we were creating a new alliance today, we would not make the old Iron Curtain its eastern frontier. We would not leave a democratic country out in the cold because it was once, against the will of its people, part of the Warsaw Pact.

The only question we would consider is this: Which democratic nations in Europe are important to our security and which are willing and able to contribute to our security? In other words, we would not be confined by old thinking or zero sum calculations from the Cold War. We would begin to think in entirely new terms about what a European continent, whole and free, would look like, and what our relationship with Russia and other key states on such a continent would be.

That is exactly what we are doing as we plan the enlargement of NATO, strengthen its Partnership for Peace, build the new Atlantic Partnership Council, and develop NATO's new partnerships with Russia, Ukraine, and other European nations.

As you know, at the Madrid summit in July, NATO will invite several nations to begin accession negotiations. We aim to finish those talks in time to sign accession documents by December.

In 1998, the Senate and the parliaments of our allies will be asked to ratify enlargement. With your consent, the first new members will join by 1999.

NATO enlargement involves the most solemn commitments one nation can make to another. Let me explain exactly why it is in our interest to do this.

First, to protect against Europe's next war.

Three times in this century, American troops have had to go to Europe, in two hot wars and one cold war, to end conflicts that arose in Central and Eastern Europe.

And yet, in the last half century, America has never been called upon to go to war to defend a treaty ally. We have learned that alliances make the threat of force more credible and therefore the use of force less likely—that by promising to fight if necessary, we can make it less necessary to fight.

The United States has important security interests in Central and Eastern Europe. If there were a major threat to the peace and security of this region, there is already a high likelihood that we would decide to act, whether NATO enlarges or not. The point of NATO enlargement is to deter such a threat from ever arising.

The second reason is to defend Europe's gains toward democracy, peace and integration.

Just the prospect of enlargement has given central and Eastern Europe greater stability than it has seen in this century. Old disputes between Poland and Lithuania, Poland and Ukraine, Hungary and Romania, Italy and Slovenia, Germany and the Czech Republic are melting away as nations align themselves with NATO. Democratic reforms are advancing. Country after country has made sure soldiers take orders from civilians. These nations are fixing exactly the problems that could have led to future Bosnias.

NATO's prospective members know that they will not have to go it alone if peace and security is threatened in their region. This gives them a reason to avoid destabilizing arms buildups. It means we can continue to cut conventional arms across Europe. It means confidence within the region will grow, allowing political and economic ties with Russia to improve, too.

The third reason, Mr. Chairman, as I suggested, is to right the wrongs of the past. If we don't enlarge NATO, we will be validating the dividing line Stalin imposed in 1945 and that two generations of Americans and Europeans fought to overcome. That's conscionable. With the Cold War over, there is no moral or strategic basis for saying to the American people: "we must be allied with Europe's old democracies forever, but with Europe's new democracies never."

That would create a permanent injustice, mocking a half century of sacrifices on both sides of the Iron Curtain. And it would create a permanent source of tension in the heart of Europe.

The final reason for enlargement is that it will strengthen NATO by adding capable new allies.

Secretary Cohen can speak with greater authority about the military capabilities of NATO's prospective members and their progress in meeting NATO's standards. I want to stress that enlargement will strengthen the political and moral cohesion of the alliance.

The nations we are considering for membership share our most fundamental values and aspirations for Europe and the world. Many shared risks with our soldiers in the Gulf War. Without hesitation, each provided troops to NATO in Bosnia; Hungary provided the bases from which NATO launched its mission and all these nations are with us in SFOR today. They are heeding our call to stop dealing with rogue states such as Iran and Iraq. And they have lent their support to the expansion of democratic principles and respect for human rights around the globe.

The bottom line is, our future allies will bear the cost of defending freedom, because they know the price of losing freedom. Now it falls to us to decide whether the people who knocked the teeth out of totalitarianism in Europe and who helped to liberate us from the Cold War are worthy members of history's greatest democratic alliance.

The President and I believe that some are now ready, willing and able and we trust the Senate will agree.

ANSWERING THE CRITICS

Still, I know that many thoughtful people remain skeptical. Let me answer their concerns as plainly and directly as I can.

Some people say that enlargement will simply create a new line of division in Europe, leaving the most insecure countries out. But we have taken a range of steps to avoid that outcome.

We have made it clear that NATO's first new members will not be the last and that the door to future membership must not be slammed in the face of countries that are not yet ready.

NATO is also launching a number of internal reforms and strengthening its Partnership for Peace, so that whenever the allies act our Partners will be able to act with us. And we are creating an Atlantic Partnership Council, composed of NATO's allies and the members of the Partnership for Peace, so that every new democracy, whether it joins NATO sooner, later or not at all, will have a say in Europe's future. This approach has the support of our partners, from the Baltic states, to Poland to Ukraine.

We have made a particular effort to reach out to Ukraine. We are working towards signing a NATO-Ukraine document and seek to strengthen NATO's practical cooperation with Ukraine, to support the new Polish-Ukrainian peacekeeping battalion, to bolster military reform, to enhance interoperability with NATO, and to encourage Ukraine's cooperation with its neighbors.

There are only two possible alternatives to this overall strategy. We could freeze Europe's Cold War division. Or we could create a lowest common denominator NATO that includes everyone and imposes obligations on no one. Both of these alternatives are unacceptable. It is far better to invite the strongest candidates to join now, while keeping the door open to every democracy that can shoulder the responsibilities of membership.

We should also remember that when NATO was created in 1949, important countries such as Germany, Greece and Turkey were not included. Yet NATO left no doubt that it had a direct and material interest in their security—and not coincidentally, just a month after the NATO treaty was signed, the Berlin blockade was lifted. NATO's area of concern has always been wider than its area of membership and it always will be.

Others suggest that if we want to integrate Europe's new democracies, then the European Union or NATO's Partnership for Peace can do the job alone. Frankly, I think it is patronizing to assume all these proud nations will just accept partial membership in Western institutions because they happen to sit on the wrong side of an outdated dividing line. Why should they settle for second class citizenship if they are ready to make a first class contribution?

EU expansion is vital. But the security NATO provides has always been critical to the prosperity the EU promises. EU expansion will also require new members to make vast adjustments in their regulatory policies. If NATO can proceed now, why wait until, say, tomato farmers in Central and Eastern Europe start using the right kinds of pesticides? And as the EU expands, only NATO can make sure that a united Europe maintains its strongest link to America.

As for the Partnership for Peace, it has indeed been a great success and it will remain critical. But we should remember that many nations have embraced the Partnership both to develop lasting ties with NATO and to prepare for eventual membership. The idea that NATO can remain as it is forever, while the Central and East Europeans happily participate in the Partnership for Peace forever, with no prospect of joining the alliance, is a fantasy.

A final criticism we often hear is that we do not need to bother with NATO at all because there is no military threat in Europe. In fact, due largely to Bosnia, more Europeans have died in violent conflict in the last 5 years than in the previous 45. So I cannot be complacent.

At the same time, with our leadership strong, Bosnia now being stabilized, Russia engaging with NATO and nuclear arms reductions moving forward, I can understand why some people don't see a threat right now. It is because our policy is working.

Mr. Chairman, if you don't see smoke, that is no reason to stop paying for fire insurance. Like any good insurance policy, NATO enlargement will certainly carry costs. Those costs are outlined in the report we presented to the Congress in February. Secretary Cohen will talk more about the military costs and there will also be a small cost to the NATO civil budget, although it is not possible to estimate the precise amount at this time.

As Secretary of State, I am equally concerned about the costs of a decision not to enlarge.

NATO would be stuck in the past, risking irrelevance, even dissolution. Our leadership in Europe will be compromised and relations with our traditional allies would deteriorate.

It might be said, rightly or wrongly, that we blocked the aspirations of NATO's would-be allies solely because Russia objected. Confidence would crumble in Central and Eastern Europe, leading to a search for security by other means, including arms buildups and increased tensions between neighbors. The worst elements in Russia would be encouraged, secure in their view that Europe can be divided into new spheres of influence and that confrontation with the West pays off. There would be little chance of building a constructive partnership between Russia and NATO.

RUSSIA

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the debate about NATO should be reduced to a debate about Russia. After all, from the Baltic States to the Balkans, more than 200 million people live in Europe's other new and emerging democracies.

At the same time, every NATO ally and every Central and East European democracy agrees that we cannot build a Europe whole and free until a democratic Russia is a full participant in Europe.

This means that we must appreciate the remarkable distance that Russia has traveled since it rejected communism, as well as our own interest in seeing Russia play an important role in Europe—

as a great power, and no longer an imperial power. We must recognize that Russia has made a choice for democracy and markets and defied the most dire predictions about its evolution.

Some, given the history, object to the very idea of Russian cooperation with the alliance. But we, given the history, understand that Russia's willingness to work with NATO is an opportunity to be seized, not a reason to hide the silverware.

One area where we are cooperating is our effort to adapt the Conventional Forces in Europe treaty. NATO's CFE proposal responds to the remarkable changes in European security since the treaty was signed in 1990. It calls for significant reductions in the number of conventional weapons permitted in the Atlantic-to-the-Urals region, consistent with NATO's continuing security requirements. It can ensure there is no destabilizing concentration of military equipment anywhere in Europe. And it makes clear that the specter of NATO tanks and artillery advancing to Russia's borders is not real.

A critical part of our approach to adapt the CFE is timely Senate approval of the "Flank Document" to which all 30 CFE states agreed on May 31, 1996. This agreement addresses concerns raised by Russia and Ukraine about the impact of the treaty's equipment limits in the CFE "flank" zone, while applying new constraints and special transparency measures as added assurance against excessive force concentrations. The flank document is a balanced agreement that serves U.S. interests.

To enter into force, all 30 states party must formally approve the Flank Document by May 15, 1997. If it does not enter into force by then, this valuable and sensible agreement will be put at risk, and the prospects for successful CFE adaptation would diminish.

In the past few months, NATO has also been discussing the terms of a charter that will institutionalize its practical cooperation with Russia. At the Helsinki summit, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin outlined the possibilities of such a partnership.

We will be able to act together with Russia to fight proliferation, to keep nuclear arsenals safe and to respond to humanitarian crises and threats to peace. We will build on the cooperation our troops forged in Bosnia, making sure it lasts long after the last foreign soldier leaves that country. A joint NATO-Russia Council will give Russia a voice, but not a veto—a chance to work in partnership with NATO, not within NATO. Both sides will retain complete freedom of action when we can't agree.

President Clinton has been absolutely clear with President Yeltsin about the lines we will not cross and the barriers we will not build as we construct the NATO-Russia partnership.

First, NATO enlargement will go forward with no delay.

Second, no European nation will be excluded from consideration.

Third, NATO's new members will enjoy the full benefits of membership.

Fourth, the new NATO-Russia Joint Council will be a forum for consultation, cooperation and, where possible, joint action. It will not have the power to dilute, delay or block NATO decisions, nor will it supplant NATO's North Atlantic Council. It will grow in importance only to the extent Russia uses it constructively.

Finally, NATO will continue to evolve, but its core function of collective defense will be maintained and enhanced, and the qualities that have made it the most successful alliance in history will be preserved.

As you know, Russia would also like us to make absolute commitments in the charter about the deployment of nuclear and conventional forces on the territory of new members. But we will not compromise on this issue.

All we have done, and all we will do, is to restate unilaterally existing NATO policy: that in the current and foreseeable security environment, we have no plan, no need, and no intention to station nuclear weapons in the new member countries, nor do we contemplate permanently stationing substantial combat forces. The only binding limits on conventional forces in Europe will be set as we adapt the CFE treaty, with Central and East European countries and all the other signatories at the table.

Let me also stress that the point of the NATO-Russia agreement is not to convince Russia to agree to NATO enlargement. We do not need Russia to agree to enlargement. The point is to advance a goal that is worthwhile in its own right: our interest in promoting the integration of a democratic Russia and acting together to meet the challenges of the next century.

I do not expect the Russian government to change its mind about NATO's plans to take in new members. We must face this fact squarely, but we should also recognize it for what it is: an issue of perception, not of military reality. NATO poses no danger to Russia, just as Russia poses no danger to NATO. We do no favor to Russia's democrats to suggest otherwise.

The fate of Russian democracy is certainly not at stake in NATO's decisions on enlargement. Russia's future as a free and prosperous nation will depend upon the ability of its leaders and people to build an open society, to defeat crime and corruption, to spark economic growth and spread its benefits. The Russian people know that their future will be written in Moscow, in Irkutsk, in Novgorod, and not at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

The truth is, the quest for freedom and security in Europe is not a zero sum game, in which Russia must lose if Central and Eastern Europe gains, and Central and Eastern Europe must lose if Russia gains. Such thinking has imposed enormous human and economic costs during the last 50 years, and we have a responsibility as well as an opportunity to transcend it.

In this new Europe, the United States and Western Europe have a chance to gain new allies and partners who can and will contribute to our common security. The people of Central and Eastern Europe have a chance to see the erasure of a Cold War dividing line that has cut them off from the European mainstream. The people of Russia have a chance to achieve the deepest and most genuine integration with the West that their nation has ever enjoyed.

Twice in this century, Mr. Chairman, we have faced the challenge, in the aftermath of war, to bring together that kind of Europe. We had the opportunity after World War I, but too many, in the United States and elsewhere, lacked the vision. After World War II, there was no shortage of vision, but across half of Europe the opportunity was denied.

Today we have the vision and the opportunity to build a Europe in which every nation is free and every free nation is our partner. With continued bipartisan support from the Senate and from the American people, I am confident that this is the Europe our children and grandchildren will know.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF
REPORT TO THE U.S. CONGRESS
ON THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION:
RATIONALE, BENEFITS, COSTS AND IMPLICATIONS**

**RELEASED BY THE BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AND CANADIAN AFFAIRS,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FEBRUARY 24, 1997**

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has declared its intent again to admit new members. At a summit in Madrid this coming July, NATO's 16 heads of state and government plan to invite specific states from among the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe to start accession talks to join the Alliance. President Clinton and NATO have stressed their support for admitting the first new members by 1999 as part of a broad strategy to foster a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe. This report, submitted to Congress pursuant to Section 1048 of the Fiscal Year 1997 Defense Authorization Act, describes the rationale, benefits, costs and other considerations related to NATO's enlargement.

This report also reflects the administration's commitment to work closely and in a bipartisan manner with Congress as it pursues this policy. Adding new members to NATO requires ratification by the United States Senate and requires both chambers of Congress to approve the resources needed to implement this initiative. If the security guarantees that will be extended to the new members are to be meaningful, they must represent an expression of informed national will. It is therefore essential that NATO enlargement proceed with the active participation and support of the American people and their representatives of both parties in Congress.

The major conclusions of this report include:

NATO enlargement contributes to the broader goal of a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe. NATO enlargement is one part of a much broader, post-Cold War strategy to help create a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe. That strategy has included many other elements: support for German unification; assistance to foster reforms in Russia, Ukraine and other new independent states; negotiation and adaptation of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty; and the evolution and strengthening of European security and economic institutions, including the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe and the Western European Union. NATO enlargement is also part of a much broader series of steps to adapt NATO to the post-Cold War security environment, including adaptation of NATO strategy, strategic concept, command arrangements and force posture, and its willingness to carry out new missions beyond NATO's territory, as it has in Bosnia. As part of this broad series of steps, NATO enlargement aims to help the United States and Europe erase outdated Cold War lines and strengthen shared security into the next century.

Enlargement will yield benefits for the United States, NATO and Europe. Adding Central and East European states to the Alliance will: foster democratic reforms and stability throughout Europe; give NATO a stronger collective defense capability; improve relations among the region's states; improve burden-sharing within NATO; improve general security that will benefit Russian security and the security of other former Soviet states by improving general European stability; create a better environment for trade, investment and economic growth in Central and Eastern Europe; and help all of Europe become a stronger partner for the United States in political, economic and security affairs. As President Clinton has said, in this way, "NATO can do for Europe's East what it did for Europe's West:

prevent a return to local rivalries, strengthen democracy against future threats and create the conditions for prosperity to flourish.”

NATO enlargement carries costs. Security is not free. The United States and its allies will, by enlargement, extend solemn security guarantees to additional nations, and NATO members must provide the capability to back them up. Enlargement will not, however, require a change in NATO’s military doctrine, which has already shifted from positional defense against an identified enemy to a capacity for flexible deployment to areas of need. Because the United States already has the world’s pre-eminent deployment capability, and substantial forces forward deployed in Europe, there will be no need for additional U.S. forces. Current European NATO members are already investing in improved capabilities to operate beyond their border, and Central and East European states, including likely new members, are likewise investing in modernizing and restructuring their forces. These efforts have already begun and would continue whether or not NATO adds members.

Costs to the United States will be modest. The Department of Defense has estimated both the direct enlargement costs (e.g., for interoperability between the forces of current and new members and for extending NATO’s integrated command, communications and air defense surveillance systems) and the costs of force improvements already being pursued by existing and new members which will also contribute to carrying out NATO’s missions in an enlarged alliance. The direct enlargement costs are estimated to average \$700-900 million annually, for a total of around \$9-12 billion between 1997 and 2009, they have reached a “mature capability” as discussed later in this report. The U.S. share of these costs, chiefly for our share of the NATO budgets for direct enlargement costs, would largely be incurred in the ten years following formal accession in 1999, and would average about \$150-200 million annually during that period. The estimated costs for new members associated with restructuring their forces are estimated to be about \$800 million-\$1 billion annually, while those for improvements of our NATO Allies’ regional reinforcement capabilities are estimated at \$600-800 million annually—respectively \$10-13 billion and \$8-10 billion over 1997-2009. These costs, in accordance with longstanding NATO financial principles, would be borne by those nations. The United States would share in these costs only to the extent the U.S., with Congressional approval, may choose to continue or expand the current modest assistance being provided to the military modernization of the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe.

There are greater costs and risks to not enlarging NATO on the current schedule. The security of Europe has been a vital interest of the United States throughout this century, and it remains so, including for the new democracies to the east. If we fail to seize this historical opportunity to help integrate, consolidate and stabilize Central and Eastern Europe, we would risk a much higher price later. The most efficient and cost-effective way to guarantee stability in Europe is to do so collectively with our European partners, old and new, through NATO. Alliances save money. Collective defense is both cheaper and stronger than national defense. A decision to defer enlargement, much less to withhold it altogether, would send the message to Central and Eastern Europe that their future does not lie with NATO and the West. It would falsely validate the old divisions of the Cold War. The resulting sense of isolation and vulnerability would be destabilizing in the region and would encourage nationalist and disruptive forces throughout Europe. NATO would remain stuck in the past, in danger of irrelevance, while the U.S. would be seen as inconstant and unreliable in its leadership and withdrawing from its responsibilities in Europe and the world.

The United States and NATO are committed to constructive relations with Russia. The United States and its NATO Allies are committed to building a strategic partnership with a democratic Russia; indeed, that effort and NATO enlargement are both part of the same enterprise of building a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe. While many Russian leaders have expressed opposition to NATO

enlargement, this initiative can serve Russia's own long-term security interests by fostering stability to its west. The United States and NATO already have worked with Russia on specific tasks, including the peace process and military operation in Bosnia. Parallel to NATO enlargement, the United States and NATO have proposed a series of initiatives, including a NATO-Russia Charter and a permanent consultative mechanism, in order to ensure that Russia plays an active part in efforts to build a new Europe even as NATO enlargement proceeds.

In summary, the addition of new members to NATO will strengthen the Alliance, contribute to a stronger and more peaceful Europe and benefit American security interests. It is one of the President's highest priorities for American foreign policy.

FACT SHEET: NATO ADAPTATION/ENLARGEMENT

**PREPARED BY THE BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AND CANADIAN AFFAIRS,
FEBRUARY 12, 1997**

The NATO Alliance, reformed and enlarged to meet the security challenges of the 21st century, is a key element in the New Atlantic Community that Secretary Christopher described on September 6 in Stuttgart. The U.S. has led the way in building a new NATO by giving the Alliance capabilities for new missions; opening NATO's doors to Europe's emerging democracies; and forging a strong, cooperative relationship between NATO and Russia.

At the January 1994 Brussels summit, President Clinton initiated a process of NATO external and internal adaptation. This process will reach new milestones at the July 1997 summit. The U.S. expects the summit to agree on NATO's internal reforms, launch enlargement negotiations with one or more countries, and deepen NATO's partnership with Russia and other European states.

NEW ROLES AND MISSIONS: BOSNIA

The new NATO emerging from this process of internal and external adaptation is capable of meeting the security challenges of the 21st century. European and Atlantic systems will be intertwined to create a true security partnership. NATO will continue to enlarge both the scope and depth of its cooperation with all European nations.

Circumstances have already forced NATO to demonstrate its new capability, and the Alliance has proved its mettle. Bosnia encapsulates the new kind of challenge.

IFOR has been a brilliant response, and the new NATO-led Stabilization Force—SFOR—is continuing to secure the peace. Under the NATO umbrella, Allies and former adversaries have joined together to conduct the most important and successful peacekeeping operation since World War II.

INTERNAL ADAPTATION

In 1990, NATO began its adaptation from a Cold War institution to a modern instrument of North Atlantic and European security, revising strategy and restructuring force posture to reflect the changed European security environment and the disappearance of the Soviet threat. One major development has been NATO's decision to adapt its standards to the growing European capabilities in the security field. The June 1996 North Atlantic Council-NAC-Ministerial in Berlin took major steps to give Europeans a larger role within a single, flexible Alliance structure. NATO Foreign Ministers agreed that the European role—known as the European Security and Defense Identity-ESDI—would be developed within the Alliance. ESDI will permit creation of coherent military forces capable of cooperating under the political control and strategic direction of the exclusively European security organization, the Western European Union-WEU.

NATO experts are working on detailed terms through which NATO assets, such as logistics or headquarters units, could be made available to the WEU on a case-by-case basis, as well as the appropriate command arrangements to support and conduct operations under WEU leadership. When ready, these arrangements will allow Europeans and the WEU to conduct security operations by drawing upon some of the Alliance's unique military assets.

The Berlin Ministerial also agreed on the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces-CJTF-which is being developed in more detail by NATO's Military Committee.

When implemented, this concept will provide the Alliance with more flexible and mobile forces and headquarters elements to be used, for example, in WEU-led operations or in missions including non-NATO countries.

EXTERNAL ADAPTATION: PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

President Clinton's initiative in January 1994 led the Alliance to reach out to non-member states and extend the zone of security and stability eastward in Europe. At his suggestion, NATO established the highly successful Partnership for Peace, a framework for practical cooperation with, currently, 27 Partners. PFP has become an integral part of the European security scene, helping young democracies restructure and establish democratic control of their military forces, develop transparency in defense planning and budgetary processes, operate effectively with Alliance forces, better understand collective defense planning, and learn new forms of military doctrine. The December NAC further strengthened the Partnership for Peace.

In September 1996, then-Secretary Christopher called for creation of an Atlantic Partnership Council-APC-to serve as a forum for consultations and cooperation between Allies and Partners on such issues as peacekeeping, peace enforcement, humanitarian and search and rescue missions, and PFP exercises. The APC will become a vital organ of Allied-Partner relations, giving Partners a greater voice in political consultation and planning of joint military activities. While PFP assists prospective members, it has become an institution in its own right which builds permanent cooperation among a large number of Partner states.

ENLARGEMENT

President Clinton's January 1994 initiative also launched a process of steady, transparent enlargement of the Alliance. In September 1995, NATO completed a study on the "how" and "why" of enlargement. During 1996, NATO and prospective new members engaged in intensified dialogue on potential accession to the Alliance.

At the December 1996 NAC, the Ministers called for a NATO summit to be held in July in Madrid. At that summit, one or more countries that want to join NATO will be invited to begin accession negotiations, with actual membership targeted for 1999—NATO's 50th anniversary. The U.S. has consistently stated that the first accession will not be the last and that the door to membership will remain open.

NATO enlargement is not directed against anyone, and it will not create new dividing lines. It will advance the security of everyone-NATO's old members, new members, and non-members alike. Enlargement will not be free of cost for the U.S. and current Allies or for new members, who must demonstrate that they are willing and able to shoulder the burdens and responsibilities of membership.

SPECIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH NATO

A major U.S. goal is to integrate Russia into a stable European security system. The U.S., therefore, seeks a cooperative NATO-Russia relationship, which will strengthen the cooperative and consultative mechanisms between NATO and Russia. President Clinton has proposed concluding arrange-

ments that permit NATO and Russia to consult broadly and act jointly when possible to meet new security challenges. NATO Secretary-General Solana is leading the efforts to develop this relationship.

Also, an independent, democratic, and stable Ukraine is another essential element of the New Atlantic Community. The U.S. is developing its own strategic partnership with Ukraine and supports the Alliance's efforts to enhance the NATO-Ukraine relationship.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994 (PUBLIC LAW 103-447)

SEC. 201.—SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “NATO Participation Act of 1994”.

SEC. 202. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the leaders of the NATO member nations are to be commended for reaffirming that NATO membership remains open to Partnership for Peace countries emerging from Communist domination and for welcoming eventual expansion of NATO to include such countries;

(2) full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the

North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date, if such participants-

(A) maintain their progress toward establishing democratic institutions, free market economies, civilian control of their armed forces, and the rule of law; and

(B) remain committed to protecting the rights of all their citizens and respecting the territorial integrity of their neighbors;

(3) the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition to full NATO membership at an early date of full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace; and

(4) in particular, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia have made significant progress toward establishing democratic institutions, free market economies, civilian control of their armed forces, and the rule of law since the fall of their previous Communist governments.

SEC. 203. AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM TO FACILITATE TRANSITION TO NATO MEMBERSHIP.

(a) In General.—The President may establish a program to assist the transition to full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and other Partnership for Peace countries emerging from Communist domination designated pursuant to subsection (d).

(b) Conduct of Program.—The program established under subsection (a) shall facilitate the transition to full NATO membership of the countries described in such subsection by supporting and encouraging, inter alia—

(1) joint planning, training, and military exercises with NATO forces;

(2) greater interoperability of military equipment, air defense systems, and command, control, and communications systems; and

(3) conformity of military doctrine.

(c) Type of Assistance.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the President may provide to the countries described in such subsection the following types of security assistance:

(1) The transfer of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, without regard to the restrictions in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) of such section (relating to the eligibility of countries for such articles under such section).

(2) The transfer of nonlethal excess defense articles under section 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, without regard to the restriction in subsection (a) of such section (relating to the justification of the foreign military financing program for the fiscal year in which a transfer is authorized).

(3) Assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international military education and training).

(4) Assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (relating to the “Foreign Military Financing Program”).

(d) Designation of Partnership for Peace Countries Emerging From Communist Domination.—The President may designate countries emerging from communism and participating in the Partnership for Peace, especially Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, to receive assistance under the program established under subsection (a) if the President determines and reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that such countries—

(1) are full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace;

(2) have made significant progress toward establishing democratic institutions, a free market economy, civilian control of their armed forces, and the rule of law;

(3) are likely in the near future to be in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area;

and

(4) are not selling or transferring defense articles to a state that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

(e) Notification.—At least 15 days before designating any country pursuant to subsection (d), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in accordance with the procedures applicable under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(f) Determination.—It is hereby determined that Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia meet the criteria required in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d).

SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) Arms Export Control Act.—The President is authorized to exercise the authority of sections 63 and 65 of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to any country designated under section 203(d) of this title on the same basis authorized with respect to NATO countries.

(b) Other NATO Authorities.—The President should designate any country designated under section 203(d) of this title as eligible under sections 2350c and 2350f of title 10, United States Code.

(c) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that, in the interest of maintaining stability and promoting democracy in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and any other Partnership for Peace country designated under section 203(d) of this title, those countries should be included in all activities under section 2457 of title 10, United States Code, related to the increased standardization and enhanced interoperability of equipment and weapons systems, through coordinated training and procurement activities, as well as other means, undertaken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization members and other allied countries.

SEC. 205. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall include in the report required by section 514(a) of Public Law 103-236 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) the following:

(1) A description of all assistance provided under the program established under section 203(a), or otherwise provided by the United States Government to facilitate the transition to full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and other Partnership for Peace countries emerging from Communist domination designated pursuant to section 203(d).

(2) A description, on the basis of information received from the recipients and from NATO, of all assistance provided by other NATO member nations or NATO itself to facilitate the transition to full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and other Partnership for Peace countries emerging from Communist domination designated pursuant to section 203(d).

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

TITLE VI OF (PUBLIC LAW 104-208)
NATO ENLARGEMENT FACILITATION ACT OF 1996

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the 'NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996'.

SEC. 602. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has played an essential role in guaranteeing the security, freedom, and prosperity of the United States and its partners in the Alliance.

(2) The NATO Alliance is, and has been since its inception, purely defensive in character, and it poses no threat to any nation. The enlargement of the NATO Alliance to include as full and equal members emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe will serve to reinforce stability and security in Europe by fostering their integration into the structures which have created and sustained peace in Europe since 1945. Their admission into NATO will not threaten any nation. America's security, freedom, and prosperity remain linked to the security of the countries of Europe.

(3) The sustained commitment of the member countries of NATO to a mutual defense has made possible the democratic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. Members of the Alliance can and should play a critical role in addressing the security challenges of the post-Cold War era and in creating the stable environment needed for those emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to successfully complete political and economic transformation.

(4) The United States continues to regard the political independence and territorial integrity of all emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe as vital to European peace and security.

(5) The active involvement by the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has made the Partnership for Peace program an important forum to foster cooperation between NATO and those countries seeking NATO membership.

(6) NATO has enlarged its membership on 3 different occasions since 1949.

(7) Congress supports the admission of qualified new members to NATO and the European Union at an early date and has sought to facilitate the admission of qualified new members into NATO.

(8) Lasting security and stability in Europe requires not only the military integration of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe into existing European structures, but also the eventual economic and political integration of these countries into existing European structures.

(9) As new members of NATO assume the responsibilities of Alliance membership, the costs of maintaining stability in Europe should be shared more widely. Facilitation of the enlargement process will require current members of NATO, and the United States in particular, to demonstrate the political will needed to build on successful ongoing programs such as the Warsaw Initiative and the Partnership for Peace by making available the resources necessary to supplement efforts prospective new members are themselves undertaking.

(10) New members will be full members of the Alliance, enjoying all rights and assuming all the obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on April 4, 1949 (hereafter in this Act referred to as the 'Washington Treaty').

(11) In order to assist emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe that have expressed interest in joining NATO to be prepared to assume the responsibilities of NATO membership, the United States should encourage and support efforts by such countries to develop force structures and force modernization priorities that will enable such countries to contribute to the full range of NATO missions, including, most importantly, territorial defense of the Alliance.

(12) Cooperative regional peacekeeping initiatives involving emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe that have expressed interest in joining NATO, such as the Baltic Peacekeeping Battalion, the Polish-Lithuanian Joint Peacekeeping Force, and the Polish-Ukrainian Peacekeeping Force, can make an important contribution to European peace and security and international peacekeeping efforts, can assist those countries preparing to assume the responsibilities of possible NATO membership, and accordingly should receive appropriate support from the United States.

(13) NATO remains the only multilateral security organization capable of conducting effective military operations and preserving security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region.

(14) NATO is an important diplomatic forum and has played a positive role in defusing tensions between members of the Alliance and, as a result, no military action has occurred between two Alliance member states since the inception of NATO in 1949.

(15) The admission to NATO of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe which are found to be in a position to further the principles of the Washington Treaty would contribute to international peace and enhance the security of the region. Countries which have become democracies and established market economies, which practice good neighborly relations, and which have established effective democratic civilian control over their defense establishments and attained a degree of interoperability with NATO, should be evaluated for their potential to further the principles of the Washington Treaty.

(16) Democratic civilian control of defense forces is an essential element in the process of preparation for those states interested in possible NATO membership.

(17) Protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights is an integral aspect of genuine security, and in evaluating requests for membership in NATO, the human rights records of the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should be evaluated according to their commitments to fulfill in good faith the human rights obligations of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act.

(18) A number of Central and East European countries have expressed interest in NATO membership, and have taken concrete steps to demonstrate this commitment, including their participation in Partnership for Peace activities.

(19) The Caucasus region remains important geographically and politically to the future security of Central and Eastern Europe. As NATO proceeds with the process of enlargement, the United States and NATO should continue to examine means to strengthen the sovereignty and enhance the security of United Nations recognized countries in that region.

(20) In recognition that not all countries which have requested membership in NATO will necessarily qualify at the same pace, the accession date for each new member will vary.

(21) The provision of additional NATO transition assistance should include those emerging democracies most ready for closer ties with NATO and should be designed to assist other countries meeting specified criteria of eligibility to move forward toward eventual NATO membership.

(22) The Congress of the United States finds in particular that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have made significant progress toward achieving the criteria set forth in section 203(d)(3) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and should be eligible for the additional assistance described in this Act.

(23) The evaluation of future membership in NATO for emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should be based on the progress of those nations in meeting criteria for NATO membership, which require enhancement of NATO's security and the approval of all NATO members.

(24) The process of NATO enlargement entails the consensus agreement of the governments of all 16 NATO members and ratification in accordance with their constitutional procedures.

(25) Some NATO members, such as Spain and Norway, do not allow the deployment of nuclear weapons in their territory although they are accorded the full collective security guarantees provided by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. There is no a priori requirement for the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of new NATO members, particularly in the current security climate. However, NATO retains the right to alter its security posture at any time as circumstances warrant.

SEC. 603. UNITED STATES POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to join with the NATO allies of the United States to adapt the role of the NATO Alliance in the post-Cold War world;

(2) to actively assist the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe in their transition so that such countries may eventually qualify for NATO membership;

(3) to support the enlargement of NATO in recognition that enlargement will benefit the interests of the United States and the Alliance and to consider these benefits in any analysis of the costs of NATO enlargement;

(4) to ensure that all countries in Central and Eastern Europe are fully aware of and capable of assuming the costs and responsibilities of NATO membership, including the obligation set forth in Article 10 of the Washington Treaty that new members be able to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area; and

(5) to work to define a constructive and cooperative political and security relationship between an enlarged NATO and the Russian Federation.

SEC. 604. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FURTHER ENLARGEMENT OF NATO.

It is the sense of the Congress that in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine—

(1) the United States should continue and expand its support for the full and active participation of these countries in activities appropriate for qualifying for NATO membership;

(2) the United States Government should use all diplomatic means available to press the European Union to admit as soon as possible any country which qualifies for membership;

(3) the United States Government and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should continue and expand their support for military exercises and peacekeeping initiatives between and among these nations, nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and Russia; and

(4) the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance.

SEC. 605. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING ESTONIA, LATVIA AND LITHUANIA.

In view of the forcible incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania into the Soviet Union in 1940 under the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the refusal of the United States and other countries to recognize that incorporation for over 50 years, it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have valid historical security concerns that must be taken into account by the United States; and

(2) Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania should not be disadvantaged in seeking to join NATO by virtue of their forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union.

SEC. 606. DESIGNATION OF COUNTRIES ELIGIBLE FOR NATO ENLARGEMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL—The following countries are designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act: Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

(b) DESIGNATION OF SLOVENIA—Effective 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Slovenia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d) of such Act, unless the President certifies to Congress prior to such effective date that Slovenia fails to meet the criteria under section 203(d)(3) of such Act.

(c) DESIGNATION OF OTHER COUNTRIES.—The President shall designate other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act if such countries-

- (1) have expressed a clear desire to join NATO;
- (2) have begun an individualized dialogue with NATO in preparation for accession;
- (3) are strategically significant to an effective NATO defense; and

(4) meet the other criteria outlined in section 203(d)(3) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION- Nothing in this section precludes the designation by the President of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, Ukraine, or any other emerging democracy in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 607. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATO ENLARGEMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL- There are authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1997 for the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994.

(b) AVAILABILITY- Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a)-

(1) not less than \$20,000,000 shall be available for the cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Credit Reform Act of 1990, of direct loans pursuant to the authority of section 203(c)(4) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (relating to the 'Foreign Military Financing Program');

(2) not less than \$30,000,000 shall be available for assistance on a grant basis pursuant to the authority of section 203(c)(4) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (relating to the 'Foreign Military Financing Program'); and

(3) not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available for assistance pursuant to the authority of section 203(c)(3) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (relating to international military education and training).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION- Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this section are authorized to be appropriated in addition to such amounts as otherwise may be available for such purposes.

SEC. 608. REGIONAL AIRSPACE INITIATIVE AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL- To the extent provided in advance in appropriations acts for such purposes, funds described in subsection (b) are authorized to be made available to support the implementation of

the Regional Airspace Initiative and the Partnership for Peace Information Management System, including—

- (1) the procurement of items in support of these programs; and
- (2) the transfer of such items to countries participating in these programs.

(b) FUNDS DESCRIBED—Funds described in this subsection are funds that are available—

(1) during any fiscal year under the NATO Participation Act of 1994 with respect to countries eligible for assistance under that Act; or

(2) during fiscal year 1997 under any Act to carry out the Warsaw Initiative.

SEC. 609. EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

(a) PRIORITY DELIVERY—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the delivery of excess defense articles under the authority of section 203(c) (1) and (2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be given priority to the maximum extent feasible over the delivery of such excess defense articles to all other countries except those countries referred to in section 541 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103-306; 108 Stat. 1640).

(b) COOPERATIVE REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING INITIATIVES- The Congress encourages the President to provide excess defense articles and other appropriate assistance to cooperative regional peacekeeping initiatives involving emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe that have expressed an interest in joining NATO in order to enhance their ability to contribute to European peace and security and international peacekeeping efforts.

SEC. 610. MODERNIZATION OF DEFENSE CAPABILITY.

The Congress endorses efforts by the United States to modernize the defense capability of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, and any other countries designated by the President pursuant to section 203(d) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, by exploring with such countries options for the sale or lease to such countries of weapons systems compatible with those used by NATO members, including air defense systems, advanced fighter aircraft, and telecommunications infrastructure.

SEC. 611. TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.

(a) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY—The eligibility of a country designated pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 606 or pursuant to section 203(d) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 may be terminated upon a determination by the President that such country does not meet the criteria set forth in section 203(d)(3) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994.

(b) NOTIFICATION—At least 15 days before terminating the eligibility of any country pursuant to subsection (a), the President shall notify the congressional committees specified in section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under that section.

SEC. 612. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT.

The NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended in sections 203(a), 203(d)(1), and 203(d)(2) by striking ‘countries emerging from Communist domination’ each place it appears and inserting ‘emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe’.

**ENLARGEMENT-RELATED LEGISLATION
INTRODUCED IN THE 105TH CONGRESS**

H.Con.Res. 10 (Solomon) A concurrent resolution recommending the integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

S.Con.Res. 5 (Roth): A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the extension of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 to certain democracies of Central and Eastern Europe is essential to the consolidation of enduring peace and stability in Europe.

H.Con.Res. 53 (Solomon) A concurrent resolution encouraging and expediting the integration of Romania at the earliest stage into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

H.R.1431 (Gilman) A bill to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes.

S.Con.Res. 29 (Gorton) A concurrent resolution recommending the integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO POLICY

NATO FACT SHEET: NATO'S ENLARGEMENT

MARCH 1996

In December 1994, NATO Foreign Ministers initiated a study to examine the questions related to the inclusion of new members into the North Atlantic Alliance. They stated that enlargement, when it takes place, will be part of a broad European security architecture based on true cooperation throughout the whole of Europe. It will threaten no one and will enhance security and stability for all of Europe. This study was completed in September 1995, at which time it was presented to Partnership for Peace (PfP) Partners.

Interested Central and East European Partner states were briefed on an individual basis in the weeks following the completion of the study. NATO Foreign Ministers met in Brussels in December 1995 to determine the next steps to be taken. On the basis of the study and the reactions of Partner countries, NATO Foreign Ministers decided that during 1996, the next phase of the enlargement process will consist of intensified, individual dialogue with interested Partners; enhancement of PfP to help those interested Partners to prepare for the responsibilities of membership and to strengthen long-term partnership with others; and further consideration of what the Alliance must do internally to ensure that enlargement preserves its effectiveness.

The origins and principal conclusions of the study are summarized below.

At their Summit meeting in Brussels in January 1994, Heads of State and Government of the 16 member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance reaffirmed the openness of the Alliance and stated that they expected and would welcome NATO enlargement that would reach to their east, as part of an evolutionary process, taking into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe.

In December 1994, Allied Foreign Ministers initiated a process of examination inside the Alliance to determine how NATO will enlarge, the principles to guide this process and the implications of membership. It was agreed that the results of this study would be presented to interested Partners before the next Ministerial meeting in Brussels in December 1995. Elaboration of the study has served to clarify the "why and how" of enlargement and what NATO and possible new members will need to do to prepare to join. The "who and when" of enlargement have not been addressed and are subjects for future discussion and decision.

WHY NATO WILL ENLARGE

With the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact, there is both a need and a unique opportunity to build an improved security architecture in the whole of the Euro-Atlantic area, without recreating dividing lines. NATO enlargement will be a further step towards the Alliance's basic goal of enhancing security and extending stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area, within the context of a broad European security architecture based on true cooperation. NATO enlargement will extend to new members the benefits of common defence and integration into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions.

NATO enlargement will threaten no one. NATO is and will remain a purely defensive Alliance whose fundamental purpose is to preserve peace in the Euro-Atlantic area and to provide security to its members. NATO enlargement will contribute to enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area by: encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control over the military; fostering patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation and consensus building which characterize relations among current Allies; promoting good-neighborly relations in the whole Euro-Atlantic area; increasing transparency in defence planning and military budgets and thus confidence among states; reinforcing the tendency toward integration and cooperation in Europe; strengthening the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security and support peacekeeping under the U.N. or OSCE; and by strengthening and broadening the transatlantic partnership.

PRINCIPLES OF ENLARGEMENT

Enlargement of the Alliance will be through accession of new member states to the Washington Treaty in accordance with its Article 10. All new members will enjoy all the rights and assume all obligations of membership under the Washington Treaty; and will need to accept and conform with the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that new members join. Willingness and ability to meet such commitments, not only on paper but in practice, would be a critical factor in any decision to invite a country to join. The Alliance rests upon commonality of views and a commitment to work for consensus; part of the evaluation of the qualifications of a possible new member will be its demonstrated commitment to that process and those values. In particular, the Alliance will wish to avoid a situation where a new member might “close the door” behind it to new admissions in the future to other countries which may also aspire to membership. States which have ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes, including irredentist claims, or internal jurisdictional disputes, must settle those disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles. Resolution of such disputes would be a factor in determining whether to invite a state to join the Alliance. Finally, the ability of prospective members to contribute militarily to collective defence and to peacekeeping and other new missions of the Alliance will be a factor in deciding whether to invite them to join the Alliance. The Alliance is committed to maintaining the importance, vitality and credibility of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and the Partnership for Peace (PfP). As enlargement evolves, the two cooperative frameworks will remain important for strengthening relations with Partners which may be unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all. While PfP will help prepare interested Partners for possible eventual membership, it is neither a substitute for membership nor a guaranteed path to automatic membership.

DECISIONS ON ENLARGEMENT

Decisions on enlargement will be for NATO itself. There is no fixed or rigid list of criteria for inviting new member states to join the Alliance. Enlargement will be decided on a case-by-case basis and some nations may attain membership before others. New members should not be admitted or excluded on the basis of belonging to some group or category. Ultimately, Allies will decide by consensus whether to invite each new member to join according to their judgment of whether doing so will contribute to security and stability in the North Atlantic area at the time such a decision is to be made. No country outside the Alliance should be given a veto or *droit de regard* over the process and decisions.

COLLECTIVE DEFENSE ARRANGEMENTS

Against the background of existing arrangements for contributing to collective defence, Allies will want to know how possible new members intend to contribute to NATO's collective defence and will explore all aspects of this question in detail through bilateral dialogue prior to accession negotiations. New members should accept NATO doctrine and policies directed at ensuring interoperability of forces. It is important for NATO's force structure that Allies' forces can be deployed, when and if appropriate, on the territory of new members.

The Alliance has no a priori requirement for the stationing of Alliance troops on the territory of new members. The coverage provided by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, including its nuclear component, will apply to new members. There is no a priori requirement for the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. For the foreseeable future, NATO's current nuclear posture will meet the requirements of an enlarged Alliance.

NATO ENLARGEMENT AND THE OSCE, EU AND WEU

A strengthened OSCE, an enlarged NATO, an active NACC and PfP would, together with other fora, form complementary parts of a broad, inclusive European security architecture, supporting the objective of an undivided Europe. NATO's commitments to support, on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with Alliance procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, will remain valid after enlargement. An enlarged Alliance would have greater capacity to support such peacekeeping activities and operations. The enlargement of NATO is a parallel process with and will complement that of the European Union. Both enlargement processes will contribute significantly to extending security, stability and prosperity enjoyed by their members to other, like-minded, democratic European states. All full members of the WEU are also members of NATO. The maintenance of this linkage is essential, because of the cumulative effect of security safeguards extended in the two organizations. The enlargement of both organizations should, therefore, be compatible and mutually supportive. An eventual broad congruence of European membership in NATO, EU and WEU would have positive effects on European security. Therefore, the Alliance should, at an appropriate time, give particular consideration to countries with a perspective of EU membership, and which have shown interest in joining NATO, in order to consider how they can contribute to transatlantic security within the Washington Treaty and to determine whether to invite them to join NATO.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

NATO enlargement threatens no one and is not directed against Russia or any other state. Allies believe that inviting new members into the Alliance will contribute to enhanced security for the whole of Europe, which is in Russia's interest as well. Like NATO, Russia has an important contribution to make to European stability and security. A stronger NATO-Russia relationship should form a cornerstone of a new, inclusive and comprehensive security structure in Europe. Russia joined Partnership for Peace in June 1994. In May 1995, NATO and Russia also agreed on a broad, enhanced dialogue and cooperation, beyond PfP. NATO-Russia relations must be based on reciprocity, mutual respect and confidence, avoiding "surprise" decisions by either side which could affect the interests of the other. Implementation of Russia's Individual Partnership Programme under the Partnership for Peace and of our dialogue and cooperation with Russia beyond PfP will be important steps in this direction. NATO wants to strengthen the NATO-Russia relationship even further, in rough parallel with NATO enlargement. The Alliance is addressing the concerns which Russia has raised with respect to NATO enlarge-

ment in the development of its wider relationship with Russia. The Alliance has made clear, however, that it cannot be subordinated to another European security institution.

NEXT STEPS

A collective briefing on the conclusions of the study was given to interested Partners on 28 September 1995, at NATO Headquarters, and individual briefings in Brussels or Partner capitals took place over the subsequent few weeks at the request of interested Partners. Countries interested in joining the Alliance have indicated that they would like more information on country-specific requirements for membership. At their meeting on 5 December, NATO Foreign Ministers decided, on the basis of the study and the reactions of Partner countries, that throughout 1996, the next phase of the enlargement process will consist of three elements: intensified, individual dialogue with interested Partners, building on the foundation of the enlargement study and the presentations made during the first phase; further enhancement of the Partnership for Peace to help those interested Partners to prepare to assume the responsibilities of membership and to strengthen long-term partnership with others; and further consideration of what NATO must do internally to ensure that enlargement preserves the effectiveness of the Alliance. Intensified dialogue will allow interested Partners to learn about specific and practical requirements for Alliance membership, and to review their efforts to prepare for membership in relation to the principles included in the enlargement study. NATO, in turn, will acquire a better appreciation of what individual Partners could or could not contribute to the Alliance. However, participation in this next phase will not imply that interested Partners will have an automatic prospect of being invited to accede to NATO. Foreign Ministers will continue their assessment of progress and consideration of the way forward at future meetings.

This text is not a formally agreed NATO document and does not therefore necessarily represent the official opinion or position of individual member governments on all policy issues discussed

NATO FACT SHEET: PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP)

MARCH 1996

Partnership for Peace (PFP) is a major initiative introduced by NATO at the January 1994 Brussels Summit.

The Partnership is working to expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance.

It offers participating states the possibility of strengthening their relations with NATO in accordance with their own individual interests and capabilities.

NATO will also consult with any active participant in the Partnership if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security. The states participating in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and other member countries of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) able and willing to contribute, were invited to join the NATO member states in this Partnership in January 1994.

Twenty-six states¹ have since accepted this invitation and in most cases, detailed Individual Partnership Programmes have been agreed and are being implemented. Four of these countries—Austria, Finland, Malta and Sweden—are not members of the NACC but participate in NACC deliberations on PFP issues and take part in other NACC activities as observers. At a pace and scope determined by the capacity and desire of the individual participating Partners, NATO is working with its Partners in concrete ways towards creating greater transparency in defence budgeting, improving civil-military relations and promoting democratic control of armed forces; developing joint planning and joint military exercises; and developing the ability of the forces of Partner countries to operate with NATO forces in such fields as peacekeeping, search and rescue and humanitarian operations, and others as may be agreed.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NACC AND PFP

Partnership for Peace has been established within the framework of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council and builds on the momentum of cooperation created by the NACC. Partnership for Peace activities are fully coordinated with other activities undertaken in the NACC framework. While PFP focuses in particular on practical, defence-related and military cooperation activities, the NACC provides a forum for broad consultations on political and security related issues as well as for practical cooperation on security-related economic questions, information and scientific and environmental matters. Moreover, a fundamental difference between the NACC and PFP is that the NACC is a multi-lateral forum while PFP focuses on cooperation between NATO and individual partners. The NACC Work Plan sets down cooperation activities designed for all NACC members.

The Partnership Work Programme is developed by NATO as a “menu” of potential cooperative activities from which PFP Partners may select according to their own specific, individual interests.

Each PFP Partner jointly develops with NATO an Individual Partnership Programme (IPP) listing specific cooperation activities agreed between NATO and that Partner, drawn from the Partnership Work Programme.

AIMS OF PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

Concrete objectives of the Partnership include:

facilitating transparency in national defence planning and budgeting processes; ensuring democratic control of defence forces;

maintaining the capability and readiness to contribute to operations under the authority of the U.N. and/or the responsibility of the OSCE;

developing cooperative military relations with NATO, for the purpose of joint planning, training and exercises in order to strengthen the ability of PFP participants to undertake missions in the fields of peacekeeping, search and rescue, humanitarian operations, and others as may subsequently be agreed;

developing, over the longer term, forces that are better able to operate with those of the members of the North Atlantic Alliance.

Active participation in the Partnership for Peace will play an important role in the evolutionary process of including new members in NATO.

Alliance governments have stated that they “expect and would welcome” the addition of new members to the Alliance “as part of an evolutionary process taking into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe”.

Article 10 of the Washington Treaty provides for the inclusion in NATO of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area.

OBLIGATIONS AND COMMITMENTS OF PFP

In accordance with the invitation issued by NATO at the beginning of 1994, countries wishing to participate in PFP sign a Framework Document in which they affirm their commitment to the preservation of democratic societies and the maintenance of the principles of international law; to fulfil in good faith the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state; to respect existing borders; and to settle disputes by peaceful means.

They also reaffirm their commitment to the Helsinki Final Act and all subsequent CSCE/OSCE documents and to the fulfillment of the commitments and obligations they have undertaken in the field of disarmament and arms control.

IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCEDURES

After signing the Framework Document, each Partner then submits its own, individual Presentation Document to NATO. Developed with the assistance of NATO authorities if desired, this document indicates the scope, pace and level of participation in cooperation activities with NATO sought by the Partner (for example, joint planning, training and exercises).

The Presentation Document also identifies steps to be taken by the Partner to achieve the political goals of the Partnership as well as military and other assets that might be made available by the Partner for Partnership activities.

It serves as a basis for developing an agreed Individual Partnership Programme (IPP), between the Partner and NATO, which details cooperation activities with each Partner. IPPs have been agreed between NATO and most PfP partners and are being implemented. Partners undertake to make available personnel, assets, facilities and capabilities necessary and appropriate for carrying out the agreed Partnership Programme; to fund their own participation in Partnership activities; and to share the burdens of mounting exercises in which they take part. PfP funding guidelines agreed by NATO stipulate that, for an interim period, to alleviate the burden on the Partners from their participation in Partnership activities, assistance could be made available by the Alliance if required.

THE PFP MACHINERY

A Political-Military Steering Committee (PMSC) meets as the working forum for Partnership for Peace, under the chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary General of NATO, in different configurations. Meetings of NATO allies with individual Partners examine, as appropriate, questions pertaining to that country's Individual Partnership Programme. Meetings with all NACC/PfP Partners also take place to address common issues relating to Partnership for Peace; to provide the necessary transparency on Individual Partnership Programmes; and to consider the Partnership Work Programme. To facilitate cooperation activities, NACC Partner countries and other PfP participating states have been invited to send permanent liaison officers to NATO Headquarters and to a separate Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) at Mons (Belgium), where the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) is located.

Most PfP countries have designated Liaison Officers to NATO, who work in office facilities provided for them in the Manfred Wrner Wing at NATO Headquarters in Brussels.

Many PfP countries have also appointed Liaison Officers to the Coordination Cell. The Partnership Coordination Cell is responsible, under the authority of the North Atlantic Council, for coordinating joint military activities within the Partnership for Peace and for carrying out the military planning necessary to implement the military aspects of the Partnership Programmes, notably, the preparation of PfP exercises. The Cell is headed by a Director with responsibilities which include consultation and coordination with NATO's military authorities on matters directly related to the PCC's work. Detailed operational planning for military exercises is the responsibility of the military commands conducting the exercise. Three PfP exercises were held in autumn 1994 and 11 land and sea exercises in 1995, five in Partner countries.

These exercises are designed to improve practical military cooperation and common capabilities in the areas on which PfP focuses and help to develop interoperability between the forces of NATO Allies and Partner countries. They also have an important political role.

A large number of nationally sponsored exercises in the spirit of PfP are also taking place. A PfP Status of Forces Agreement, defining the legal status of NATO and Partner military forces when present on each other's territory, is now open for signature by Partner countries.

THE PMSC/AHG ON COOPERATION IN PEACEKEEPING

The Political-Military Steering Committee/Ad Hoc Group on Cooperation in Peacekeeping (PMSC/AHG), which operates in the NACC/PfP framework, serves as the main forum for consultations on political and conceptual issues related to peacekeeping, and for the exchange of experience and the discussion of practical measures for cooperation. The PMSC/AHG reports periodically to NACC/PfP Foreign Ministers on these matters. Ireland, as an interested OSCE member state with specific experience in peacekeeping, also participates in the work of the group and actively contributes to it. A representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office regularly attends the meetings of the Group and a representative of the United Nations has also participated in its activities.

DEFENCE-RELATED AND MILITARY COOPERATION MATTERS

Among the defence and military-related matters addressed in PfP, are:

- Civil-military relations and the democratic control of armed forces
- Allies and Partners attach importance to improving civil-military relations and enhancing democratic control of defence establishments and armed forces in the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe.

A number of activities have therefore been undertaken aimed at these objectives, including ensuring transparency and appropriate Parliamentary oversight and public scrutiny of decision-making related to defence issues, and developing civilian expertise on security questions.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT ISSUES

Cooperation programmes on topics related to defence procurement programme management, materiel and technical standardization, technical research, air defence and communications and information systems interoperability, are developed by the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD), the NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC) and the NATO Communications and Information Systems Committee (NACISC). Specific activities include meetings of multinational expert teams, the provision of technical documentation, workshops, seminars and other joint meetings.

AIRSPACE COORDINATION

NATO's Committee for European Airspace Coordination (CEAC) meets in regular plenary sessions with specialists from PfP Partner countries and other nations to focus on civil-military coordination of air traffic management. Partner country representatives also take part in working groups, seminars and workshops held under the auspices of CEAC.

CIVIL EMERGENCY PLANNING

The Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee meets with PfP Partners to oversee a programme of practical cooperation activities (seminars, workshops and exchanges of information) in the field of civil emergency planning and humanitarian assistance. Cooperation Partners also have the opportunity of exchanging technical expertise in the field of civil emergency planning through their participation in other committees responsible to the SCEPC.

Emphasis is placed on the development of emergency legislation; disaster preparedness covering the entire spectrum of disaster prevention, mitigation, response and recovery and promotion of effective civil-military cooperation.

MILITARY COOPERATION

NATO's Military Committee holds annual meetings at Chiefs of Staff level with NACC/PfP Partners and also meets at Military Representative level. The first meeting of the Military Committee in Cooperation Session took place in April 1992. It represented an important milestone in the partnership process and resulted in a military work plan designed to develop cooperation and assist Cooperation Partners with the process of restructuring their armed forces. Activities in the framework of the Military Cooperation programme have since been subsumed under the Partnership for Peace.

SCIENTIFIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE NACC FRAMEWORK

Scientists from Cooperation Partner countries have participated in the scientific and environmental programmes of the Alliance since 1992.

In 1993 measures were taken by the North Atlantic Council to make these programmes more relevant to activities involving Cooperation Partners, singling out in particular scientific fields having a special bearing on security.

As a result of these developments, scientists from NATO and Cooperation Partner countries are now engaged in NATO-sponsored activities designed to address issues such as the dismantling of weapons of mass destruction, military-related environmental degradation, and the conversion of military industries to civilian purposes.

Representatives of Cooperation Partner countries also meet on an annual basis with the NATO Science Committee and the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society.

PfP PLANNING AND REVIEW PROCESS

In January 1995 a Planning and Review Process (PARP) was introduced within PfP, based on a biennial planning cycle, designed to advance interoperability and increase transparency among Allies and Partners. The first cycle of this process, in which 14 Partner states participated (Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and Ukraine), was completed in spring 1995.

The Planning and Review Process provides an important tool for enhancing interoperability between Partners and NATO member states in the areas of peacekeeping, humanitarian missions, and search and rescue operations.

It also contributes to transparency in defence planning.

FOOTNOTE

¹ Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Poland, Romania,

Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Note that Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name. This text is not a formally agreed NATO document and does not therefore necessarily represent the official opinion or position of individual member governments on all policy issues discussed

SEPTEMBER 1995 STUDY ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

CHAPTER 1: PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES OF ENLARGEMENT

A. PURPOSES OF ENLARGEMENT

1. With the end of the Cold War, there is a unique opportunity to build an improved security architecture in the whole of the Euro-Atlantic area. The aim of an improved security architecture is to provide increased stability and security for all in the Euro-Atlantic area, without recreating dividing lines. NATO views security as a broad concept embracing political and economic, as well as defence, components. Such a broad concept of security should be the basis for the new security architecture which must be built through a gradual process of integration and cooperation brought about by an interplay of existing multilateral institutions in Europe, such as the EU, WEU and OSCE, each of which would have a role to play in accordance with its respective responsibilities and purposes in implementing this broad security concept. In this process, which is already well under way, the Alliance has played and will play a strong, active and essential role as one of the cornerstones of stability and security in Europe. NATO remains a purely defensive Alliance whose fundamental purpose is to preserve peace in the Euro-Atlantic area and to provide security for its members.

2. When NATO invites other European countries to become Allies, as foreseen in Article 10 of the Washington Treaty and reaffirmed at the January 1994 Brussels Summit, this will be a further step towards the Alliance's basic goal of enhancing security and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area, within the context of a broad European security architecture. NATO enlargement will extend to new members the benefits of common defence and integration into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions. The benefits of common defence and such integration are important to protecting the further democratic development of new members. By integrating more countries into the existing community of values and institutions, consistent with the objectives of the Washington Treaty and the London Declaration, NATO enlargement will safeguard the freedom and security of all its members in accordance with the principles of the U.N. Charter. Meeting NATO's fundamental security goals and supporting the integration of new members into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions are thus complementary goals of the enlargement process, consistent with the Alliance's strategic concept.

3. Therefore, enlargement will contribute to enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area by:

- Encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control over the military;
- Fostering in new members of the Alliance the patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation and consensus building which characterize relations among current Allies;
- Promoting good-neighbourly relations, which would benefit all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, both members and non-members of NATO;
- Emphasizing common defence and extending its benefits and increasing transparency in defence planning and military budgets, thereby reducing the likelihood of instability that might be engendered by an exclusively national approach to defence policies;

- Reinforcing the tendency toward integration and cooperation in Europe based on shared democratic values and thereby curbing the countervailing tendency towards disintegration along ethnic and territorial lines;
- Strengthening the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security, including through peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the U.N. Security Council as well as other new missions;
- Strengthening and broadening the Trans-Atlantic partnership.

B. PRINCIPLES OF ENLARGEMENT

4. Enlargement of the Alliance will be through accession of new member states to the Washington Treaty. Enlargement should:

- Accord with, and help to promote, the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the safeguarding of the freedom, common heritage and civilization of all Alliance members and their people, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. New members will need to conform to these basic principles;
- Accord strictly with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty which states that “the parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty ...”;
- Be on the basis that new members will enjoy all the rights and assume all obligations of membership under the Washington Treaty; and accept and conform with the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that new members join;
- Strengthen the Alliance's effectiveness and cohesion; and preserve the Alliance's political and military capability to perform its core functions of common defence as well as to undertake peacekeeping and other new missions;
- Be part of a broad European security architecture based on true cooperation throughout the whole of Europe. It would threaten no-one; and enhance stability and security for all of Europe;
- Take account of the continuing important role of PfP, which will both help prepare interested partners, through their participation in PfP activities, for the benefits and responsibilities of eventual membership and serve as a means to strengthen relations with partner countries which may be unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all. Active participation in the Partnership for Peace will play an important role in the evolutionary process of the enlargement of NATO;
- Complement the enlargement of the European Union, a parallel process which also, for its part, contributes significantly to extending security and stability to the new democracies in the East.

5. New members, at the time that they join, must commit themselves, as all current Allies do on the basis of the Washington Treaty, to:

- unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security; settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that

international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

- contribute to the development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being;
- maintain the effectiveness of the Alliance by sharing roles, risks, responsibilities, costs and benefits of assuring common security goals and objectives.

6. States which have ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes, including irredentist claims, or internal jurisdictional disputes must settle those disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles. Resolution of such disputes would be a factor in determining whether to invite a state to join the Alliance.

7. Decisions on enlargement will be for NATO itself. Enlargement will occur through a gradual, deliberate, and transparent process, encompassing dialogue with all interested parties. There is no fixed or rigid list of criteria for inviting new member states to join the Alliance. Enlargement will be decided on a case-by-case basis and some nations may attain membership before others. New members should not be admitted or excluded on the basis of belonging to some group or category. Ultimately, Allies will decide by consensus whether to invite each new member to join according to their judgment of whether doing so will contribute to security and stability in the North Atlantic area at the time such a decision is to be made. NATO enlargement would proceed in accordance with the provisions of the various OSCE documents which confirm the sovereign right of each state to freely seek its own security arrangements, to belong or not to belong to international organizations, including treaties of alliance. No country outside the Alliance should be given a veto or droit de regard over the process and decisions.

8. NATO's collective defence arrangements, as described in paragraphs 47 and 48, are a concrete expression of Allies' commitment to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. Against the background of existing arrangements for contributing to collective defence, Allies will want to know how possible new members intend to contribute to NATO's collective defence and will explore all aspects of this question in detail through bilateral dialogue prior to accession negotiations.

CHAPTER 2: HOW TO ENSURE THAT ENLARGEMENT CONTRIBUTES TO THE STABILITY AND SECURITY OF THE ENTIRE EURO-ATLANTIC AREA, AS PART OF A BROAD EUROPEAN SECURITY ARCHITECTURE, AND SUPPORTS THE OBJECTIVE OF AN UNDIVIDED EUROPE

A. INTRODUCTION—NATO ENLARGEMENT IN ITS BROAD CONTEXT

NATO plays an essential role within the developing European Security Architecture. NATO's membership of like-minded Allies dedicated to working together has, over the course of its forty-five year existence, helped fundamentally improve the nature of relations between member states. More-

over, the commitment by all Allies to defend one another's territory has proven its value, over more than four decades, as an anchor of stability and confidence in Europe. This commitment has helped Allied countries develop powerful and flexible military capabilities, firmly under political control. NATO's reliance on collective defence has ensured that no single Ally is forced to rely upon its own national efforts alone in dealing with basic security challenges. Sharing these benefits with new members can help extend security and stability in Europe. NATO's enlargement will occur as one element of the broader evolution of European cooperation and security currently underway. NATO's enlargement must be understood as only one important element of a broad European security architecture that transcends and renders obsolete the idea of "dividing lines" in Europe.

The current discussion on enlargement is taking place in very different circumstances than those which prevailed during the Cold War. In this context, the decision to admit new members must reflect the fact that the security challenges and risks which NATO faces now are different in nature from those faced in the past. In 1991, the Strategic Concept stated, "The threat of a simultaneous, full-scale attack on all of NATO's European fronts has effectively been removed". Since then, the risk of a re-emergent large-scale military threat has further declined. Nevertheless, risks to European security remain, which are multi-faceted and multi-directional and thus hard to predict and assess. NATO must be capable of responding to such risks and new challenges as they develop if stability in Europe and the security of its members, old and new, are to be preserved. For their part, numerous countries aspire to NATO membership in the wider context of becoming part of existing European and Euro-Atlantic structures and strengthening their security and stability.

Stability and security in Europe will be strengthened through an evolutionary process, taking into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe. NATO enlargement will be part of that process, threaten no-one and contribute to a developing broad European security architecture based on true cooperation throughout the whole of Europe, enhancing stability and security for all.

The architecture of European security is composed of European institutions (such as the European Union (EU) and the Western European Union (WEU)) and transatlantic institutions (NATO). It also includes the OSCE, whose membership comprises all European as well as North American countries and is thus the most inclusive European security institution, in whose framework agreements of particular importance for European security (the CFE Treaty and the Pact on Stability) have been concluded. For its part, NATO has developed cooperation arrangements: the NACC and PfP. NACC/PfP cooperation will continue to play an important role in the European security architecture both in enlarging the Alliance and in strengthening Alliance relations with partner countries which may not join the Alliance early or at all. This is addressed in Chapter 3.

Enlargement will have implications for all European nations, including states which do not join NATO early or at all. It will be important to maintain active, cooperative relations with countries which do not join the Alliance, in order to avoid divisions or uncertainties in Europe and to ensure broad, inclusive approaches to cooperative security. The Alliance should underline that there can be no question of "spheres of influence" in the contemporary Europe. NATO's relations with other European states, whether cooperation partners or not, are important factors to consider in taking any decision to proceed with the enlargement process as is building security for states which may not be prospective NATO members. Any such decision will have a significant impact on the European security environment and its timing, therefore, will require careful consideration.

Implementation of Russia's Individual Partnership Programme under the PfP and of our dialogue and cooperation with Russia beyond PfP will together renew and extend cooperation between the

Alliance and Russia which we believe will enhance stability and security in Europe, as part of our broad approach to developing a cooperative security architecture in Europe. Equally, we want to develop further our relations with all newly independent states, whose independence and democracy constitute an important factor of security and stability for Europe. In this context, we attach particular importance to our relations with Ukraine which we will further develop, especially through enhanced cooperation within the PfP.

B. NATO ENLARGEMENT AND OTHER EUROPEAN SECURITY INSTITUTIONS, IN PARTICULAR THE OSCE, EU AND WEU

There are several institutions with a critical role to play in the emerging European security architecture. It is important to assess NATO's enlargement in terms of how it can contribute to stability and security in conjunction with these other institutions.

As the most inclusive institution in the European security architecture, the OSCE has a key role to play in maintaining security and transcending divisions in Europe and should continue to be strengthened independently of enlargement of NATO. A strengthened OSCE will help to provide reassurance to states which may not join NATO either early or at all. The OSCE has developed unique capabilities in its 20-year history to contribute to security and stability in such areas as early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management, confidence and security-building measures, economic cooperation and the advancement of democracy and human rights.

The activities of the OSCE and of NATO are complementary and mutually reinforcing. NATO provides an important forum for political consultations among like-minded Allies as well as unique military capabilities to respond to security challenges. NATO's commitments to support, on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with Alliance procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, will remain valid after enlargement. An enlarged Alliance would have greater capacity to support such peacekeeping activities and operations. OSCE discussions on a European security model for the 21st century should reflect the process of NATO enlargement but not delay it. A strengthened OSCE, an enlarged NATO, an active NACC and PfP would, together with other fora, form complementary parts of a broad, inclusive European security architecture, supporting the objective of an undivided Europe.

The Pact on Stability in Europe, which was entrusted to the OSCE and comprises numerous bilateral agreements and treaties between European countries, is a fundamental underpinning for security and stability in the whole of Europe. The Pact on Stability is aimed at developing good neighbourly relations, advancing respect for the human rights, including those of persons belonging to national minorities, and resolving disputes between European states. As noted in Chapter 1, the resolution of such disputes would be a factor in determining whether to invite a state to join the Alliance. Implementation of the Pact on Stability as well as of other international agreements already concluded can contribute to creating the conditions necessary for enlargement of NATO. In turn, enlargement of NATO's membership will also facilitate the implementation of existing agreements and full compliance with the obligations they contain.

Enlargement of the Alliance is aimed at extending stability in the Euro-Atlantic area and enhancing long-term security for all NATO member countries and others as well. The enlargement of NATO is a parallel process with and will complement that of the European Union. Both NATO and the EU share common strategic interests as well as a broad approach to stability and security encompassing political, economic, social and environmental aspects, along with the defence dimension. Both en-

largement processes will contribute significantly to extending security, stability and prosperity enjoyed by their members to other, like-minded, democratic European states. Through the conclusion of Euro-agreements, the EU has given a number of European states a perspective of eventual EU membership and integration into EU structures.

The enlargement of the two organizations will proceed autonomously according to their respective internal dynamics and processes. This means they are unlikely to proceed at precisely the same pace. But the Alliance views its own enlargement and that of the EU as mutually supportive and parallel processes which together will make a significant contribution to strengthening Europe's security structure. Thus, each organization should ensure that their respective processes are in fact mutually supportive of the goal of enhancing European stability and security. While no rigid parallelism is foreseen, each organization will need to consider developments in the other.

European Union members are committed to a Common Foreign and Security Policy which shall include all questions related to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence compatible with that of the Atlantic Alliance. The WEU is an integral part of the development of the Union. In its dual role as defence component of the EU and European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance, the WEU brings an important additional dimension to European security. Acknowledging this dual role, and wishing to contribute to its further development, NATO Heads of State and Government, in January 1994, expressed their readiness to make collective assets of the Alliance available, on the basis of consultations in the North Atlantic Council, for WEU operations undertaken by the European Allies in pursuit of their Common Foreign and Security Policy.

All full members of the WEU are also members of NATO. Because of the cumulative effect of the security safeguards of Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty and of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the maintenance of this linkage is essential. Both enlargement processes should, therefore, be compatible and mutually supportive. At the same time, the WEU is being developed as the defence component of the European Union, which strengthens the relationship between the two organizations. An eventual broad congruence of European membership in NATO, EU and WEU would have positive effects on European security. The Alliance should at an appropriate time give particular consideration to countries with a perspective of EU membership, and which have shown an interest in joining NATO, in order to consider, on the basis indicated in this study, how they can contribute to transatlantic security within the Washington Treaty and to determine whether to invite them to join NATO.

All CFE States Parties acknowledge the Treaty's continued fundamental role in building and maintaining European stability and security. This is also shared by all other OSCE participating states. NATO Allies consider the CFE Treaty as the cornerstone of European security. Therefore, it is of fundamental importance to preserve the Treaty's integrity and to ensure its full and timely implementation. NATO as such is not a signatory of the CFE Treaty, nor of any other arms control agreement. Therefore, from a legal point of view, NATO's enlargement per se has no impact on the Treaty. In any case, possible implications of NATO's enlargement for the CFE Treaty can only be assessed when the actual enlargement is taking place. Since there is no decision as yet on the timing and the scope of NATO's enlargement, it would be premature to draw any conclusions at this stage.

The existing confidence-building, disarmament and arms control agreements are fundamental underpinnings for security and stability in the whole of Europe. NATO must contribute to their continuing validity and relevance in the course of its enlargement process. Enlargement could strengthen

the Alliance's ability to promote further arms control and disarmament measures and ways to control proliferation of WMD.

C. RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Russia has an important contribution to make to European stability and security. We have agreed that constructive, cooperative relations of mutual respect, benefit and friendship between the Alliance and Russia are a key element for security and stability in Europe. In June 1994, we agreed that such relations should be developed in a way that reflects common objectives and complements and reinforces relations with all other states, is transparent and is not directed against the interests of third countries. Cooperative NATO-Russia relations are in the interest not only of NATO and Russia, but of all other states in the OSCE area.

NATO and Russia have agreed to pursue a broad, enhanced dialogue and cooperation in areas where Russia has unique and important contributions to make, commensurate with its weight and responsibility as a major European, international and nuclear power.

In June 1994, NATO and Russia agreed to set in train the development of a far-reaching, cooperative NATO-Russia relationship aimed at enhancing mutual confidence and openness. At that time Russia signed the PfP Framework Document. By December, agreement had been reached on Russia's Individual Partnership Programme and areas for pursuance of a broad, enhanced NATO-Russia dialogue and cooperation beyond PfP, which were formally accepted by Russia on 31 May 1995.

The Alliance considers that it is desirable to develop the NATO-Russia relationship even further as part of our broad approach to developing a cooperative security architecture in Europe. NATO and Russia have initiated a dialogue, to be pursued in our newly established relationship beyond the PfP, on the future direction our relationship should take, with the aim of achieving by the end of this year a political framework for NATO-Russia relations elaborating basic principles for security cooperation as well as for the development of mutual political consultations. A stronger NATO-Russia relationship should form another cornerstone of a new, inclusive and comprehensive security structure in Europe. NATO-Russia cooperation can help to overcome any lingering distrust from the Cold War period, and help ensure that Europe is never again divided into opposing camps. This further development of the NATO-Russia relationship, and its possible eventual formalization, should take place in rough parallel with NATO's own enlargement, with the goal of further strengthening stability and security in Europe. The substance and form of this enhanced relationship will be developed through a NATO-Russia dialogue.

NATO-Russia relations should reflect Russia's significance in European security and be based on reciprocity, mutual respect and confidence, no "surprise" decisions by either side which could affect the interests of the other. This relationship can only flourish if it is rooted in strict compliance with international commitments and obligations, such as those under the U.N. Charter, the OSCE, including the Code of Conduct and the CFE Treaty, and full respect for the sovereignty of other independent states. NATO decisions, however, cannot be subject to any veto or *droit de regard* by a non-member state, nor can the Alliance be subordinated to another European security institution.

Russia has raised concerns with respect to the enlargement process of the Alliance. The Alliance is addressing these concerns in developing its wider relationship with Russia and the Alliance has made it clear that the enlargement process including the associated military arrangements will threaten no-one and contribute to a developing broad European security architecture based on true cooperation

throughout the whole of Europe, enhancing security and stability for all. D. Effects of the decision-making process on European security and stability The decision-making process on enlargement will be in accordance with the Washington Treaty. Each invitation will be decided on its own merits, case by case, and in accordance with the principles identified in this study, taking into account political and security related developments in the whole of Europe. It will be important, particularly in the meantime, not to foreclose the possibility of eventual Alliance membership for any European state in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty.

Countries could be invited to join sequentially or several countries could be simultaneously invited to join, bearing in mind that all Allies will decide by consensus on each invitation, i.e. new Allies must join consensus for subsequent invitations. There could be two or more sets of simultaneous invitations. Sequential accession could reduce the implication that others might be excluded and make it easier to begin with one or more countries but could also risk extending the calendar of accessions and thereby diverting attention from other important Alliance business. Simultaneous accessions would avoid the possibility of veto by new members on others joining at the same time; any decision on simultaneous accession should take into account relations among the prospective new members concerned and the impact on other states, including their relationship with NATO. Legislative/ratification considerations in Allied countries related to the accession of new member(s) to the Washington Treaty should also be taken into account.

Concerns have already been expressed in the context of the discussion of the enlargement of NATO that a new member might “close the door” behind it to new admissions in the future of other countries which may also aspire to NATO membership. Such a situation must be avoided; the Alliance rests upon commonality of views and a commitment to work for consensus; part of the evaluation of the qualifications of a possible new member will be its demonstrated commitment to that process and those values. We will invite prospective new members to confirm that they understand and accept this and act in good faith accordingly. The Alliance may require, if appropriate, specific political commitments in the course of accession negotiations.

CHAPTER 3: HOW NACC AND PFP CAN CONTRIBUTE CONCRETELY TO THE ENLARGEMENT PROCESS

A. INTRODUCTION

The Pfp and NACC can help to ensure that, in accepting new members, the Alliance will contribute to enhanced security and stability in an undivided Europe, fundamental goals of the Alliance, as discussed in Chapter II. As the enlargement process proceeds, NACC/Pfp will continue to provide the fundamental framework for developing relations with partner countries. Dynamic NACC/Pfp cooperation is an integral part of the European security architecture, deepening interaction and extending security and stability throughout Europe, and as a means to strengthen relations with partner countries, whether possible new members or not. In the context of enlargement, this will require particular attention and effort by the Alliance.

Pfp will play an important role both to help prepare possible new members, through their participation in Pfp activities, for the benefits and responsibilities of eventual membership and as a means to strengthen relations with partner countries which may be unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all.

There will be a need to ensure that appropriate human and financial resources are directed to support those activities in accordance with PfP funding policy.

NACC will continue, as it has since its inception in 1991, to play a significant role in building confidence and drawing NATO Allies and cooperation partners closer together. In the context of enlargement, the importance of NACC will be enhanced, in particular, as a common forum encompassing NATO Allies and NACC/PfP partners for dialogue and consultation on political and security-related issues and for cooperation among its members to strengthen security.

B. THE CONTINUING ROLE OF THE NACC AND THE PFP IN STRENGTHENING EUROPEAN SECURITY

The Partnership for Peace is a key element in NATO's political and military cooperation programmes with non-member OSCE countries which deepens interaction, cooperation and stability in Europe and contributes to the overall goal of transparency. PfP is only at the beginning of its development; its full potential has not yet been achieved; and its continuing importance will not be affected by enlargement.

Within the broader PfP framework, a critical aspect is that partners reaffirmed their commitment to the principles of the U.N. and the OSCE and their readiness to develop cooperative military relations with NATO to strengthen their ability to undertake peacekeeping and other missions under the authority of the U.N. and/or the responsibility of the OSCE. The Alliance should ensure that PfP gets all due attention and credit in this regard.

For countries that do not become members, NACC/PfP must constitute: a continuing vehicle for active cooperation with NATO; concrete evidence of NATO's continuing support and concern for their security; and their primary link to the Alliance, as a key Euro-Atlantic security institution, including for consultation with NATO in the event an active partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security. The Alliance will maintain the importance, vitality and credibility of NACC/PfP as enlargement evolves to retain their value for countries which may be unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all. Maintaining the vitality of NACC/PfP may require new approaches and mechanisms to be devised in parallel to the Alliance's enlargement process. In this context, Ministers have instructed the Council to explore the scope for integrating the existing cooperative structures and procedures for NACC and the Partnership for Peace.

PfP cooperation should be further developed in order to:

- help partners to further develop democratic control of their armed forces and transparency in defence planning and budgeting processes, although this will largely depend on these countries' own efforts;
- enhance the network of military and defence-related cooperation to provide effective support to partners in adapting their defence arrangements to the new security environment;
- develop the cooperative features of PfP, e.g., through enhancing partners' involvement in developing, planning and implementing PfP activities, in particular by increasing their capability/readiness to contribute with others to peacekeeping, humanitarian, search and rescue and other activities to be agreed;

- strengthen the confidence-building and transparent character of defence-related and military cooperation, both with Allies and among partners;
- complement the development of interoperable forces by adequate mechanisms to duly involve partners in planning and carrying out joint peacekeeping operations.

C. THE ROLE OF PFP IN PREPARING FOR MEMBERSHIP

PfP activities and programmes are open to all partners, who themselves decide which opportunities to pursue and how intensively to work with the Alliance through the Partnership. This varying degree of participation is a key element of the self-differentiation process. Active participation in PfP will play an important role in possible new members' preparation to join the Alliance, although it will not guarantee Alliance membership. Active participation in NACC/PfP will provide the framework for possible new members to establish patterns of political and military cooperation with the Alliance to facilitate a transition to membership. Through PfP planning, joint exercises and other PfP activities, including seminars, workshops and day-to-day representation in Brussels and at Mons, possible new members will increasingly become acquainted with the functioning of the Alliance, including with respect to policy-making, peacekeeping and crisis management. Possible new members' commitment to the shared principles and values of the Alliance will be indicated by their international behavior and adherence to relevant OSCE commitments; however, their participation in PfP will provide a further important means to demonstrate such commitment as well as their ability to contribute to common defence.

For possible new members, PfP will contribute to their preparation both politically and militarily, to familiarize them with Alliance structures and procedures and to deepen their understanding of the obligations and rights that membership will entail.

PfP will help partners undertake necessary defence management reforms as they establish the processes and mechanisms necessary to run a democratically controlled military organization, in areas such as transparent national defence planning, resource allocation and budgeting, appropriate legislation and parliamentary and public accountability. PfP will assist possible new members to develop well-established democratic accountability and practices and to demonstrate their commitment to internationally-accepted norms of behavior. Within the scope of the Framework Document, PfP also provides a means to promote and develop interoperability with Alliance forces by familiarizing possible new members with important elements for interoperability.

The PfP Planning and Review Process and PfP exercises will introduce partners to collective defence planning and pave the way for more detailed operational planning. A biennial PfP Planning and Review Process has been offered to all Partners on an optional basis and provides a means of self-differentiation. Participation in the process will be the most effective way to develop, in the longer term, Partner forces that are better able to operate with those of the NATO Allies. Cooperation between Partners and the Alliance in the process will be broadened and deepened over time as appropriate. Results of this process should be incorporated in Partner defence plans and reflected in PfP IPPs and the Partnership Work Programme as appropriate. While new members will not be required to achieve full interoperability with NATO before joining the Alliance, they will need to meet certain minimum standards essential to a functioning and credible Alliance. These standards will continue to be developed by NATO and will be based in part on conclusions reached through the Planning and Review Process. Partners' own efforts will largely determine how quickly they progress in preparing for possible NATO membership, although outside assistance may facilitate progress.

The preparation of possible new members interested in joining NATO can be facilitated by an appropriate reinforcement and deepening of their Individual Partnership Programmes. Such a reinforcement and deepening is a key to self-differentiation. Among other things, it would allow partners to distinguish themselves by demonstrating their capabilities and their commitment with a view to possible NATO membership and to contribute to Alliance missions. Concerning the process of preparing for membership, the premature development of measures outside PfP for possible new members should be avoided. A clear distinction should be maintained between participation in PfP and an eventual invitation to join the Alliance. There will come a point, after a country has been invited to join the Alliance, when specific measures for preparing the accession of that country will have to be devised.

CHAPTER 4: HOW TO ENSURE THAT ENLARGEMENT STRENGTHENS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ALLIANCE, PRESERVES ITS ABILITY TO PERFORM ITS CORE FUNCTIONS OF COMMON DEFENCE AS WELL AS TO UNDERTAKE PEACEKEEPING AND OTHER NEW MISSIONS, AND UPHOLDS THE PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WASHINGTON TREATY

A. MAINTAINING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ALLIANCE TO PERFORM ITS CORE FUNCTIONS AND NEW MISSIONS

In enlarging its membership, the Alliance will want to ensure that it maintains its ability to take important decisions quickly on the basis of consensus and that enlargement results in an Alliance fully able to carry out both its core functions and its new missions. In addition to being fundamentally important in its own right, the Alliance's ability to act quickly, decisively and effectively is crucial to its role in the European security architecture and to its ability to integrate new members into it.

On joining the Alliance, new members must accept the full obligations of the Washington Treaty. This includes participation in the consultation process within the Alliance and the principle of decision-making by consensus, which requires a commitment to build consensus within the Alliance on all issues of concern to it. New members must also be prepared to contribute to collective defence under Article 5, to the Alliance's new evolving missions and to Alliance budgets. This may include appropriate contributions to the Alliance's military force and command structures and infrastructure. New members must accept and conform with the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that new members join. In this respect, new members deciding to participate in the integrated military structure must accept the applicable policies and procedures.

NATO must ensure that all Alliance military obligations, particularly those under Article 5, will be met in an enlarged Alliance. This will require a case-by-case assessment of the military factors, including preparation time for NATO to take on new Article 5 commitments, for each prospective new member, taking into account the strategic environment, possible risks faced by potential new members, the capabilities and interoperability of their forces, their approach and that of the allies to the stationing of foreign forces on their territory, and the relevant reinforcement capabilities of Alliance forces, including strategic mobility. The Alliance will also have to ensure the accessibility of its forces to new members' territory for reinforcement, exercises, crisis management and, if applicable, stationing. This issue will need to be considered in the context of deciding individual new members' accession.

The Alliance will have to take a number of elements into account to ensure that NATO maintains its military credibility when it enlarges. Many of these elements may require further analysis and development by the Alliance in the course of the enlargement process. The Alliance bears the responsibility for determining the measures taken to maintain military credibility within each of these elements. These elements, which are developed further in later sections of this chapter and in chapter 5, fall into the following categories: Collective Defence A key principle of the enlargement process is that new members will be expected not only to benefit from, but also to contribute to, the Alliance's collective defence. They should also be prepared to contribute to other Alliance missions;

COMMAND STRUCTURE

All new members should participate in an appropriate way in the command structure of the Alliance. New members joining the integrated structure will need to be integrated into existing NATO headquarters. The Alliance will have to consider whether a limited number of new headquarters may be needed and any need for existing headquarters to cover new Areas of Responsibility. NATO operations will be controlled by existing or new NATO headquarters or, as appropriate, future CJTF headquarters;

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

Training and Exercises New members will need to participate in NATO exercises, including those designed to ensure the common defence. Exercises should be held regularly on new members' territory;

NUCLEAR FORCES

The supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance. New members will share the benefits and responsibilities from this in the same way as all other Allies in accordance with the Strategic Concept. New members will be expected to support the concept of deterrence and the essential role nuclear weapons play in the Alliance's strategy of war prevention as set forth in the Strategic Concept;

FORCE STRUCTURE

It is important for NATO's force structure that other Allies' forces can be deployed, when and if appropriate, on the territory of new members. The Alliance has no a priori requirement for the stationing of Alliance troops on the territory of new members. New members should participate in the Alliance's force structure. How this will be achieved may require additional considerations to include: whether new members should develop specially-trained units capable of reinforcing NATO forces and of being reinforced by NATO units; the prepositioning of materiel in critical areas; how to ensure that infrastructure is adequate to meet planned missions; and whether there is a need to increase strategic and intra-theatre mobility;

INTELLIGENCE

New members will have the opportunity to participate to the fullest extent possible in the NATO intelligence processes;

FINANCE

New members will be expected to contribute their share to NATO's commonly funded programmes. They should also be aware that they face substantial financial obligations when joining the Alliance;

INTEROPERABILITY

All new members will be expected to make every effort to meet NATO interoperability standards, in particular for command, control and communication equipment. New members will have to incorporate NATO standard operational procedures in selected areas, including for their national headquarters. A smooth and effective decision-making process in an enlarged Alliance will be key to preserving its effectiveness. Maintenance of the consensus principle will be essential in the political, military and defence areas. All Allies must therefore be willing to work constructively towards this. To this end, it will be important that prospective new members become familiar with the Alliance decision-making process, and the modalities and traditions of consensus and compromise, before joining. The highest priority should be given to a new member's involvement in the appropriate elements of the decision-making processes and military commands. B. The Military and Defence Implications of Enlargement

(I) COLLECTIVE DEFENCE

As stated in paragraph 38 of the Strategic Concept, "the collective nature of Alliance defence is embodied in practical arrangements that enable the Allies to enjoy the crucial political, military and resource advantages of collective defence, and prevent the renationalisation of defence policies, without depriving the Allies of their sovereignty. These arrangements are based on an integrated military structure as well as on cooperation and coordination agreements. Key features include collective force planning; common operational planning; multinational formations; the stationing of forces outside home territory, where appropriate on a mutual basis; crisis management and reinforcement arrangements; procedures for consultation; common standards and procedures of equipment, training and logistics; joint and combined exercises; and infrastructure, armaments and logistics cooperation".

There are currently three forms under which Allies contribute to NATO collective defence: full participation in the integrated military structure and the collective defence planning process; non-membership of the integrated military structure but full participation in the collective defence planning process together with a series of coordination agreements providing for cooperation with the integrated military structure in certain defined areas; and non-participation in the integrated military structure and collective defence planning but cooperation with the integrated military structure in more limited defined areas under agreements between the Chief of Defence and the Major NATO Commanders (MNCs). As a general principle, we should avoid new forms of contribution to NATO collective defence which would complicate unnecessarily practical cooperation among Allies and the Alliance's decision-making process.

Against the background of existing arrangements for contributing to collective defence, Allies will want to know how possible new members intend to contribute to NATO's collective defence and will explore all aspects of this question in detail through bilateral dialogue prior to accession negotiations. In this context, the ability to contribute and the manner in which a possible new member intends to contribute to collective defence will be important criteria for Allies in deciding whether such a potential new member is capable and willing to contribute to security and stability in the trans-Atlantic area within the meaning of Article 10 of the Washington Treaty.

The Alliance will adopt a flexible approach to assimilating new members into its defence and military structures and its planning processes. The approach taken will ensure that an enlarged NATO maintains a credible military posture.

(II) COMMAND STRUCTURE

NATO's command structure must be prepared for the probability that new members will want to join the integrated military structure. If enlargement takes place consecutively, considerable military flexibility will be required with regard to the establishment of new areas of responsibility and the related command structure. A broad plan will therefore be needed to ensure the maximum effectiveness and flexibility of the command structure following the accession of new members, bearing in mind the potential effect of the CJTF concept and of any structural adjustments.

NATO headquarters may be required on the territory of new members to cover the revised tasks and AORs resulting from their accession. Although it may be possible to upgrade new members' existing headquarters if necessary to meet an as yet undefined NATO requirement, existing command, control and communications equipment and infrastructure is unlikely to meet minimum NATO standards. The establishment of headquarters on the territory of new members may also have implications for NATO's existing command structure. The building of new headquarters and/or the upgrading of existing headquarters to NATO standards would involve significant costs although progress on the development of the CJTF concept may have a bearing on Alliance headquarters requirements. A country-specific review of the requirements and costs should be undertaken prior to a new member joining the integrated military structure.

Multinationality remains a key feature of Alliance policy. Any new NATO headquarters on the territory of a new member would therefore require multinational representation; this should reflect operational needs. New members will also have to be represented as appropriate at major headquarters (MSC and above), support elements, commonly-funded NATO Agencies, and on the International Military Staff. Enlargement would therefore probably require a review of the size of staffs at most NATO headquarters and national representation. This process would inevitably be complicated if new members join consecutively.

(III) CONVENTIONAL FORCES—TRAINING AND EXERCISES

The presence of Allied Forces on the territory of other members contributes to strengthening the Alliance's ability to perform its fundamental security tasks, fostering Alliance cohesion and expressing solidarity and confidence. This presence could take various forms. The stationing of Allied forces offers specific military advantages in relation to collective defence. It allows a threat or an attack to be countered earlier, and provides more time to prepare and deploy reinforcements, enabling the most effective use to be made of mobility. Moreover, military forces operate more effectively when they are familiar with the terrain and conditions. However, the redeployment of existing Allied forces from their current locations or the repositioning of equipment would be expensive. There also is a risk that it could give a misleading impression of Alliance concerns. The regular and frequent presence of Allied forces on exercise or when other situations demand is another way to demonstrate NATO's commitment to collective defence. This option may not be adequate in all cases. It would in any event require effective rapid reaction and reinforcement capabilities and planning, and adequate warning time to allow for political decision making and the deployment of forces in time of crisis. Other options might include dual basing of air assets, or the repositioning of equipment and ammunition (e.g., increased prepositioned materiel in key areas and increased storage sites for such materiel in key geographical areas).

Individual Allies' policy on the stationing of other Allies' forces on their territory in peacetime varies considerably, taking into account a range of national and broader factors. For new members, the peacetime stationing of other Allies' forces on their territory should neither be a condition of membership nor foreclosed as an option. Decisions on the stationing of Allies' conventional forces on the territory of new members will have to be taken by the Alliance in the light of the benefits both to the Alliance as a whole and to particular new members, the military advantages of such a presence, the Alliance's military capacity for rapid and effective reinforcement, the views of the new members concerned, the cost of possible military options, and the wider political and strategic impact. All Allies must of course be prepared in times of crisis or war to allow other Allies' forces to enter and operate on their territory, and to provide essential host nation support as mutually agreed, to enable NATO to provide effective common defence.

Individual Allies' policy on stationing their forces outside their borders in peacetime also varies considerably. Some Allies are, for example, legally constrained from doing so. For new members the peacetime stationing of forces on other Allies' territory should neither be a condition of membership nor foreclosed as an option. All Allies are, however, prepared in principle to deploy their forces outside their territory in the Treaty area as part of their contribution to NATO collective defence, taking into account factors such as operational capabilities and geographic limitations. New members should be expected to be similarly prepared.

Multinational training and exercises on the territory of new members will contribute significantly to maintaining Alliance military capability and effectiveness and enhance the ability of the Alliance to fulfil its full range of missions.

Such exercising and training would help familiarize the forces involved with the terrain and operating conditions, and would contribute directly to supporting Article 5 commitments. Reinforcement should also be exercised from time to time. The terms on which such activities currently take place vary between Allies and have to take account of national factors. However, as a general principle, new members should be ready to host multinational training and exercises relating to all Alliance missions.

(IV) NUCLEAR FORCES

The coverage provided by Article 5, including its nuclear component, will apply to new members. There is no a priori requirement for the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. In light of both the current international environment and the potential threats facing the Alliance, NATO's current nuclear posture will, for the foreseeable future, continue to meet the requirements of an enlarged Alliance. There is, therefore, no need now to change or modify any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or policy, but the longer term implications of enlargement for both will continue to be evaluated. NATO should retain its existing nuclear capabilities along with its right to modify its nuclear posture as circumstances warrant. New members will, as do current members, contribute to the development and implementation of NATO's strategy, including its nuclear components; new members should be eligible to join the Nuclear Planning Group and its subordinate bodies and to participate in nuclear consultation during exercises and crisis. Decisions on the modalities and specifics of this contribution will be based on consultations, and agreements among Allies.

(V) FORCE STRUCTURES

The Alliance's military strength and cohesion depends on its multinational forces and structures, and the fair sharing of risks, responsibilities, costs and benefits. Current force structures are based primarily on the requirements of collective defence, but Alliance involvement in non-Article 5 opera-

tions will continue to influence future capabilities. All Alliance nations have a high degree of ability to operate together, although there is room for further improvement.

Subject to any changes in the security environment, the main characteristics of current NATO force structures will remain valid in an enlarged Alliance. However, the Alliance will need to pay special attention to the requirements of inter-regional reinforcement, and their potential impact on the various force categories. To ensure continued Alliance military effectiveness, current and prospective new members must be committed to developing, manning and supporting NATO's new force structures. New members' forces would be expected to take part in the full spectrum of Alliance missions to the extent appropriate to their capabilities, and taking into account the need for case by case consideration of non-Article 5 missions. The further development of Alliance military structures, including force levels and readiness, should facilitate such involvement across the spectrum of potential Alliance missions.

Multinational forces have an increased political and military importance. Thus the increasing need for mobility, flexibility and inter-service and multinational interoperability in undertaking both defence and new missions means that current Alliance policy on multinationality should apply when new members' forces join NATO force structure, consistent with the need to maintain military effectiveness.

There is a continuing need to address current limitations in reaction force capabilities, which have to be taken into account to ensure that there is no reduction in military effectiveness. The principle of multinationality should also apply in integrating new members' forces into main defence forces. No change of current policy towards augmentation forces would seem to be necessary as a result of enlargement. There will, however, be a substantial impact, the extent of which has yet to be determined, on contingency and reinforcement planning including force requirements and host nation support arrangements. Prepositioning of equipment, and both intra-theatre and inter-theatre lift, can contribute to flexibility and military effectiveness. Further examination of these elements will be required when enlargement occurs.

(VI) INTELLIGENCE SHARING

Sharing of intelligence among Allies contributes to the effectiveness of the Alliance. New members will bring to the Alliance both increased requirements and capabilities in the intelligence field. Intelligence sharing is based on mutual trust and cooperation. New members must be able to safeguard NATO information according to Alliance standards.

C. SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (SIP)

The NATO Security Investment Programme should be used to accelerate the assimilation process of new members. The scope of this will depend upon the terms under which new members will participate. Procedurally and organizationally, the incorporation of new members into the Programme will not present problems although the process may take time. The renewed prioritization and resource allocation mechanisms are well suited to deal with new requirements resulting from enlargement.

Financially, new members would be expected to contribute their share, as from the start, to all new programme activities, with a contribution level based, in a general way, on "ability to pay". Because of the time needed in an investment programme to bring activities to implementation, and because of the limited absorption capacity of new members, financial implications will be limited in the early years. Enlarged participation in the programme should therefore be possible without impact on

the implementation of existing commitments and programmes. It is important, however, to get prospective new members involved in the planning and preparatory processes as soon as possible and to ensure that they are fully aware of their prospective liabilities. D. Administration and Budgets Without knowing the number of prospective new members it is only possible to address management issues in a general manner. Enlargement will lead to new activities and a need for increased resources. Additional office space will be needed at NATO HQ to accommodate new members and possible increases to the staffs of the IS and IMS. Operating and capital costs in the Civil Budget will grow. New members will be expected to contribute. Cost shares must be calculated and decisions taken concerning their obligations. Enlargement will also mean increases in the Military Budget, but the actual budgetary consequences will depend in large part on the new members' level of participation.

It will be important to ensure that potential new members are fully aware that they face considerable financial obligations when joining the Alliance.

CHAPTER 5: WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP FOR NEW MEMBERS, INCLUDING THEIR RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS, AND WHAT DO THEY NEED TO DO TO PREPARE FOR MEMBERSHIP ?

New members will be full members of the Alliance, enjoying all the rights and assuming all the obligations under the Washington Treaty. There must be no "second tier" security guarantees or members within the Alliance and no modifications of the Washington Treaty for those who join. Possible new members should prepare themselves on this basis. Although this Chapter describes the principal rights and obligations of new member states, some more specific rights and obligations are covered elsewhere, in Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

A. WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED POLITICALLY OF NEW MEMBERS

Commitments entered into by new member states should be the same as for present Allies, including acceptance of the principles, policies and procedures already adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that new members join. Willingness and ability to meet such commitments, not only on paper but in practice, would be a critical factor in any decision to invite a country to join.

Bearing in mind that there is no fixed or rigid list of criteria for inviting new members to join the Alliance, possible new member states will, nevertheless, be expected to: Conform to basic principles embodied in the Washington Treaty: democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law; Accept NATO as a community of like-minded nations joined together for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security, with each nation contributing to the security and defence from which all member nations benefit; Be firmly committed to principles, objectives and undertakings included in the Partnership for Peace Framework Document; Commit themselves to good faith efforts to build consensus within the Alliance on all issues, since consensus is the basis of Alliance cohesion and decision-making; Undertake to participate fully in the Alliance consultation and decision-making process on political and security issues of concern to the Alliance; Establish a permanent representation at NATO HQ; Establish an appropriate national military representation at SHAPE/SACLANT; Be prepared to nominate qualified candidates to serve on the International Staff and in NATO agencies; Provide qualified personnel to serve on the International Military Staff and in the Integrated Military Structure if and as appropriate; Contribute to Alliance budgets, based on budget shares to be agreed; Participate, as appropriate, in the exchange of Allied intelligence, which is based entirely on national contributions; Apply

NATO security rules and procedures; Accept the Documents which provide the basis for the existing policies of the Alliance. (1) The Alliance expects new members not to “close the door” to the accession of one or more later candidate members, as referred to also in paragraph 30 of Chapter 2.

B. WHAT PROSPECTIVE NEW MEMBERS WILL NEED TO DO POLITICALLY TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR MEMBERSHIP

Prospective members will have to have: Demonstrated a commitment to and respect for OSCE norms and principles, including the resolution of ethnic disputes, external territorial disputes including irredentist claims or internal jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, as referred to also in paragraph 6 of Chapter 1; Shown a commitment to promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility; Established appropriate democratic and civilian control of their defence force; Undertaken a commitment to ensure that adequate resources are devoted to achieving the obligations described in section A and C.

C. WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED MILITARILY OF NEW MEMBERS

New members of the Alliance must be prepared to share the roles, risks, responsibilities, benefits, and burdens of common security and collective defence. They should be expected to subscribe to Alliance strategy as set out in the Strategic Concept and refined in subsequent Ministerial statements.

An important element in new members’ military contribution will be a commitment in good faith to pursue the objectives of standardization which are essential to Alliance strategy and operational effectiveness. New members should concentrate, in the first instance, on interoperability. As a minimum, they should accept NATO doctrine and policies relating to standardization and in addition aim at achieving a sufficient level of training and equipment to operate effectively with NATO forces. PfP cooperation, including the Planning and Review Process, can help to improve the interoperability of Partners’ forces with those of NATO Allies and aspiring new members should be expected to participate actively in PfP activities; but these are limited in scope to forces made available by Partners for cooperation in peacekeeping, humanitarian and SAR missions, and related training and exercises.

D. WHAT PROSPECTIVE NEW MEMBERS WILL NEED TO DO MILITARILY TO PREPARE THEMSELVES FOR MEMBERSHIP

The ability of prospective members to contribute militarily to collective defence and to the Alliance’s new missions will be a factor in deciding whether to invite them to join the Alliance.

New members will need to adapt themselves to the fact that NATO’s strategy and force structure are designed to exploit multinationality and flexibility to provide effective defence at minimum cost. NATO policy is therefore heavily dependent on standardization, particularly in the areas of operations, administration and material. Current NATO standardization priorities include commonality of doctrines and procedures, interoperability of command, control and communications and major weapon systems, and interchangeability of ammunition and primary combat supplies.

There are at present over 1200 agreements and publications that new members should undertake to comply with. Compliance should be an evolutionary and controlled process to enhance Alliance operational effectiveness. Although national participation in standardization is optional, there are a number of areas, such as communication and information systems and measures to facilitate reinforcements where military necessity requires participation. One way of achieving improved interoperability

might be for new members to select units that can act as cornerstone units around which the rest of their forces can be developed with priority being given to maximizing these units' interoperability with existing NATO units. To determine the minimum requirements necessary for operational effectiveness, a review of the STANAGs and Allied Publications is already under way. A country-by-country assessment of prospective new members' standardization will also be required, based on levels of standardization displayed during the full range of PfP military and defence activities. A proposal should be developed by the Alliance in consultation with the prospective new member so that it will understand what will be expected of it. In addition, NATO schools and training will need to be developed so that the forces of new members can achieve interoperability with NATO in a reasonable time, and new members can adapt to NATO doctrine across a broad spectrum of activities.

Although the funding of new members' enhanced interoperability is their responsibility, it poses important challenges for the Alliance as a whole. There is a military imperative to achieve the minimum level of interoperability required for military effectiveness as quickly as possible. There is also a political imperative to demonstrate intra-Alliance cohesion, to ensure that new members feel that they are participating fully in the Alliance and to enable them to make an equitable contribution to collective defence at an early stage. In principle, both objectives should be achieved within the existing arrangements for funding Allies' development, procurement, infrastructure and other costs (i.e. using national resources and the Security Investment Programme as appropriate).

FOOTNOTE:

¹ These include, in particular: The Agreement on the Status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, National Representatives and International Staff (Ottawa Convention, 1951); The NATO Agreement on the Mutual Safeguarding of Secrecy of Inventions relating to Defence, and for which applications for Patents have been made (Paris, 1960); The Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status on their Forces (London, 1951); The NATO Agreement on the Communication of Technical Information for defence Purposes Brussels, 1970); as well as The Strategic Concept; Summit Declarations and NAC decisions in Ministerial and permanent session as reflect in NAC Communiques, including those issued in Oslo in June 1992 and Brussels in December 1992 in which the Alliance undertook to support, on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, including by making available Alliance resources and expertise; Documents on cooperation between NATO and any partner state already agreed with new member(s) join the Alliance, recognizing that Alliance polices evolve over time and in the light of new circumstances.

CHAPTER 6: MODALITIES ACCORDING TO WHICH THE ENLARGEMENT PROCESS SHOULD PROCEED

The modalities for enlargement flow from Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. Previous accessions in accordance with Article 10 need not be considered precise models for future accessions, since the general political and security context of future accessions will be different as well as the number, individual circumstances and characteristics of new acceding members. In this context, a process which is predictable and transparent with respect to new accessions may be required to provide reassurance to public and legislative opinion in existing member states. The modalities for future accession should avoid any suggestion of different classes of membership.

While each invitation to join the Alliance will be decided on its own merits, case by case, the timing of future accessions could be sequential or in one or more simultaneous sets. In any case, it will be important to make clear that the Alliance remains open to further accessions by countries not among the earliest to be invited to join. A declaration at the time of the first invitation(s) being issued which clearly stated this would both reassure those countries that would not be among the first to be invited and reduce the likelihood of some of those countries submitting unsolicited applications to join the Alliance.

The precise timing, sequence and content of the accession process need to be considered carefully, particularly with respect to talks and negotiations with countries to be invited to join. Detailed briefings to provide necessary information to such countries will be needed at an early stage of the accession process, prior to formal negotiations. The NAC will decide on beginning any necessary exploratory contacts, after which the following steps would be required for any future accession to the Washington Treaty:

- a decision by the NAC (at an appropriate level) to authorize the Secretary General to inform a country/countries that the Allies are favorably disposed to its/their accession, and to enter into talks with it/them;
- a formal notification from the country/countries to the Secretary General of its/their firm commitment, in accordance with domestic legal requirements, to join the Alliance;
- detailed consultations with the country/countries concerned about the protocol of accession;
- formulation by the Allies of the protocol of accession;
- approval and signature of the accession protocol by the NAC;
- ratification, acceptance or approval of the accession protocol by the Allies and entry into force;
- formal invitation to the country/countries to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty;
- deposition by the country/countries of its/their instrument(s) of accession with the U.S. Government.

It may not be feasible for countries invited to join to provide assurances that all domestic requirements for it/them to do so have been met together with formal notification of its/their desire to join.

Precision may therefore be required on this point. It will be important, however, to avoid legislative ratification procedures for new accessions going forward in existing Allied countries without assurance that the country concerned wants to and will accede.

It will need to be decided to what extent preparations for membership by countries can be undertaken before formal accession or whether many of these can be left until after formal accession. When to deal with budgetary and administrative issues will need to be decided. Consultations regarding accession with any country concerned should not delay those with any other, i.e. the pace of movement towards accession by a number of invited countries should not be dictated by that of the slowest.

MINISTERIAL MEETING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL HELD AT NATO HQ BRUSSELS, 10 DEC 1996

FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

As we look ahead, the new NATO is taking shape, reflecting the fundamental changes in the security environment in Europe and the enduring vitality of the transatlantic partnership which underpins our endeavours. The broad vision of this new NATO and its role in the development of a new European security architecture was set out at the 1994 Brussels Summit and further defined at our last meeting in Berlin. The Alliance's adaptation and reform is well underway. We will take this process forward today.

The Alliance is resolved to preserve its political and military strength, ensuring its ability to carry out the full range of its missions—as IFOR and its planned successor SFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina clearly show. We have issued a separate statement in this regard. The Alliance will continue to strengthen European security by maintaining its capability for collective defence, admitting new members, expanding and strengthening cooperative relationships with all Partners, including building a strong security partnership with Russia and a distinctive relationship with Ukraine, and realizing the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance.

The evolution of the Alliance takes place in the context of our aim to help build a truly cooperative European security structure. We welcome as a contribution the important decisions taken at the recent OSCE Summit in Lisbon and the decision by the States Parties to the CFE Treaty to begin negotiations in early 1997 with a view towards adapting the Treaty to the changing security environment in Europe.

Against this background, we have decided to recommend to our Heads of State and Government to convene a Summit meeting in Madrid on 8/9 July 1997 to set the course for the Alliance as it moves towards the 21st century, consolidating Euro-Atlantic security. To achieve this aim, major decisions will have to be taken by the time of the Summit concerning NATO's internal adaptation, the opening of the Alliance and its ability to carry out all its new roles and missions. The agenda for our Summit will include:

- agreeing a new command structure, which enables all Allies to participate fully, and further advancing the implementation of the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) concept, in order to enhance the Alliance's ability to carry out the full range of its missions, while preserving the capability for collective defence, based on a strong transatlantic partnership;
- finalizing, to the satisfaction of all Allies, all the necessary arrangements for the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO, which will allow for the preparation and conduct of WEU-led operations with the participation of all European Allies if they were so to choose;
- inviting one or more of the countries which have expressed interest in joining the Alliance to begin accession negotiations;
- pledging that the Alliance will remain open to the accession of further members and will remain ready to pursue consultations with nations seeking NATO membership, as it has done in the past;

- strengthening cooperative relations with all our Partners including through an enhanced Partnership for Peace (PfP) and the initiative to establish an Atlantic Partnership Council;
- intensifying and consolidating relations with Russia beyond the Partnership for Peace by aiming at reaching an agreement at the earliest possible date on the development of a strong, stable and enduring security partnership;
- further developing an enhanced relationship with Ukraine;
- enhancing our Mediterranean dialogue;
- further developing our ability to carry out new roles and missions relating to conflict prevention and crisis management; and
- further enhancing our political and defence efforts against the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their delivery means.

We warmly welcome the decision of the Government of Spain, endorsed by the Spanish Parliament on 14 November 1996, to take the necessary steps to participate in the Alliance's new structure. Spain's participation will further strengthen the cohesion and military effectiveness of the Alliance, as it takes on new roles and missions, reinforce the transatlantic link and help develop ESDI within the Alliance.

Stability and security in the whole Euro-Atlantic area are our primary goal. We want to help build cooperative European security structures which extend to countries throughout the whole of Europe without excluding anyone or creating dividing lines. Recent decisions at the OSCE Summit meeting in Lisbon on European security cooperation and the decision to adapt the CFE Treaty to the new European security environment establish a cooperative foundation for our common security. The Alliance, for its part, has developed a broad pattern of intensive cooperation with North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and PfP Partner countries and with other international organizations and is thereby contributing to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. With the same aim, we are now working towards opening the Alliance to new members; developing ever-closer and deeper cooperative ties with all Partner countries who so wish; building a strong, stable and enduring security partnership with Russia; strengthening our relationship with Ukraine; and enhancing our Mediterranean dialogue.

We reaffirm that the nuclear forces of the Allies continue to play a unique and essential role in the Alliance's strategy of war prevention. New members, who will be full members of the Alliance in all respects, will be expected to support the concept of deterrence and the essential role nuclear weapons play in the Alliance's strategy. Enlarging the Alliance will not require a change in NATO's current nuclear posture and therefore, NATO countries have no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy—and we do not foresee any future need to do so.

A number of countries have longstanding aspirations to become full members of our Alliance and have undertaken intensive and wide-ranging preparations and reforms with this aim in mind. We are now in a position to recommend to our Heads of State and Government to invite at next year's Summit meeting one or more countries which have participated in the intensified dialogue process, to start accession negotiations with the Alliance. Our goal is to welcome the new member(s) by the time of NATO's 50th anniversary in 1999. We pledge that the Alliance will remain open to the accession of

further members in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. We will remain ready to pursue consultations with nations seeking NATO membership, as we have done in the past.

We are satisfied with the intensified, individual dialogue which the Alliance has been conducting throughout this year with interested Partners. This dialogue has improved their understanding of specific and practical details of how the Alliance works. It has provided the Alliance in turn with a better understanding of where these countries stand in their internal development as well as in the resolution of any external issues with neighbouring countries. We have tasked the Council in Permanent Session to prepare comprehensive recommendations for decisions to be taken by the Summit on which country or countries to invite to begin accession negotiations. The process should include:

- an intensified dialogue with interested Partner countries including in a “16+1” format, as appropriate;
- analysis, on the basis of further political guidance to be elaborated by the Council in Permanent Session, of the relevant factors associated with the admission of potential new members;
- preparation of recommendations on the adaptation of Alliance structures necessary to integrate new members into the Alliance;
- preparation of a plan for conducting the accession talks with one or more new members.

We look forward to tomorrow’s meeting of the NACC, which will mark its fifth anniversary. The NACC has provided us over the years with a valued opportunity to consult regularly with our Partners on political and security issues. Through NACC and Partnership for Peace, we have achieved the development of common approaches to European security and brought the NACC countries closer together in a spirit of cooperation and a common commitment to European security. We are committed to ensuring that the NACC goals of enhancing transparency and confidence in security matters among member states remain central to future cooperation. In order to derive maximum benefit from our NACC meetings, we want to move towards further deepening our political dialogue and giving it more focus.

We are pleased with the dynamic development of Partnership for Peace and the role it plays in building European security cooperation. The Partnership for Peace will continue as a permanent element of the Alliance’s cooperative effort to contribute to the development of a more stable European security area and, with those Partners seeking to join NATO, will also facilitate their preparations to meet the responsibilities of membership in the Alliance. Substantial progress has been achieved in enhancing the scope and substance of our Partnership cooperation, in particular the growing range of exercises, the broadening and deepening of the PfP Planning and Review Process, the intensification of work on civil-military relations, and civil emergency planning and disaster relief. In the current IFOR operation, in which 13 Partner countries are cooperating with Alliance armed forces, the Partnership for Peace has proved its value with regard both to political commitment to joint crisis management and to military interoperability.

We want to develop on the basis of transparency ever-closer and deeper cooperative ties open to all Partner countries by making the Partnership more operational; strengthening its political consultation element, taking full account of the respective activities of the OSCE and the relevant European institutions such as the WEU and the EU; and involving Partners more in operations planning and Partnership decision-making. To this end, the Alliance has set up a Senior Level Group to develop by the time of the Summit meeting a clearly strengthened and thus more attractive Partnership for Peace.

We have received an interim report on the ongoing work and agree that work should begin without delay to implement its recommendations. These include:

- enhancing the political dimension of the Partnership through increasing opportunities for political consultations;
- expanding the agreed fields of military missions within PfP to the full range of the Alliance's new missions, as appropriate, including Peace Support operations over and above previously agreed areas;
- broadening the NATO/PfP exercise programme in accordance with the expanded scope of the Partnership;
- enabling Partner countries to participate in the planning and execution of PfP activities (exercises and operations);
- involving Partners more substantively and actively in PfP-related parts of the regular peacetime work of NATO's Military Authorities;
- affording the appropriate opportunity to Partners who join future NATO-led PfP operations to contribute to the provision of political guidance for oversight over such operations, drawing on the experience gained in Operation Joint Endeavour;
- examining, together with Partners, the possible modalities for the elaboration of a political-military framework for PfP operations, building on the current work of the Political-Military Steering Committee;
- enhancing Partner participation in decision-making for PfP programmes issues;
- increasing regional cooperation within the Partnership provided it remains open to all Partners and remains an integral part of the overall PfP;
- expanding the Planning and Review Process; and
- as soon as the Brussels Agreement on the Status of Missions and Representatives of Third States to NATO comes into force, offering Partners the opportunity to establish diplomatic missions with NATO.

We have tasked the Council in Permanent Session to ensure implementation of these recommendations without delay and to continue the work on the enhancement of Partnership for Peace and also to review its common funding and resource implications, with a view to providing a further report by the SLG with recommendations for decisions at the time of the Spring Ministerial meeting.

With the rapid growth of our activities under both NACC and PfP, we have identified a need for greater coherence in our cooperation in a framework which will establish with Partners a more meaningful and productive cooperative and consultative process, building on the elements of NACC and PfP which we and our Partners deem most valuable. To this end, we have agreed to work with Partners on the initiative to establish an Atlantic Partnership Council (APC) as a single new cooperative mechanism, which would form a framework for enhanced efforts in both practical cooperation under PfP and an expanded political dimension of Partnership. We have accordingly tasked the Council in Permanent

Session to draw up the modalities for such a council, in close coordination with Partners, by the time of our next meeting.

We affirm our support for the political and economic reform process in the Russian Federation. We welcome the landmark Presidential elections in Russia. We applaud the progress toward a lasting, peaceful settlement of the conflict in Chechnya.

A broad process of integration and cooperation is underway in Europe; Russia is a part of it through its membership in the OSCE and the Council of Europe and its relationship with NATO as well as the European Union and the WEU. The pattern of consultations anchored by our regular "16+1" discussions, provide a firm foundation on which to build. We welcome Russia's participation in Partnership for Peace and encourage it to take full advantage of the opportunities which the Partnership offers.

We value the close and effective cooperation between Russia and NATO in IFOR. This cooperation demonstrates that NATO and Russia can collaborate effectively in the construction of cooperative security structures in Europe. We appreciate and welcome Russia's readiness to contribute to a follow-on operation to consolidate peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We look forward to continuing the experience of working closely together, which we believe will have a lasting, positive impact on our relationship.

Today, we reiterate our commitment to a strong, stable, and enduring security partnership between NATO and Russia. This partnership demonstrates that European security has entered a fundamentally new, more promising era. It constitutes an important element of the developing European cooperative security architecture to which Russia has an essential contribution to make. It will further enhance stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. By the time of the Summit, we aim to reach agreement with the Russian Federation on arrangements that can deepen and widen the scope of our current relationship and provide a framework for its future development. We want to ensure that NATO and Russia have a strong, flexible means to consult and cooperate as part of our evolving relationship. Agreement might be expressed in a document or could take the form of a Charter, which could encompass:

- the shared principles that will form the basis of our relationship;
- a broad set of areas of practical cooperation in particular in the political, military, economic, environmental, scientific, peacekeeping, armaments, nonproliferation, arms control and civil emergency planning fields;
- mechanisms for regular and ad hoc consultations; and
- mechanisms for military liaison and cooperation.

We therefore task the Council in Permanent Session to develop further guidance on these matters on the basis of which the Secretary General could explore with Russia the possibility of such agreement.

We continue to support Ukraine as it develops as a democratic nation and a market economy. The maintenance of Ukraine's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty is a crucial factor for stability and security in Europe.

Ukraine's development of a strong, enduring relationship with NATO is an important aspect of the emerging European security architecture. We greatly value the active participation of Ukraine in the Partnership for Peace and look forward to next year's exercise near Lviv. We also value Ukraine's cooperation with European institutions such as the EU and the WEU. Ukraine has made an important contribution to IFOR and UNTAES, and we welcome its commitment to contribute to a follow-on operation to consolidate peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We welcome the continued development of our broad cooperation beyond PfP. We note with satisfaction the recent meeting between the Alliance and Ukraine on issues related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We welcome the progress made towards establishing a NATO information office in Kyiv, and look forward to its opening in the near future. We welcome Ukraine's active interest in further enhancing its relations with the Alliance. We are committed to the development in coming months, through high level and other consultations, of a distinctive and effective NATO-Ukraine relationship, which could be formalized, possibly by the time of the Summit, building on the document on enhanced NATO-Ukraine relations agreed in September 1995, and taking into account recent Ukrainian proposals.

We support the Middle East peace process, and urge all participants to remain firmly committed to it.

We reaffirm our conviction that security in Europe is closely linked with security and stability in the Mediterranean, and that the Mediterranean dimension is consequently one of the various components of the European security architecture. In this regard, as part of the adaptation of the Alliance, we will work towards enhancing our relations with non-NATO Mediterranean countries through our dialogue.

The dialogue complements other international efforts, such as those undertaken by the Barcelona process, the OSCE and the WEU without creating any division of labor. We welcome the report of the Council in Permanent Session on the progress of and recommendations for future steps to develop the dialogue with Mediterranean countries through political dialogue and other activities agreed by the Alliance. Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia have reiterated their interest in the development of our relations. We have decided to enhance our Mediterranean dialogue in a progressive way and have tasked the Council in Permanent Session to report at our next meeting on the implementation of the activities foreseen in the report as well as on the scope for further development.

We are carrying forward the process of the Alliance's internal adaptation, with the fundamental objectives of ensuring the Alliance's military effectiveness, maintaining the transatlantic link, and developing the ESDI within NATO. In keeping with the decisions taken by NATO Heads of State and Government at the 1994 Summit Meeting and by the Ministerial meetings in June this year in Berlin and Brussels and with a view to preparing for the Summit next year, our primary focus has been on three closely linked issues: the development of a new command structure for the Alliance; the implementation of the CJTF concept; and the development of the ESDI within NATO.

We welcome the progress made in the development of the future command structure, noting that two structural alternatives have been selected by the Military Committee for future assessment and subsequent political consideration and agree the proposed way ahead. We urge the Council in Permanent Session and the Military Committee to complete the work as quickly as possible. Once approved, this new command structure will help ensure the Alliance's military effectiveness so that it is able, in the changing security environment facing Europe, to perform its traditional mission of collective de-

fence and through flexible and agreed procedures to undertake new roles in changing circumstances and to provide for increased participation by Partner countries. It will constitute a renovated, single multinational command structure, reflecting the strategic situation in Europe and enabling all Allies to participate fully.

We welcome the progress made towards realizing the CJTF concept, on the basis of the Overall Politico-Military Framework approved by us last June. We direct the Council in Permanent Session and the NATO Military Authorities to pursue vigorously their work on this concept, bearing in mind its importance for future Alliance operations, including the possible involvement of nations outside the Alliance, as well as for the development of ESDI.

We are pleased with the progress made in developing the appropriate arrangements for ESDI within NATO, as decided at the Brussels Summit and at our meeting last June in Berlin. The newly created Policy Coordination Group has contributed significantly to this process.

We note in particular the steps taken towards implementing the concept of separable but not separate capabilities:

- the decisions of the Council in Permanent Session on political guidance concerning the elaboration of European command arrangements within NATO able to prepare and conduct WEU-led operations;
- the decisions of the Council in Permanent Session regarding the arrangements for identifying NATO capabilities and assets which might be made available to the WEU for a WEU-led operation;
- the progress to date on arrangements for the release, monitoring and return or recall of Alliance assets and capabilities;
- the decision of the Council in Permanent Session with respect to modalities of cooperation with the WEU;
- the progress on work regarding planning and conducting exercising for WEU-led operations, following receipt of illustrative profiles for WEU missions.

We have directed the Council in Permanent Session to submit to the Spring 1997 Ministerial meetings a report on the adaptation of Alliance structures and procedures related to the future command structure, on the implementation of the CJTF concept, and on further progress with recommendations for decisions in the development of ESDI within the Alliance.

We welcome the close and intensifying cooperation between NATO and the WEU. At their meeting in Ostend on 19 November 1996, WEU Ministers agreed that it would be valuable for WEU to become actively involved in the Alliance's defence planning process and expressed their readiness to participate. Early agreement is now being sought in the WEU on the participation of all European Allies in WEU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities, as well as in planning and preparing for such operations. This would be a key contribution to the development of ESDI within the Alliance. We have tasked the Council in Permanent Session to develop the NATO-WEU relationship further in order to ensure effective cooperation in preparing for possible WEU-led operations.

We are pleased with the successful outcome of the OSCE Summit in Lisbon and, in particular, the adoption of a declaration on security as a result of work on a Common and Comprehensive Security

Model for the 21st Century. The Lisbon Summit has created a security framework in which all European states can participate on an equal footing. The Security Model adopted in Lisbon is a comprehensive expression of the endeavour to strengthen security and stability. It complements the mutually reinforcing efforts of NATO and other European and transatlantic institutions and organizations. We attach great importance to the role of the OSCE as a primary instrument in preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, post-conflict rehabilitation and regional security cooperation, as well as to the enhancement of its operational capabilities to carry out these tasks. We believe the OSCE, as the only pan-European security organization, has an essential role to play in European peace and stability. We are committed to supporting its comprehensive approach to security. The principles and commitments on which the OSCE is built provide the standards for the development of a comprehensive and cooperative European security structure.

We commend the OSCE for its essential contribution to the implementation of civil aspects of the Peace Agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly in supervising the preparation and conduct of the elections, in promoting and monitoring human rights and in overseeing the implementation of agreed confidence—and security—building measures and subregional arms control agreements. The OSCE thereby demonstrates its central role in contributing to regional stability and security.

We are pleased with the support given by IFOR to the OSCE in carrying out its tasks. The cooperation between OSCE and IFOR is a good example of our concept of mutually reinforcing organizations. The practical assistance given by NATO to the OSCE in helping to establish measures to verify the confidence-building and arms control agreements of the Dayton Accords testifies to a growing cooperation between NATO and the OSCE. We reiterate our readiness to further develop the cooperation between the two organizations.

The democratic and economic development, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states are essential factors for stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. We commend the OSCE for its mediation efforts in a number of regional conflicts through its various missions, and recognize the valuable work of the High Commissioner on National Minorities. We support the efforts of the Minsk Group to achieve a political settlement of the conflict in and around Nagorno-Karabakh.

The OSCE acquis in the field of disarmament, arms control, and confidence- and security-building measures continues to contribute significantly to political and military stability. We consider the full implementation, the further development, and if necessary, the adaptation of these measures to be indispensable elements in our effort to further enhance the European security architecture. We welcome the recent adoption by the Forum for Security Cooperation of the Framework for Arms Control and its Future Agenda.

The CFE Treaty is a fundamental cornerstone of security and stability for all in the Euro-Atlantic area. We are committed to maintain and strengthen it. Consistent with our broader goal of enhancing political cooperation and military stability in a Europe without dividing lines, we welcome the decision of the 30 States Parties to the CFE Treaty on 1 December 1996 in Lisbon to launch negotiations to adapt the Treaty to the changing security environment in Europe. We look forward to beginning negotiations in the Joint Consultative Group in Vienna in January 1997 on the basis of the scope and parameters (Terms of Reference) document agreed in Lisbon.

Our common goal is to enhance security for all States Parties, irrespective of whether they belong to an alliance, and preserve their right to choose and change their security arrangements. Within the broader political context of enhanced security for all, this process should strengthen the cooperative

pattern of relationships between States Parties, based on mutual confidence, transparency, stability and predictability. Committed, like the other States Parties, to adapting the Treaty by developing mechanisms which will enhance the Treaty's viability and effectiveness, we will pursue steps to review the Treaty's group structure, to adapt the Treaty system of limitations and to enhance its verification and information provisions. To that end, the members of the Alliance will develop and table proposals for the negotiations in Vienna.

We reaffirm our support for the CFE Flank Agreement, reached at this year's Review Conference in Vienna. We urge all States Parties who have not yet done so to approve this Agreement before the end of the extended provisional application period.

We will play our full part in the intensive continuing efforts directed at resolving outstanding implementation issues.

The members of the Alliance reaffirm the commitment made at Lisbon to exercise restraint during the period of negotiations as foreseen in the document in relation to the current postures and capabilities of their conventional armed forces—in particular, with respect to their levels of forces and deployments—in the Treaty's area of application. As decided in Lisbon, this commitment is without prejudice to the outcome of the negotiations, or to voluntary decisions by the individual States Parties to reduce their force levels or deployments, or to their legitimate security interests. We believe that the CFE Treaty must continue to play a key role in ensuring military stability into the 21st century, and are committed to adapting it expeditiously in order to take account of new security challenges.

We emphasize the importance of the START Treaties for international stability and security. We note with satisfaction the progress made by the United States and the Russian Federation in the implementation of START I. We urge the Russian Federation to follow the United States in ratifying the START II Treaty. We welcome the successful conclusion and signing by the great majority of U.N. members of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and we urge all other nations to sign this important international arms control agreement. We look forward to the early start of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.

We are pleased that the Chemical Weapons Convention will soon enter into force and we look forward to its early implementation. We welcome the fact that States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention have at the Fourth Review Conference in Geneva in December 1996 again solemnly declared their recognition that effective verification could reinforce the Convention.

Recognizing the heightened concern of the international community of the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, we support the vigorous pursuit of an effective, legally binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of antipersonnel mines and, as an important step to this end, support the early ratification of the revised Second Protocol of the Convention on Inhumane Weapons.

We urge the early ratification of the Treaty on Open Skies by those states which have not already ratified.

Proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their delivery means continues to be a matter of serious concern to us. Progress in expanding and intensifying NATO's political and defence efforts against proliferation, as directed by NATO Heads of State and Government in January 1994, is an integral part of NATO's adaptation to the new security environment. These efforts also contribute to NATO's ability to conduct new roles and missions. We remain committed to preventing

proliferation in the first place, or, if it occurs, to reversing it through diplomatic means. The Alliance is improving its capabilities to address the risks posed by proliferation. We welcome further consultations and cooperation with Partner countries to address the common security risks posed by proliferation. We note with satisfaction the report of the Alliance's Joint Committee on Proliferation on the activities of the Senior Political-Military Group on Proliferation and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation and direct them to continue their vital efforts.

We attach particular importance to a solid preparation of the first preparatory committee of the strengthened review process of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), scheduled for April 1997. This process will significantly contribute to the further strengthening of the NPT, which is the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation system.

We reaffirm our commitment to the Alliance's common-funded programmes.

We note with appreciation the progress made in moving existing resources to the highest priority programmes, such as Partnership for Peace and the support of enhanced information activities in Moscow and Kyiv. We have directed the Council in Permanent Session to keep under review the allocation of resources in order to ensure their optimal use. We have also directed the Council in Permanent Session to identify the implications of adaptation for NATO's common-funded budgets and to make appropriate recommendations for dealing with these.

We continue to support all efforts to combat terrorism, which constitutes a serious threat to peace, security and stability.

The Spring 1997 meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ministerial Session will be held in Sintra, Portugal, on 29 May.

**MINISTERIAL MEETING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL
HELD IN SINTRA, PORTUGAL 29 MAY 1997**

FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

We have met in Sintra today to carry forward the Alliance's ongoing process of internal and external adaptation, and to prepare the major decisions our Heads of State and Government will take at their Summit meeting on 8th-9th July in Madrid. This Summit will shape the new NATO as a foundation for the development of a truly cooperative European security structure as we move towards the 21st century. Allied solidarity and cohesion as reflected in the core functions, including our common commitment to collective defence, and a strong transatlantic partnership will remain the backbone of the Alliance's success in this endeavour.

We are determined to raise to a qualitatively new level our political and military cooperation with our Partners, building upon the success of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and the Partnership for Peace (PfP). We have therefore decided to propose to our Partners to launch together at tomorrow's NACC meeting the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the framework of which we have developed with Partners over the last months. During the past 5 years, the NACC has served as a key forum for bringing Europe together. The EAPC, in replacing the NACC, will unite the positive experience of NACC and PfP by providing the overarching framework for political and security-related consultations and for enhanced cooperation under PfP, whose basic elements will remain valid. We are looking forward to tomorrow's first meeting with our Partners in the EAPC.

We are pleased with the dynamic and successful development of the Partnership for Peace with 27 countries. The Partnership has brought us closer together in a new spirit of common commitment to Euro-Atlantic security and has enabled Partners to participate rapidly and successfully in our broad coalition for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have therefore decided to substantively enhance the Partnership for Peace and to develop ever-closer and deeper cooperative ties with all interested Partner countries. We have endorsed today a number of additional measures to strengthen political consultation with the Alliance, increase the Partners' involvement in PfP decision-making and planning, and make PfP more operational. This will allow Partner countries to draw closer to the Alliance.

We are particularly pleased that on 27th May in Paris our Heads of State and Government and Secretary General Solana signed with President Yeltsin the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation. This marks the beginning of a new strong, stable and enduring partnership which will be of vital importance for European security. We are committed to make the Permanent Joint Council a forum for consultation and cooperation for the benefit of stability in the whole of Europe. The activities of the Council will be built upon the principles of reciprocity, transparency and full respect for the interests of other states. We commend the Secretary General and his staff for having achieved this historic agreement for the Alliance.

We are satisfied that the preparations for decisions of the Madrid Summit on inviting new members into our Alliance are well on track. We noted a report by the Secretary General reflecting the results of the latest round of the intensified dialogue with interested Partner countries and of the analysis of relevant factors associated with the admission of new members; the necessary adaptation of Alliance structures to integrate new members into the Alliance; and a plan and timetable for the accession talks. These preparations will allow in the weeks to come the formulation of the comprehensive recommendations which we requested at our last meeting. The admission of new members, which will enhance our common security, will involve the Alliance providing the resources which enlargement

will necessarily require. We also recommend to our Heads of State and Government to make explicit our commitment that the Alliance remains open to the accession of any other European state able and willing to further the principles of the Washington Treaty and to contribute to our common security. We therefore recommend to our Heads of State and Government that the Madrid Summit should give substance to this commitment.

We welcome today's initialling of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine and look forward to its signature at the Summit in Madrid. The maintenance of Ukraine's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty is a crucial factor for stability and security in Europe. We continue to support Ukraine as it develops as a democratic nation and a market economy. We also welcome the opening of the NATO Information Office in Kyiv earlier this month as an important step in further enhancing our relations with Ukraine.

We attach great importance to security and stability in the Mediterranean region. We are pleased with the development of the dialogue between NATO and a number of countries of the region. We want to further enhance this dialogue and improve its overall political visibility as an effort of confidence-building and cooperation that contributes to stability. To this end, we have today agreed a number of measures on the implementation and scope for further development of this dialogue. We have decided to recommend to our Heads of State and Government to formally establish under the authority of the Council a new committee having the overall responsibility for the Mediterranean dialogue.

We welcome the progress made on the Alliance's internal adaptation, guided by the fundamental objectives of ensuring its military effectiveness, preserving the transatlantic link and building the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance. We note the progress made on the Long-Term Study on the development of the Alliance's future command structure, underscore the importance of solutions of outstanding issues, and stress the desirability of further developments so that appropriate recommendations for decisions can be submitted to the Madrid Summit in the interest of a timely and successful completion of a new command structure. We note with satisfaction the progress made in implementing the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) concept.

We welcome the substantial progress achieved in the development of the ESDI within the Alliance. We have approved a consolidated interim report, and we direct that further work be pursued vigorously with a view to submitting to our Heads of State and Government in Madrid recommendations for decisions necessary for the successful completion of the internal adaptation of the Alliance.

We welcome agreement reached recently in the WEU on the participation of all European Allies, if they were so to choose, in WEU operations using NATO assets and capabilities, as well as in planning and preparing of such operations; and on involvement, to the fullest extent possible and in accordance with their status, of Observers in the follow-up, within the WEU, of our meetings of Berlin and Brussels. We note that the basis has therefore been established for the implementation of Ministerial decisions, for the strengthening of NATO-WEU working relations and, in this framework, for the development of the ESDI with the full participation of all European Allies. This will, together with decisions taken at the meeting of the WEU Council of Ministers in Paris on 13th May 1997, contribute to setting the groundwork for possible WEU-led operations with the support of Alliance assets and capabilities.

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, adopted by our Heads of State and Government at their meeting in Rome in 1991, sets out the principal aims and objectives of the Alliance. Recognizing the changes in the strategic environment since 1991, the Alliance has already decided to examine the Strategic Con-

cept to ensure that it is fully consistent with Europe's new security situation and challenges. We recommend to our Heads of State and Government at their Madrid Summit to decide the way ahead.

We commend the officers and soldiers participating in the Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina for their continued successful contribution to peace in that country.

We recognize that important and demonstrable progress has been made in the overall effort to implement the Peace Agreement since we last met. Municipal elections are scheduled, the sensitive Brcko decision is being implemented, and there have been positive developments in the initiation of joint institutions, the return of refugees and displaced persons, and in economic reconstruction. We are greatly encouraged by the effective cooperation between SFOR and the High Representative and the international organizations and agencies.

Nevertheless, significant challenges remain, and the failure of all the parties to the Peace Agreement to comply fully with their commitments cannot be tolerated. Reaffirming our commitment to the full implementation of the Peace Agreement, we express our serious concern at the lack of determination by the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina to honor their obligations and strongly urge them:

- to establish functioning central institutions;
- to ensure freedom of movement, freedom of communication and freedom of the press;
- to respect human rights, the rule of law and the right of all refugees and displaced persons to return freely;
- to cooperate fully with the international community in preparing, conducting and implementing the municipal elections;
- to cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague in the apprehension and bringing to justice of war criminals;
- to implement fully the provisions of the arms control agreement;
- to adopt and implement the economic measures needed for the functioning of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single state; and
- to develop democratic, restructured police forces.

We continue to monitor closely the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and look forward to the six-month review of SFOR's work in June. We also look forward to the results of tomorrow's Ministerial meeting of the Peace Implementation Council Steering Board.

We welcome the initiatives taken in Albania by the OSCE as the coordinating framework for international assistance, as well as by the EU and the WEU. We commend the Italian-led Multinational Protection Force with the participation of several Allies and Partners which is contributing to creating a secure environment for these initiatives for the re-establishment of peace and order in that country. The elections to be held on 29th June 1997 are an essential step in the process of national reconciliation, and we call on all parties to engage in a constructive dialogue on future democratic reforms in Albania.

We welcome entry into force of the CFE Flank Agreement on 15th May 1997. This step underscores the commitment of all States Parties to retain the regional stability ensured by the provisions of the Flank Agreement for the long term in an adapted treaty. We note the progress that has been made toward a Framework Agreement on CFE adaptation and look forward to completion of that task as soon as possible. To this end, we have proposed in Vienna in February 1997 a revised treaty structure of national and territorial ceilings, together with other measures to strengthen overall and regional stability and security throughout Europe. We underline the commitment of all members of the Alliance to the process of adapting the CFE Treaty to a changing security environment, a process which should enhance the security of all States Parties and ensure that the Treaty continues to serve as a cornerstone of European security in the decades to come.

We noted with satisfaction the progress report of the Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP) regarding the activities of the Senior Political-Military Group on Proliferation and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation. We note the Policy Guidelines for Military Operations in a NBC Weapons Environment developed by the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation. We direct the JCP to continue its vital work. We reaffirm that these political and defence efforts against proliferation remain an integral part of adaptation to the new security environment and welcome further consultations and cooperation with Partner countries to address the common security risks posed by proliferation.

We welcome the agreement reached between Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin at Helsinki to reduce strategic nuclear warheads to a level of 2000-2500 in a START III Treaty. We urge the Russian Federation to ratify the START II Treaty promptly so that the negotiations on START III may begin.

We are pleased that the Chemical Weapons Convention has entered into force and strongly advocate its full and effective implementation. We call on all states which have not yet signed and ratified the Convention to do so at the earliest possible date.

We express our deep appreciation to the Government of Portugal for hosting this meeting.

APPENDICES

NATO: THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY WASHINGTON D.C., APRIL 4, 1949

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty :

ARTICLE 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

ARTICLE 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ARTICLE 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

ARTICLE 5

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-defence 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. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security ⁽¹⁾.

ARTICLE 6

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack: on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France,⁽²⁾ on the territory of Turkey or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer; on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

ARTICLE 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

ARTICLE 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

ARTICLE 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ARTICLE 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.⁽³⁾

ARTICLE 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation

ARTICLE 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey and by the Protocols signed on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Spain.

² On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council heard a declaration by the French Representative who recalled that by the vote on self-determination on July 1, 1962, the Algerian people had pronounced itself in favour of the independence of Algeria in cooperation with France. In consequence, the President of the French Republic had on July 3, 1962, formally recognized the independence of Algeria. The result was that the “Algerian departments of France” no longer existed as such, and that at the same time the fact that they were mentioned in the North Atlantic Treaty had no longer any bearing. Following this statement the Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned, the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from July 3, 1962.

³ The Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949, after the deposit of the ratifications of all signatory states.

THE 16 NATO MEMBER COUNTRIES

Belgium
Canada
Denmark
France
Germany
Greece
Iceland
Italy
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Norway
Portugal
Spain
Turkey
United Kingdom
United States

OSCE PARTICIPATING STATES

AS OF JUNE 1, 1997

Albania	Observer as of 6/90; Fully participating State since 6/91
Andorra	Fully participating State since 4/96
Armenia	Fully participating State since 1/92
Austria	Original participating State
Azerbaijan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Belarus	Fully participating State since 1/92
Belgium	Original participating State
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Fully participating State since 4/92
Bulgaria	Original participating State
Canada	Original participating State
Croatia	Observer as of 1/92; Fully participating State since 3/92
Cyprus	Original participating State
Czech Republic	As Czechoslovakia, original participating State; fully participating State as the Czech Republic since 1/93
Denmark	Original participating State
Estonia	Fully participating State since 9/91
Finland	Original participating State
France	Original participating State
Georgia	Fully participating State since 3/92
Germany	Originally participated as Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic
Greece	Original participating State
The Holy See	Original participating State

Hungary	Original participating State
Iceland	Original participating State
Ireland	Original participating State
Italy	Original participating State
Kazakhstan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Kyrgyzstan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Latvia	Fully participating State since 9/91
Liechtenstein	Original participating State
Lithuania	Fully participating State since 9/91
Luxembourg	Original participating State
Malta	Original participating State
Macedonia	Observer as of 4/93; Fully participating State as of 10/95
Moldova	Fully participating State since 1/92
Monaco	Original participating State
Netherlands	Original participating State
Norway	Original participating State
Poland	Original participating State
Portugal	Original participating State
Romania	Original participating State
Russia	Succeeded Soviet Union as fully participating State, 1/92
San Marino	Original participating State
Slovak Republic	As Czechoslovakia, original participating State; as Slovak Republic, Fully participating State since 1/93
Slovenia	Observer as of 1/92; Fully participating State since 3/92
Spain	Original participating State
Sweden	Original participating State

Switzerland	Original participating State
Tajikistan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Turkey	Original participating State
Turkmenistan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Ukraine	Fully participating State since 1/92
United Kingdom	Original participating State
United States	Original participating State
Uzbekistan	Fully participating State since 1/92
Yugoslavia	Original participating State; membership suspended as of 7/92

STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE PARTERNSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP)

as of June 1, 1997

Albania	February 23, 1994
Armenia	October 5, 1994
Austria	February 10, 1995
Azerbaijan	May 4, 1994
Belarus	January 11, 1995
Bulgaria	February 14, 1994
Czech Republic	March 10, 1994
Estonia	February 3, 1994
Finland	May 9, 1994
Georgia	March 23, 1994
Hungary	February 8, 1994
Kazakhstan	May 27, 1994
Kyrgyzstan	June 1, 1994
Latvia	February 14, 1994
Lithuania	January 27, 1994
Malta	April 26, 1995, withdrew October 29, 1996
Macedonia	November 15, 1995
Moldova	March 16, 1994
Poland	February 2, 1994
Romania	January 26, 1994
Russia	June 22, 1994
Slovak Republic	February 9, 1994

Slovenia	March 30, 1994
Sweden	May 9, 1994
Switzerland	December 11, 1996
Turkmenistan	May 10, 1994
Ukraine	February 8, 1994
Uzbekistan	July 13, 1994