Mr. Speaker, supporters of internationalism celebrated

NATO's 50th anniversary with the Senate's 1998 overwhelming approval

for expanding NATO to include Eastern European countries. This year's

official inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic made all

NATO's supporters proud, indeed. But in reality, NATO now is weaker and

more chaotic than ever.

In the effort to expand NATO and promote internationalism, we see in

reaction the rise of ugly nationalism. The U.S. and NATO policy of

threats and intimidation to establish an autonomous Kosovo without true

independence from Serbia, and protected by NATO's forces for the

foreseeable future, has been a recipe for disaster. This policy of

nation-building and interference in a civil war totally contradicts the

mission of European defense set out in the NATO charter.

Without the Soviet enemy to justify the European military machine,

NATO had to find enemies and humanitarian missions to justify its

existence. The centuries-old ethnic hatreds found in Yugoslavia and the

militant leaders on all sides have served this purpose well. Working

hard to justify NATO's policy in this region has totally obscured any

objective analysis of the turmoil now raging.

Some specific policy positions of NATO guaranteed that the ongoing

strife would erupt into a full-fledged and dangerous conflict. Once it

was determined in the early 1990s that outsiders would indict and try

Yugoslavian war criminals, it was certain that cooperation with western

negotiators would involve risks. Fighting to the end became a practical

alternative to a mock international trial. Forcing a treaty settlement

on Serbia where Serbia would lose the sovereign territory of Kosovo

guaranteed an escalation of the fighting and the forced removal of the

Kosovars from their homes.

Ignoring the fact that more than 500,000 Serbs were uprooted from

Croatia and Bosnia with the encouragement of NATO intervention did

great harm to the regional effort to reestablish more stable borders.

The sympathy shown Albanian refugees by our government and our media,

although justified, stirred the flames of hatred by refusing to admit

that over a half million Serbs suffered the same fate and yet elicited

no concern from the internationalists bent on waging war. No one is

calling for the return of certain property and homes.

Threatening a country to do what we the outsiders tell them or their

cities will be bombed is hardly considered good diplomacy. Arguing that

the Serbs must obey and give up what they see as sovereign territory

after suffering much themselves as well as face war crimes trials run

by the West makes no sense. Anyone should have been able to predict

what the results would be.

The argument that, because of humanitarian concerns for the refugees,

we were forced to act is not plausible. Our efforts dramatically

increased the refugee problem. Milosevic, as he felt cornered by the

Western threats, reacted the only way he could to protect what he

considered Serbia, a position he defends with international law while

being supported by unified Serb people.

If it is the suffering and the refugees that truly motivate our

actions, there is no answer to the perplexing question of why no action

was taken to help the suffering in Rwanda, Sudan, East Timore, Tibet,

Chechnya, Kurdish, Turkey, and for the Palestinians in Israel. This is

not a reason; it is an excuse.

Instead, we give massive foreign aid to the likes of China and

Russia, countries that have trampled on the rights of ethnic

minorities.

How many refugees, how many children's death has U.S. policy caused

by our embargo and bombing for 9 years of a defenseless poverty-ridden

Iraq. Just as our bombs in Iraq have caused untold misery and death, so

have our bombs in Serbia killed the innocent on both sides, solidified

support for the ruthless leaders, and spread the war.

This policy of intervention is paid for by the U.S. taxpayer and

promoted illegally by our President without congressional authority, as

is required by the Constitution.

The United States Government has in the past referred to the Kosovo

Liberation Army leaders as thugs, terrorists, Marxists, and drug

dealers. This current fight was initiated by Kosovo's desire for

independence from Serbia.

The KLA took on the Serbs, not the other way around. Whether or not

one is sympathetic to Kosovo's secession is not relevant. I for one

prefer many small independent governments pledged not to aggress

against their neighbors over the international special interest

authoritarianism of NATO, the CIA, and the United Nations.

But my sympathies do not justify our taxing and sending young

Americans to fight for Kosovo's independence. It is wrong legally and

morally; and besides, the KLA is not likely to institute a model nation

respecting civil liberties of all its citizens.

The biggest irony of this entire mess is to see the interventionists,

whose goal is one world government, so determined to defend a

questionable group of local leaders, the KLA, bent on secession. This

action will not go unnoticed and will provide the philosophic framework

for the establishment of a Palestinian state, Kurdistan, and

independent Tibet, and it will encourage many other ethnic minorities

to demand independence.

Our policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations,

and their border disputes is not one that comes from American tradition

or constitutional law. It is a policy based on our current leaders'

belief that we are the policemen of the world, something we have

earnestly and foolishly pursued since World War II and in a more

aggressive fashion since the demise of the Soviet Union.

Interventionism is done with a pretense of wisdom believing we always

know the good guys from the bad guys and that we will ignore the

corporate and political special interests always agitating for

influence. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Instead of being lucky enough on occasions to pick the right side of

a conflict, we instead end up supporting both sides of nearly every

conflict. In the 1980s, we helped arm, and allied ourselves with, the

Iraqis against Iran. Also in the 1980s we supported the Afghan freedom

fighters, which included Osama Bin Laden. Even in the current crisis in

Yugoslavia, we have found ourselves on both sides.

The United States, along with the United Nations, in 1992 supported

an arms embargo against Kosovo essentially making it impossible for the

Kosovars to defend themselves against Serbia. Helping the Albanian

Muslims is interpreted by some as token appeasement to the Arab oil

countries unhappy with the advantage the Serbs got from the arms

embargo.

This balancing act between three vicious warring factions was doomed

to fail and has only led to more instability and the spreading of the

war in the region.

Instead of pretending to be everything to everyone, while shifting

alliances and blindly hoping for good to come of it, we should

reconsider the advice of the Founders and take seriously the strict

restraints on waging war placed in the Constitution.

Not much long-term good can come of a foreign policy designed to

meddle and manipulate in places where we have no business or authority.

It cannot help the cause of peace.

Unfortunately, our policies usually backfire and do more harm than

good. When weaker nations are intimidated by more powerful ones,

striking back very often can be done only through terrorism, a problem

that will continue to threaten all Americans as our leaders incite

those who oppose our aggressive stands throughout the world.

War has been used throughout history to enhance the state against the

people. Taxes, conscription and inflation have been used as tools of

the state to pursue wars not popular with the people. Government size

and authority always grows with war, as the people are told that only

the sacrifice of their liberties can save the nation. Propaganda and

threats are used to coerce the people into this careless giving up of

their liberties.

This has always been true with military wars, but the same can be

said of the war mentality associated with the war on drugs, the war on

poverty, the war against illiteracy, or any other war proposed by some

social do-gooder or intentional mischief maker.

But when a foreign war comes to our shores in the form of terrorism,

we can be sure that our government will explain the need for further

sacrifice of personal liberties to win this war against terrorism as

well. Extensive preparations are already being made to fight urban and

domestic violence, not by an enhanced local police force, but by a

national police force with military characteristics.

Even the war against national disasters led by FEMA, usurps local

authority while imposing restraints on movement and controlling

recovery efforts that should be left to local police, private

insurance, and voluntary groups.

Our overseas efforts to police the world implies that with or without

success, resulting injuries and damage imposed by us and others will be

rectified with U.S. tax dollars in the form of more foreign aid, as we

always do. Nation building and international social work has replaced

national defense as the proper responsibility of our government.

What will the fate of NATO be in the coming years? Many are fretting

that NATO may dissolve over a poor showing in Yugoslavia, despite the

50th anniversary hype and its recent expansion. Fortunately for those

who cherish liberty and limited government, NATO has a questionable

future.

When our leaders sanctioned NATO in 1949, there were many patriotic

Americans who questioned the wisdom and the constitutionality of this

organization. It was by its charter to be strictly a defensive

organization designed to defend Western Europe from any Soviet threat.

The NATO charter clearly recognized the Security Council of the United

Nations was responsible for the maintenance of international peace and

security.

Likewise, the legislative history and congressional testimony

maintained NATO could not usurp from Congress and the people the power

to wage war. We have drifted a long way from that acknowledgment, and

the fears expressed by Robert Taft and others in 1949 were certainly

justified.

United States and NATO, while deliberately avoiding a U.N. vote on

the issue, have initiated war against a sovereign state in the middle

of a civil war. A Civil War that caused thousands of casualties and

refugees on both sides has been turned into a war with hundreds of

thousands of casualties and refugees with NATO's interference. The not-

so-idle U.S. threats cast at Milosevic did not produce compliance. It

only expanded the violence and the bloodshed.

The foolishness of this policy has become apparent, but Western

leaders are quick to justify their warmongering. It was not peace or

liberty or national security they sought as they sent the bombs flying.

It was to save face for NATO.

Without the Soviets to worry about, NATO needed a mission, and

stopping the evil Serbs fit the bill. It was convenient to ignore the

evil Croates and the Kosovars, and it certainly was easy to forget the

United Nations', NATO's, and the United States' policies over the past

decade that contributed to the mess in Yugoslavia.

It was soon apparent that bombing was no more a successful diplomatic

tool than were the threats of dire consequences if the treaty,

unfavorable to the Serbs, was not quickly signed by Milosevic. This

drew demands that policy must be directed toward saving NATO by

expanding the war. NATO's credibility was now at stake and how could

Europe, and the United States war machine, survive if NATO were to

disintegrate.

Hopes as expressed by Ron Brown and his corporate friends were not

extinguished by the unfortunate and mysterious Air Force crash while on

their way to Bosnia to do business deals. Nobody even bothers to find

out what U.S. policy condones business trips of our corporate leaders

in a war zone on an Air Force aircraft. Corporate interests and the

military-industrial complex continues to play a role in our Yugoslavian

war policy. Corporate America loves NATO.

Most politicians and the public do not know what NATO's real mission

is, and today's policy cannot be explained by reading its mission

statement written in 1949. Certainly our vital interests and national

security cannot justify our escalation of the war in Yugoslavia.

The excuse that we are the only superpower is hardly a moral reason

to justify bombing nations that are seen as uncooperative. Military

strength gives neither a right to bully nor a monopoly on wisdom. This

strength too often, when held by large political entities, is used

criminally to serve the powerful special interests.

The Persian Gulf and Yugoslavia obviously are much more economically

intriguing than Rwanda and Sudan. There are clearly no business

benefits for taking on the Chinese over its policy toward Tibet. Quite

the contrary, we do business with China and subsidize her to boot.

In spite of the powerful political and industrial leaders' support

behind NATO, and the budgets of 19 Western countries, NATO's days

appear numbered. We shall not weep when NATO goes the way of the Soviet

Empire and the Warsaw Pact. Managing a war with 19 vetoes makes it

impossible for a coherent strategy to evolve. Chaos, bickering,

bureaucratic blundering, waste and political infighting will surely

result.

There is no natural tendency for big government to enjoy stability

without excessive and brute force, as was used in the Soviet system.

But eventually the natural tendency towards instability, as occurred in

the Soviet Empire, will bring about NATO's well-deserved demise. NATO,

especially since it has embarked on a new and dangerous imperialistic

mission, will find using brute force to impose its will on others is

doomed to fail.

It has been said that, in numbers, there is strength. But in

politics, it can also be said that, in numbers, there is confusion as

differences become magnified.

Nationalism is alive and well even within the 19-member NATO group.

When nationalism is non-militaristic, peace loving, and freedom

oriented, it is a force that will always undermine big government

planners, whether found in a Soviet system or a NATO/U.N. system.

The smaller the unit of government, the better it is for the welfare

of all those who seek only peace and freedom. NATO no longer can hide

its true intent behind an anti-communist commitment.

Some have wondered how a 1960s generation administration could be so

proned to war. The 1960s were known for their rebellion against the

Vietnam War and a preference for lovemaking and drugs over fighting,

even Communists. In recent months four separate sovereign nations were

bombed by the United States. This has to be some kind of a record.

Bombing Belgrade on Easter has to tell us something about an

administration that is still strangely seen by some as not having the

determination to fight a real war. There is a big difference between

being anti-war when one's life is at risk as compared to when it is

someone else's. That may tell us something about character, but there

is more to it than that.

Many who were opposed to the Persian Gulf and Vietnam Wars are now

strongly supporting this so-called just and humanitarian war to punish

those who are said to be totally responsible for the Yugoslavian

refugee problem. The fact that Serbia is not Communist in the sense of

North Vietnam may play a part for some in making the decision to

support this war but not the war in Vietnam. But the Persian Gulf War

was not at all about communism, it was about oil.

Some from the left, if strongly inclined toward internationalism,

supported the Persian Gulf War, but for the most part the opposition

came from those who chose not to support a president of the opposite

party, while today, supporting one's own party's position to bomb the

Serbs becomes politically correct.

The same can be said of those who are opposed to the Yugoslavian war.

Where they supported the Persian Gulf War, this administration has not

garnered their support for partisan reasons. The principle of

interventionism, constitutionality and morality have not been applied

consistently to each war effort by either political party, and there is

a precise reason for this, over and above the petty partisanship of

many.

The use of government force to mold personal behavior, manipulate the

economy and interfere in the affairs of other nations is an acceptable

practice endorsed by nearly everyone in Washington regardless of party

affiliation. Once the principle of government force is acknowledged as

legitimate, varying the when and to what degree becomes the only issue.

It is okay to fight Communists overseas but not Serbs; it is okay to

fight Serbs but not Arabs. The use of force becomes completely

arbitrary and guided by the politician's good judgment. And when it

pleases one group to use constitutional restraint, it does, but forgets

about the restraints when it is not convenient.

The 1960s crowd, although having a reputation for being anti-war due

to their position on Vietnam, has never been bashful about its bold

authoritarian use of force to mold economic conditions, welfare,

housing, medical care, job discrimination, environment, wages and

working conditions, combined with a love for taxes and inflation to pay

the bills. When in general the principle of government force to mold

society is endorsed, using force to punish Serbs is no great leap of

faith, and for the interventionists is entirely consistent. Likewise,

the interventionists who justified unconstitutional fighting in

Vietnam, Panama, Nicaragua, Grenada, Libya and the Persian Gulf, even

if they despise the current war in Yugoslavia, can easily justify using

government force when it pleases them and their home constituency.

Philosophic interventionism is a politician's dream. It allows

arbitrary intervention, domestic or international, and when political

circumstances demand opposition, it is easy to cite the Constitution

which always and correctly rejects the use of government force, except

for national self-defense and for the protection of life, liberty and

property.

Politicians love interventionism and pragmatism, the prevailing

philosophy of our age, a philosophy based on relative ethics. No rigid

adherence to law or morality is required. Even the Constitution can be

used in this delicate debate of just when and for whom we go to war.

The trick is to grab the political moral high ground while rejecting

the entire moral foundation upon which the law rests, natural rights,

rejection of force and the requirement politicians be strictly bound by

a contract for which all of us take an oath to uphold.

What does this hodgepodge philosophy here in the Congress mean for

the future of peace and prosperity in general and NATO and the United

Nations in particular? Pragmatism cannot prevail. Economically and

socially it breeds instability, bankruptcy, economic turmoil and

factionalism here at home. Internationally it will lead to the same

results.

NATO's days are surely numbered. That is the message of the current

chaos in Yugoslavia. NATO may hold together in name only for a while,

but its effectiveness is gone forever. The U.S. has the right to

legally leave NATO with a 1-year's notice. That we ought to do, but we

will not. We will continue to allow ourselves to bleed financially and

literally for many years to come before it is recognized that

governance of diverse people is best done by diverse and small

governments, not by a one-world government dependent on the arbitrary

use of force determined by politically correct reasons and manipulated

by the powerful financial interests around the world.

Our more immediate problem is the financing of the ongoing war in

Yugoslavia. On February 9 of this year I introduced legislation to deny

funds to the President to wage war in Yugoslavia. The Congress chose to

ignore

this suggestion and missed an opportunity to prevent the fiasco now

ongoing in Yugoslavia.

The President, as so many other presidents have done since World War

II, took it upon himself to wage an illegal war against Yugoslavia

under NATO's authority, and Congress again chose to do nothing. By

ignoring our constitutional responsibility with regards to war power,

the Congress implicitly endorsed the President's participation in

NATO's illegal war against Yugoslavia. We neither declared war nor told

the President to cease and desist.

Now we have a third chance, and maybe our last, before the war gets

out of control. We are being asked to provide all necessary funding for

the war. Once we provide funds for the war, the Congress becomes an

explicit partner in this ill-conceived NATO-inspired intervention in

the civil war of a sovereign nation, making Congress morally and

legally culpable.

Appropriating funds to pursue this war is not the way to peace. We

have been bombing, boycotting and killing thousands in Iraq for 9 years

with no end in sight. We have been in Bosnia for 3 years, with no end

in sight. And once Congress endorses the war in Yugoslavia with

funding, it could take a decade, billions of dollars, and much

suffering on both sides, before we put it to an end.

Bellicosity and jingoism associated with careless and illegal

intervention can never replace a policy of peace and friendship

whenever possible. And when it is not, at least neutrality. NATO's

aggressive war of destruction and vengeance can only make the situation

worse. The sooner we disengage ourselves from this ugly civil war, the

better. It is the right thing to do.