

---

# CRS Report for Congress

---

Received through the CRS Web

---

## Senate Consideration of the North Atlantic Treaty and Subsequent Accessions: Historical Overview

December 8, 1997

(name redacted)

Senior Specialist in International Security Policy  
Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division

### **Note**

This report is based on a memorandum originally prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and released with the Committee's permission. Research assistance for the report was provided by Sarah Cambridge and Louis Golino.

# Senate Consideration of the North Atlantic Treaty and Subsequent Accessions: Historical Overview

## Summary

The Senate debate over the original North Atlantic Treaty and three subsequent accessions (Greece and Turkey in 1952, Germany in 1955, and Spain in 1982) took place under very different circumstances than the current debate over the proposed accessions of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. The historical setting, of course, has fundamentally changed. Then there was a broad consensus in the United States that the Soviet Union posed a threat to U.S. interests in Europe. Today, there is an equally broad consensus that there is no such threat. Some issues raised in the earlier debates by skeptics and opponents, for example concerning the cost and risks of the commitments entailed, however, may be echoed in the current accession discussions. Equally, some arguments offered by today's NATO enlargement supporters are similar to rationales advanced on behalf of the original treaty and subsequent enlargements, including support for common values and the benefits of cooperation with like-minded states. In all four cases, the resolutions of ratification were approved without reservations or conditions.

In the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty, Senators focused on several issues, including: (1) whether or not the Treaty undermined congressional war powers; (2) the meaning of the article V collective defense provision in the treaty; and (3) the link between the Treaty and the Military Assistance Program (MAP) that the administration planned to seek in support of West European self defense capabilities. When the resolution of ratification came to the Senate floor, three reservations were proposed and defeated. The roll call vote gave the Senate's consent to treaty ratification by a margin of 82-13.

Senate consideration of the membership of Greece and Turkey in NATO ended with a February 7, 1952 roll-call vote of 73-2 favoring their admission. Debate on the Senate floor centered primarily on the question of the war-making powers of the Congress.

The Senate's consideration of the protocol concerning Germany's membership in NATO came after several years of debate and senatorial involvement in decisions related to the future of European security arrangements. When the Senate considered the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, many Senators had then wanted to bring Germany's potential to bear as part of Western defenses. On April 1, 1955, by a roll call vote of 76-2, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the end of occupation and the accession of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty.

On March 16, 1982, Senate action on the Spanish protocol moved swiftly and without opposition. No Senator spoke in opposition and, on a division vote, two-thirds of the Senate present and voting stood for the affirmative, and the resolution of ratification was agreed to.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
North Atlantic Treaty .....	1
Background .....	1
Process/Issues .....	2
Accessions to the North Atlantic Treaty .....	6
Accession of Greece and Turkey .....	6
Background .....	6
Process/Issues .....	6
Accession of Germany .....	8
Background .....	8
Process/Issues .....	8
Accession of Spain .....	9
Background .....	9
Process/Issues .....	9
Appendix 1 .....	11
Resolutions of Ratification .....	11
North Atlantic Treaty .....	11
Accession of Greece and Turkey .....	11
Accession of Germany .....	11
Accession of Spain .....	11
Appendix 2 .....	12
Resource Note .....	12
North Atlantic Treaty .....	12
Accession of Greece and Turkey .....	12
Accession of Germany .....	13
Accession of Spain .....	13

# Senate Consideration of the North Atlantic Treaty and Subsequent Accessions: Historical Overview

## Introduction

The Senate debate over the original North Atlantic Treaty and three subsequent accessions (Greece and Turkey in 1952, Germany in 1955, and Spain in 1982) took place under very different circumstances than the current debate over the proposed accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. The historical setting, of course, has fundamentally changed. Then there was a broad consensus in the United States that the Soviet Union posed a threat to U.S. interests in Europe. Today, there is an equally broad consensus that there is no such threat. Some issues raised in the earlier debates, however, may be echoed in the current accession discussions. In 1949, several Senators were particularly concerned about the affect of U.S. accession to the North Atlantic Treaty on congressional war powers. Others focused on how much the treaty might cost the United States, and whether it would require additional U.S. military efforts. Similar issues were raised when Greece and Turkey entered the alliance in 1952 and when Germany was admitted in 1955. There was very little debate about Spain's proposed membership in NATO in 1982, in part because there had been a longstanding interest in bringing Spain into the alliance but resistance to doing so as long as democracy had not been established there. Many of the arguments offered by today's NATO enlargement supporters are reminiscent of the rationales offered on behalf of the original treaty and subsequent enlargements, including support for common values and the benefits of cooperation with like-minded states. The following paragraphs summarize the debate in the U.S. Senate on all of these earlier decisions.

## North Atlantic Treaty

### Background

Three formative actions originally shaped the North Atlantic Alliance in 1948-49: the Brussels Treaty (1948), the Vandenberg Resolution (1948), and the North Atlantic Treaty (1949). These events outlined the objectives of the "transatlantic bargain," identified the partners in the deal, and suggested some of the reciprocal obligations to be borne by the participants. The Congress, the Senate in particular, played an important part in this process.

In the Brussels Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defense, of March 17, 1948, the governments of France, the United

Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg provided the initial framework for postwar West European cooperation. More important, these five countries signaled to the United States their intent to structure postwar intra-European relations to encourage internal stability and to defend against external threats. The treaty stated the basic European commitment to the bargain. To make sure that the signal would be heard loudly and clearly in the halls of the U.S. Congress, President Harry Truman told a special joint session of Congress that he was "sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them protect themselves."

Congressional acceptance of this bargain was given political impetus in the so-called Vandenberg Resolution. Senator Arthur Vandenberg (R-Michigan), the sponsor and chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, had been known as an "isolationist" during World War II, and the Truman administration went to great lengths to encourage Vandenberg's postwar conversion to a more "internationalist" inclination. Following signature of the Brussels Treaty, the State Department asked Vandenberg to prepare a resolution which would express congressional support for the Administration's desire to affiliate the United States with the European self-help project. Vandenberg crafted a resolution which, in part, suggested the United States should support "the progressive development of regional and other collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the [United Nations] Charter...." The resolution was approved by the Senate on June 11, 1948 with overwhelming bipartisan support. Almost immediately thereafter, in late June 1948, the Soviet Union imposed a blockade of Berlin, and officials from the United States and its transatlantic partners (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom) intensified work on the North Atlantic Treaty.

The document signed on April 4, 1949 was a compromise between the European desire for explicit U.S. commitments to provide military assistance to prospective NATO allies and the American desire -- strongly expressed in Congress -- for more general, less specific assistance provisions. The end product reflected close cooperation between administration officials and key Senate leaders in their attempt to produce a treaty that could win Senate advice and consent.

## **Process/Issues**

On April 12, 1949, President Truman delivered the protocol, in the form of Executive Document L, to the Senate. The protocol was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee convened on April 21 to consider the Treaty's relationship to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, which the Administration had proposed as a military assistance program to support the Treaty's goals.

The Foreign Relations Committee, led by Chairman Tom Connally (D-Texas), began a series of public hearings on April 27 and, over the next two months, recorded hearings on 16 days producing 1263 pages of printed testimony. Two Senators not on the Committee, Forrest C. Donnell (R-Missouri) and Arthur V. Watkins (R-Utah), participated actively in the hearings. These two self-proclaimed skeptics were among the leading opponents of the Treaty when it came to the floor of the Senate. From

the beginning, there was a tension between these Treaty skeptics and Chairman Connally.

The hearings opened with testimony from Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Secretary Acheson began by making note of the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations and its members had been deeply involved in development of the Treaty. Acheson said "Without the vision and assistance of your chairman [Connally], of your former chairman [Vandenberg], and the members of this committee, this Treaty could never have been concluded. The text embodies many constructive suggestions from members of the committee."

Acheson argued that the Treaty was in the interest of peace ("If we want peace, we must be prepared to wage peace, with all our thought, energy, and courage.") and deterrence ("Security today and henceforward can only be assured, in the President's words, by stopping war before it can start.") He said the Treaty was perfectly consistent with the United Nations Charter and noted the importance of the Brussels Treaty. Acheson drew attention to the system of common values underlying the Treaty ("The principles which draw these nations into natural affinity and which they seek to defend -- freedom of the individual, tolerance and restraint, and the rule of law -- are the principles which unite free peoples throughout the world.")

He also emphasized that the Article V mutual defense provision in the Treaty was not an "automatic" commitment and would be in accord with constitutional requirements. ("This naturally does not mean that the United States would automatically be at war if one of the other signatory nations were the victim of an armed attack. Under our Constitution, the Congress alone has the power to declare war. The obligation of this Government under article V would be to take promptly the action it deemed necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. That decision would, of course, be taken in accordance with our constitutional procedures.")

In response to questioning by Chairman Connally, Acheson confirmed that the Treaty was not aimed at any country, but rather was designed to prevent armed aggression. Acheson stated that "...any nation which claims that this Treaty is directed against it should be reminded of the Biblical admonition that 'The guilty flee when no man pursueth.' "

Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper (R-Iowa) asked whether or not the United States would be "...expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of those countries' capacity to resist?" Secretary Acheson replied "The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No.'"

Acheson was questioned on various issues by a number of Committee members, all of whom were favorably inclined toward the Treaty. Chairman Connally then gave the floor to Senator Donnell, who, along with Senator Watkins, had asked to join the Committee in its work. Senators Donnell and Watkins made initial statements, and then Senator Donnell pursued a critical line of questioning. Donnell focused in particular on the meaning of the article V "guarantee," and whether or not the provision undermined Congress's constitutional war-making power.

Secretary of State Acheson was followed by a parade of administration witnesses speaking in favor of the Treaty, including Ambassador to the United Nations Warren Austin, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, and Army Chief of Staff Omar N. Bradley. In addition, testimony in favor of the Treaty was offered by a large group of private witnesses, and a similar group of witnesses and organizations testified in opposition. Opponents questioned the effect of the Treaty on congressional war-making powers, the link between the Treaty and military assistance to European countries, and whether such an agreement was warranted by the perceived threat to Europe.

In retrospect, the two major issues on which Senators focused in the hearings were: (1) the meaning of the article V commitment; and (2) the link between the Treaty and the Military Assistance Program (MAP) that the administration planned to seek in support of West European self defense capabilities.

With regard to article V, because this provision had been developed in close cooperation with members of the Committee, the entire Committee membership accepted the final outcome and Acheson's explanation of the nature of the commitment. This was not true, of course, for Senators Donnell and Watkins, who had not been involved in developing the U.S. position and remained wary of Secretary Acheson's explanations.

With regard to the Military Assistance Program, Secretary Acheson asked Committee members to treat the issues separately, even though he acknowledged that MAP was directly related to the Treaty's article III, calling for self-help and mutual aid. The basic link between article III and MAP was the question of how much the Treaty would cost the United States, at least in the near term. Because article V had been watered down to satisfy concerns expressed by the Senate, some European governments saw the provision of military assistance as an important aspect of the U.S. commitment as well as essential to their ability to build credible defense capabilities.

On both questions -- commitment and costs -- the administration tried to walk a fine line between the desire of the Europeans for guarantees and aid and the Senate's desire to protect congressional war-making prerogatives and limit costs to the American taxpayer.

On June 6, the Committee reported the Treaty, recommending, by a unanimous 13-0 vote, that the Senate give its advice and consent. Senators Donnell and Watkins, who throughout the hearings had vigorously advanced their skeptical views, were left to pursue their opposition in the floor debate. In its report on the Treaty, the Committee made five main points: (1) approval would not commit the Senate to approving the military assistance program; (2) the Treaty would not abridge the Constitutional powers of the Congress to declare war; (3) Treaty approval would not imply the Senate's "support, approval or disapproval of other pact nations' colonial policies; (4) Spain's admission to NATO depended on the approval of all pact nations; and, (5) Germany was protected by the Treaty only to the degree that the pact covered attack on U.S. armed forces stationed there.



As the floor debate opened on July 5, Senator Donnell and Senator William Jenner (R-Indiana) led opposition to the Treaty. The bipartisan pro-Treaty forces were led by Senators Connally, Vandenberg, Henry Cabot Lodge (R-Massachusetts) and Brien McMahon (D-Connecticut).

Senator Robert A. Taft (R-Ohio), before and during the floor debate, concentrated on the link between the Treaty and the military assistance program. He announced on the floor that he could not vote in favor of the North Atlantic Treaty because "...I think it carries with it an obligation to assist in arming at our expense the nations of Western Europe...." A few additional Senators joined in Taft's concern, and others remained skeptical about the wisdom of the Article V provision and its potential impact on the Constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

Following lengthy and detailed debate which concluded on July 20, the Senate on July 21 heard Senator Connally read a letter from Secretary Acheson urging adoption and opposing any reservations or conditions. The Senate then voted on three proposed reservations and finally on the Treaty itself.

The first reservation, proposed by Senators Kenneth Wherry (R-Nebraska), Taft, and Watkins, addressed the issue of the link between Treaty ratification and military assistance. It would have provided that the Treaty was ratified with the understanding that Article III commits none of the parties to supply arms to other parties to the Treaty. This reservation was defeated by a vote of 21-74. The second reservation, offered by Senator Watkins, would have specified that the United States assumed no obligation to assist another party to the Treaty unless such assistance were authorized by a joint resolution of Congress. This reservation was defeated by a vote of 11-84. The third reservation, also offered by Senator Watkins, would have declared the Senate's understanding that Article V, in the case of an attack on a party to the Treaty, does not obligate the Congress to declare war or authorize employment of U.S. military forces. This reservation was defeated 8-87.

When the resolution of ratification was brought to a vote, Senator Wherry and others asked for the "yeas and nays." At the end of the day, the Administration and Treaty supporters in the Senate overcame the objections concerning cost and commitments. The result of the roll call vote produced 82 yeas and 13 nays, and the Senate, having provided much advice over many months of negotiations and debate, also then gave its consent to ratification.

## Accessions to the North Atlantic Treaty

### Accession of Greece and Turkey

**Background.** As noted earlier, during hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, Secretary of State Acheson told Senators that it would not be necessary to send major formations of U.S. troops to Europe. In a few years, much had changed. The North Korean attack on the Republic of Korea in June 1950 led President Truman to send substantial numbers of U.S. forces to Europe less than 18 months after Secretary Acheson had pledged that no major U.S. deployments would be required. U.S. forces would become key assets within an “integrated command structure” led by an American Supreme Allied Commander. This change led to a “great debate” in the Senate and eventual passage of Senate Resolution 99, by a vote of 69-21 on April 4, 1951. Resolution 99 supported Truman’s decisions, but cautioned against making additional troop commitments without Senate approval. The resolution, issuing the first clear call for effective “burdensharing,” called on the Administration to ensure that the European nations, including Germany, Italy and Spain, were making realistic efforts on behalf of European defense.

The 1952 accession of Greece and Turkey came in the historical wake of the Senate’s consideration of Resolution 99. In a sense, adding these two southern European nations to the alliance was a logical sequel to the decisions represented by Resolution 99. The two nations, it was argued, would add important military forces and geography to NATO’s southern flank. At the time, the sense of the Senate was that any available European military potential should be used to help deal with the Soviet threat, and the addition of these countries was responsive to this concern.

**Process/Issues.** Senate consideration of the membership of Greece and Turkey in NATO ended with a February 7, 1952 roll-call vote of 73-2 favoring their admission. The process leading up to the vote included advance consultations and formal hearings with Secretary of State Acheson and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Omar Bradley. The Committee members discussed a variety of topics among themselves and with Administration witnesses, but debate on the Senate floor centered primarily on the question of the war-making powers of the Congress.

In September 1951, while the Protocol to the Treaty of Washington on bringing Greece and Turkey into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was still being negotiated, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held two formal discussions of the issue. On September 17, 1951, the Committee was convened by Senator Connally and heard a report from Senator J. William Fulbright (D-Arkansas) concerning a meeting that he and Senator Guy M. Gillette (D-Iowa) had recently held with State Department representatives. The NATO allies, meeting in Ottawa, Canada, were discussing possible membership invitations to Greece and Turkey. The State Department reportedly wanted to know whether or not SFRC members thought that Greek and Turkish membership in NATO “was a good idea.” During the Committee’s discussion, Senator Gillette observed “I think the vast majority of the Senate would be glad to see Turkey and Greece in, on the theory that you are

containing Russia." Chairman Connally asked if it would be acceptable to communicate this sense informally to the Department of State and, hearing no objections, ordered Committee staff to do so.

On September 26, 1951, Secretary of State Acheson came before a joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to discuss the decision taken by the NATO allies at Ottawa to amend the North Atlantic Treaty to admit the two nations. The brief discussion focused almost exclusively on the dangers to U.S. interests in the region and command structure issues that has been debated in Ottawa.

The Protocol providing for the accession of Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Treaty was signed on October 17, 1951. President Truman transmitted the Protocol to the Senate on January 10, 1952. On January 14, Secretary Acheson appeared before the Committee to give a survey of international conditions. He returned on January 15, along with General Bradley, to testify on behalf of the Senate's approval of the adherence of Greece and Turkey to the Treaty. Discussion in the Committee that day focused on how addition of the two nations and amending the Treaty might affect U.S. commitments in the Middle East region. The Committee sent the resolution of ratification to the floor with no reservations or conditions attached.

The proposition came quickly to the Senate floor where a voice vote was taken on January 29, 1952. Only six Senators were present and all voted to give the Senate's advice and consent to the protocol, which was then sent to the President. But on January 31, Senator Gillette observed to the Senate that it had been a mistake to approve the protocol by voice vote with only six Senators in the chamber. Majority Leader Ernest W. McFarland (D-Arizona) agreed, and declared that future action on major treaties should be taken on roll-call vote after all Senators had been formally notified. The President was requested to return the amendment to the Senate, which he did on February 6.

In floor debate, Senator Gillette suggested that the Senate consider the effect of the amendment to the Treaty on U.S. commitments. Senator Spessard L. Holland (D-Florida) replied that, even though coverage would be extended to cover two additional states, the United States and other parties to the Treaty retained the right to decide what they were willing to do in the case of hostilities. Senator Arthur V. Watkins (R-Utah) asked whether the Congress or the President had the power to send U.S. forces into a "shooting war." Senator Fulbright replied that, in a "real emergency," the President would likely act without consulting the Congress, but in a "normal and reasonable situation" would seek congressional advice and consent. Senator Watkins and Senator James P. Kem (R-Missouri) observed that the President had not done so in the case of the Korean war.

Senator Watkins offered an amendment to the resolution of ratification expressing the sense of the Senate that the Constitution gives Congress sole power to declare war and that U.S. forces committed to NATO should not be used "in a manner which would necessarily involve the United States in war, unless the Congress by act or joint resolution so provides." The Watkins proposal was supported by Senator Robert A. Taft (R-Ohio), but Senators Walter F. George (D-

Georgia) and Senator Connally argued that all provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty must be implemented by the Congress in any case. Senator Watkins then withdrew his proposed reservation, and the amendment to the North Atlantic Treaty was voted for the second time, on this occasion by a 73-2 roll-call vote on February 7, 1952. The two votes against came from Senators Langer (R-North Dakota) and Case (R-South Dakota).

## Accession of Germany

**Background.** The Senate's consideration of the protocol concerning Germany's membership in NATO came after several years of debate and senatorial involvement in decisions related to the future of European security arrangements. When the Senate considered the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, many Senators wanted to bring Germany's potential to bear as part of Western defenses. Similarly, in the debate on Resolution 99, most Senators supported using German military potential against the Soviet threat. France, however, so soon after World War II, was very reluctant to accept a rearmed Germany unless the process was carefully monitored and controlled.

The original plan was to develop European defense efforts, including Germany, through creation of a European Defense Community. When that project failed to win approval in the French National Assembly, it was agreed to strengthen the 1948 Brussels Treaty, setting up the Western European Union (WEU) organization, establish arms control provisions to govern German rearmament, end the occupation of Germany and admit it to NATO. The entire period from 1948 through 1955 was therefore one of almost continuous consultation between the Administration and the Senate. The Senate gave its approval to the protocol admitting Germany to NATO by a roll call vote of 76-2 on April 1, 1955.

**Process/Issues.** President Truman delivered the Treaty ending occupation of the Federal Republic of Germany (Executive "L") and the protocol on admission of Germany to NATO (Executive "M", a product of the London and Paris conferences of September-October 1954) to the Senate on November 15, 1954. Formal consideration of the protocol was delayed until ratification by France and Germany was assured. Consideration of Germany's membership by the SFRC began with hearings on March 29 and 30, 1955. On March 29, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles testified that the arrangements being considered would give Western Europe "its last chance to survive as a place of human welfare." On March 30, Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert B. Anderson said the agreements promoted peace and the alternative would be "chaos." Supporting statements were also received from Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Orville R. Cook, deputy U.S. commander-in-chief in Europe. Later that same day, the Committee heard opposition views from a variety of private groups who argued that ratification of the arrangements would promote neo-Fascism and possibly lead to another world war. On March 30, the Committee voted to report the two treaties favorably (without reservations or conditions) to the Senate. The vote was 14-1, with Senator William Langer (R-North Dakota) casting the sole negative vote.

When the Senate debated the German treaties on April 1, 1955, Senator Walter F. George (D-Georgia), Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, argued

that approving the treaties would increase the chances of German unification and improve the chances of settling other East-West issues in Europe. Senator Langer drew a parallel to the Treaty of Versailles, arguing that the treaties could bring on another world war the way Versailles led to World War II. Senator George W. Malone (R-Nevada), who cast the other vote against the treaties, argued that the United States was compromising its right and ability to make sovereign decisions about its national security. Senator Alexander Wiley (R-Wisconsin), speaking in favor, maintained that ending the occupation and admitting Germany to NATO "will return Western Germany to the place where she rightfully belongs, to a place of equality and partnership with other nations of the Western World." By a single roll call vote of 76-2, recorded separately for the two treaties, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the end of occupation and the accession of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty.

## Accession of Spain

**Background.** The Senate voted in favor of Spain's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty on March 16, 1982, but the process that produced that result can be seen as starting much earlier. In 1976, the United States and Spain completed negotiation of the "Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between Spain and the United States of America." The agreement was intended primarily as a political framework for U.S.-Spanish military cooperation. Generalissimo Francisco Franco had passed away in 1975, and then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger wanted to bring post-Franco Spain into the Western alliance system. But European allies objected to bringing a Spain that was still ruled by an authoritarian regime into NATO.

When the Senate gave its advice and consent to the U.S.-Spain Treaty on June 21, 1976, it made its resolution of ratification subject to a declaration. That declaration said, in part, that the United States hopes that the Treaty will "support and foster" Spain's progress toward democracy and consequent participation in "the institutions of Western European political and economic cooperation." It added that the United States "looks forward to the development of such an expanded relationship between Western Europe and a democratic Spain as would be conducive to Spain's full cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, its activities and mutual defense obligations."

**Process/Issues.** After Spain had thrown off the last vestiges of authoritarian rule, all NATO members were prepared to offer it membership in NATO. There was substantial political opposition in Spain to joining NATO, in part because of the perception that Spain's defense relationship with the United States had helped sustain Franco and his successors. But, on November 26, 1981, Spain's Senate, following the lead of the House, voted to authorize the Government of Spain to seek an invitation. NATO foreign ministers signed the protocol of Spanish accession to the North Atlantic Treaty in Brussels on December 10, 1981. President Reagan transmitted the protocol to the Senate for its advice and consent on January 25, 1982.

Senate action on the Spanish protocol moved swiftly and without opposition. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Senator Charles Percy (R-Illinois), considered the protocol and reported it to the full Senate favorably and

without reservation on March 9, 1982. On March 16, Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), assistant Majority Leader, asked unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on accession of Spain "and that no reservations, amendments, declarations, or understandings be in order." Senator Percy took the floor first to speak on behalf of the protocol. He was supported in statements by Senator Claiborne Pell (D-Rhode Island), ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator John Tower (R-Texas), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.(R-Virginia). No Senator spoke in opposition and, on a division vote, two-thirds of the Senate present and voting stood for the affirmative, and the resolution of ratification was agreed to.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Resolutions of Ratification**

#### **North Atlantic Treaty**

*Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*  
That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

#### **Accession of Greece and Turkey**

*Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*  
That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey, which was opened for signature at London on October 17, 1951, and has been signed on behalf of the United States of America and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

#### **Accession of Germany**

*Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*  
That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M, 83d Congress, 2d session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954.

#### **Accession of Spain**

*Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*  
That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the Accession of Spain, signed in Brussels on December 10, 1981, on behalf of the United States and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Resource Note**

The following sources were used in preparation of this memorandum:

#### **North Atlantic Treaty**

Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1949. Foreign Affairs. "North Atlantic Treaty," pp. 343-350, 429-430.

Ireland, Timothy P., *Creating the Entangling Alliance, The Origins of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut. 1981.

Kaplan, Lawrence S., *The United States and NATO, The Formative Years*, The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. 1984.

Sloan, Stanley R., *NATO's Future, Toward a New Transatlantic Bargain*, National Defense University Press, Washington, D.C. 1985.

United States Congress. Congressional Record. Senate. 1949. July 5, p. 8812-8820; July 6, p. 8891-8904; July 7, p. 9011-9033; July 8, 9090-9120, 9122-9123, 9127; July 11, p. 9190-9214; July 12, p. 9254-9288; July 13, p. 9334, 9352-9381; July 14, p. 9426-9446, 9447-9464, 9466-9470; July 15, p. 9534-9537, 9552-9575, 9575-9604; July 18, p. 9623-9650; July 20, p. 9762-9838; July 21, p. 9879-9916. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1949.

United States Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *North Atlantic Treaty*. Message from the President of the United States transmitting a copy of the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Washington on April 4, 1949, April 12, 1949; Questions Relating to the North Atlantic Treaty; Documents Relating to the North Atlantic Treaty; Report, June 6, 1949; Hearings, 81<sup>st</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session. Part 1, April 27, 28, 29, May 2, and 3, 1949; Part 2, May 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 11, 1949; Part 3, May 12, 13, 16, 17 and 18, 1949. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1949. 1263 p.

#### **Accession of Greece and Turkey**

Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1952. Foreign Affairs. "Greece, Turkey in NATO." p. 172, 182.

United States Congress. Congressional Record. Senate. 1952. January 29, p. 586-588; January 30, p. 714-715; January 31, p. 720-721; February 6, p. 846-847, 861-869, 870-885; February 7, p. 903, 915-930. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1952

United States Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 1951*, vol. 3.2. Admission



of Greece and Turkey to NATO; Genocide Convention. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 377-380. (82<sup>nd</sup> Congress 1st session).

United States Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 1951, vol. 3.2*. Report by the Secretary of State on European Problems. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 449-456. (82<sup>nd</sup> Congress 1st session).

United States Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 1952, vol. 4*. Greek-Turkish Protocol. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 37-43. (82<sup>nd</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> session).

### **Accession of Germany**

Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1955. Foreign Affairs. "German Treaties." p. 121, 283-284.

United States Congress. Congressional Record. Senate. 1955. p. 4201-4234.

### **Accession of Spain**

United States Congress. Congressional Record. Senate. 1982. March 16, p. 4299-4301.

United States Congress. Senate. United States Treaties and Other International Agreements. vol.27, part 3, 1976. Spain, Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. TIAS 8360. p. 2279-3310.

## EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.