

I am worried about the changes in verb tense from sentence to sentence. That's my main concern now. Shouldn't they be active voice instead of passive?

NATO: Why expand? OR

NATO Expansion: A New Europe in the 21st Century

At a July 9th summit in Madrid, NATO plans to formally announce its new invites which most likely will be the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. NATO expansion will have a significant effect on U.S. policy. State Department Spokesman, stated in the Washington Post that admitting new members to NATO is "our single most important foreign-policy initiative since Clinton came to office." *Given the long term effects the decision to admit new members into NATO will have on the international world scene (or internationally), the importance of these negotiations cannot be taken lightly.* OR- The decision of whether to admit new members into NATO will have long term, international effects, and therefore, cannot be taken lightly.

In its first post Cold War expansion, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) plans to invite new members into the alliance. This action, with significant implications for the U.S., Russia, and any newly admitted members, has not been contemplated in 15 years. With the expansion of NATO into former east bloc countries imminent, Russia is growing ever more nervous. To ease this tension, the Secretary General of NATO, Javier Solana, and Moscow's foreign minister, Yevgeny

Primakov, signed a Founding Act in Paris in mid-May. The Act established a joint council to relay the interest of Russia to the ministers of NATO. While Russia was not given veto power, the council is an acknowledged forum in which Russia can air its views, and have confidence that NATO's leadership will take into account the concerns of the Russian people in its decision making. The political mileage of the Founding Act was immediately apparent: Russian President Boris Yeltsin introduced the Founding Act as proof that the West will adhere to the wishes of Russia. Yeltsin's action highlights the problems confronting NATO as it expands: how to balance the concerns of the old NATO nations, the new NATO nations and Russia. The Western NATO nations did not intend the Act to be a concession to Russia, but rather to give them a voice. This ambiguity of the Founding Act is perhaps its most valuable aspect because it allows each nation to feel protected by it and to interpret it in ways best suited to each nation's interests.

In early June, the Clinton administration found it necessary to solidify their position on what nations the U.S. will support for membership into NATO. The clarification of the United States' preference is seen as a way to head off any support for Slovenia and Romania, whom (or who) some see as unfavorable invitees into the alliance, and whose addition could stall the confirmation process of the new NATO, which could take up to two years.

Despite the potential difficulties, the expansion of NATO is necessary for the unification of Europe. A unified Europe will create stability, speed progress for former Warsaw Pact countries, and invite favorable economic conditions for all members. These rewards will not only benefit Europe, but also

the United States. In creating stability, and thereby, peace, the involvement of U.S. soldiers in European conflict would decrease. Those nations most likely to join in NATO, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, see the costs of upgrading their military as a bargain compared to the costs of struggling with their newly found democratic status and problematic economic situations on their own. With these benefits, and the many other positive aspects (or the sensitive alignment) that NATO brings to previously divided Europe, one sees the necessity of Europe's true unification and integration through the expansion of NATO. Without NATO, we leave the new Europe to struggle on its own, and in so doing we jeopardize the future and security of the United States.