



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (U.S. Role in the World)

(Non-intervention as a ...) Next >



Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 11:03 PM

This forum thread is for Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the individual questions in SEPARATE posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

Since there are multiple questions, BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Don't simply leave it RE: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Do we really have the right?

by Kinzi Silburn - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:44 AM

This is the first time I have heard Ron Paul speak about his opinions so I found it interesting that I agreed with him for the most part. The US is NOT the worlds police. If any group of people were the "police" of the world it would be the United Nations. But the US has no right to butt in to other nations issues. It seems like the reasoning for invading and messing around in other countries is "the ends justify the means" and that isn't how it always works. On many occasions I feel like people could talk themselves out of predicaments instead of the US intervening and guaranteeing violence and death with their guns. Granted, although Ron Paul does bring up a good point that maybe things can be prevented by talking and compromising, it doesn't always work that way. But because people think talking doesn't work, they don't even try to talk and discuss the issues with other countries. It usually ends up, shoot first discuss later on when the "enemy" is laying on the ground twitching. The US has a supreriority complex with the world. Just because we are a world power, does not mean we are the only ones who can jump in and help out. Other nations

have allies that can jump in to aide.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Do we really have the right?

by Minfeng Xu - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:53 PM

I agree the point of talking and compromising does not work but 'shoot 1st and discuss later'. When the contradiction comes in both countries, no one can keep silent before acting crazy first, such as Chinese and Japanese. Because they had so many historical problem, they would relate the previous wars if one of the each trigger the problem. In this case, it is hard for them to keep silent, but instead have a fight or economics blockade to each others.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Not our business?

by Brenda Contreras - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 12:00 PM

Just by watching the 20/20 video of Ron Paul, it seems that he is the most honest thing I have ever heard any politician say. We have so many problems here in the U.S. that need to be solved. It is important that we take care of ourselves, so that when the time comes, we give everything we got in order to help someone else.

Paul makes a great point when he says that "spreading our goodness requires force," and I agree because if someone came into your home and told you how you should run your house, especially with someone who is the exact opposite in you, and has different believes and morals. You wouldn't like it, and most likely rebel against that person. "Because we neglected to peruse Osama Bin Laden... that did not mean that they had the authority to occupy and try to transform Afghanistan." The U.S. wanted to introduce democracy to Afghanistan, something that is not part of that culture. It's none of our business. I've witnessed, gotten involved even, and seen people get into something that didn't involve them. I think that it might be a cultural habit of getting into other people's business.

"In defense, I do not believe there's ever a moral justification to start the war." I agree with this statement because as kids, you're taught that it's not okay to engage in a physical fight with someone, you should talk about the problem and find a solution, or tell an adult. But usually, it comes to more blows with fists, rather than words.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Moral Obligation

by William Jones - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 12:21 AM

I'm very torn when it comes to Ron Paul's views. I agree with the statement he made about "making us a better people." It makes sense that we would focus on our own problems first rather than get involved with other country's issues. Helping others doesn't necessarily mean, however, that our own problems need to be neglected. It's hard for me to hear him talk about ignoring conflicts where one country invades another. It seems that he shrugs it off as nothing, but a simple "border war." I feel that people have a moral obligation to help those in need if they possess the power to do so. This ideology can be reflected upon the United States.

I agree with Keyes where he states that military doesn't necessarily need to be sent in to aid a suffering country. It bothers me that we would turn our backs to these issues and justify our actions by claiming that "they aren't our problems." It's understandable that people would be angered if we try to impose our values and attempt to instill our beliefs in them, but something as horrific as genocide, for example, is a universal evil. It is a wrong that I feel all people should be able to understand.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Playing Big Brother

by Haley Shaw - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 2:43 PM

In watching all three of the videos including Ron Paul I find that I stand on his side for a large amount of what he is saying. I believe that we do need to bring our troops back home and focus on national matters. Having troops in all of the places around the world that we do is causing financial problems. I also agree if we are struck it is justifiable to strike back. But we should not be the first to strike. Having troops around the world is just another way of America flexing its muscles showing the world how big we actually are. I don't consider myself a political person I don't belong to any party but I do have strong feeling about America getting into other people's business around the world. In the Treaty of Versailles 1919, Wilson signed the treaty but the senate rejected it and the idea of the U.S. joining the League of Nations. It wasn't till 1922 that the United States Senate finally signed a peace treaty with Germany. That's three years that we were technically still at war with Germany. We still have troops in Korea and Vietnam even though those wars ended decades ago. It cost the county a large amount of money to keep them there. As Paul said "we are going too stretch ourselves too thin." In this I'm not saying that we shouldn't help when help is desperately needed, but instead that we need to choose our battles more carefully.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



lose/lose  

by Agina Hale - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 9:14 PM

I remember the debates that Ron Paul participated in where these, among other issues, came up. Ron Paul gets my attention when he talks about economics. He seems to have a pretty good concept of how we might be able to turn our debt around (reminds me of Coolidge). He believes in limiting our involvement around the world, but how do we stop what we have already started? We are so interconnected with so many places, that it's hard to reverse out. I don't want us to be the bad guy if we refuse, but when we intervene we will upset the other side anyway.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Non-Intervention vs. Isolationism  

by Jesse Nichols - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 8:57 PM

This was also my first time hearing Ron Paul speak on his political beliefs and I too found myself agreeing with him on almost every issue. Its like a breath of fresh air hearing a true honest politician speak because it so rarely happens these days. Ron Paul seems to have a smart economic mind because he understands what it takes to get this country out of debt which is bringing our troops home. He is absolutely correct when he says we dont have the right to occupy countries that we aren't at war with, which include Germany, Korea, etc. I also agree with his statement about "making us better people", we have very serious issues going on here in our own country that should come before the problems of others. But i do disagree with completely turning our backs in this situation, especially when it comes to genocide, because that is a universal wrong that no one should have to face.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy  

by Macie Martin - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:27 PM

I disagree with Ron Paul because I believe that when you help other countries, they will help you if you ever need it. In order to make alliances instead of enemies you need to have their back. He was talking about how we are spending too much time in Afghanistan and we should pull our troops out of there, but I think what we are doing is good for America and Afghanistan. Maybe we should have stuck to the original plan and just got Osama Bin Laden but either way we are doing good things over there so why pull out now?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Re: intervention is not a good stuff  



by Minfeng Xu - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:41 PM

Ron Paul has two points that oppose U.S. Government. First, U.S. is not the world policeman but the United Nation does. There is not special authority for U.S. to interpret other countries. Second, Ron Paul said that we needed to use troops to spread our goodness. I totally agree with what Ron believes. Moral justification is just an excuse for a country to use force invading or mess up with others. I think every government of every country has their way or rule to regulate the country. Instead of counting on other countries or get help from others, they would use some extremely strategies to fix problems with other nations, such as politics power and army In many cases, country to country's problem is so complicated. They have to fix it by themselves, such as use talking, compromising, or firing, but not get help from U.S. On the other hand, although U.S. has a superiority complex with the world because of a world power, U.S. has no right to touch or interpret other countries' politics problem because U.S. do not want other in charge of their nation too. This is more like "nations' privacy". Second, spread our goodness requires forces. Indeed, Troops need a huge amount of money to run, especially sending them to other countries. However, U.S. still meets financial problems when the Government uses to pay for the War that happened outside of the United States. The government of US did not care about the domestic problems. This reminds us to think of the financial issue we faced during the period between the Treaty of Versailles to the League of Nations, which ran out of U.S. money to support the outside war.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

[< Previous \(U.S. Role in the World\)](#)

[\(Non-intervention as a ...\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

