



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Non-intervention as a ...)

(Taxation by the Federa...) Next >



Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 11:02 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



This is NOT isolationism!

by Veronica Wilkens - Sunday, April 21, 2013, 4:19 PM

For once, some statements by a current politician I can stand behind! Not a policy of isolationism as many would innapropriately call it, but of non-interference. These countries our military is getting involved with is not our business to deal with. It is our concern, but not something we should be using force in.

Although it was an isolationist belief that helped keep us out of the League of Nations, I would stand behind their argument. The idea of the League was to achieve peace and disarmament through arbitration. Nowhere in that sentence do I read things like "military occupation". The kind of international involvement the United States has engaged in are over the top, and in some cases do far more harm than good. This kind of involvement also seems inevitable and joining the League would have thrust us into conflicts that should otherwise been none of our business. If the League had remained true to such altruistic words I would have supported it 100%, but like isolationists of the time I just don't trust our government to remain so pure

intentioned.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Ilean Luerra - Monday, April 22, 2013, 5:11 PM

I don't believe that our governemnt has ever been *pure intentioned* about anything . There is and always will be ulterior motives for anything concerning governemnt, especially military. I agree with you on the stance that American Military issues tend to go over the top when it has concerned us putting our nose in other peoples business. This country has taken the role of the wolrd's *BIG BROTHER* and I feel that we should back off. I think there are times when we might have to step in but not unless it is directly concerning us. The current military issue was started by the bombing of the towers, but really ? twelve years later and we are still there! That's going way beyond . My personal opionin is that we have so much more to concern oursselves with right here in this country. It looks to me that we don't even own this country anymore. We are in hock over our heads and I am not feeling real confident that it's going to change in my life time. I'm very concerned about my son's future. Maybe I'm off the mark here? I'm not a historian, nor have I ever in the past really paid to much attention to it all, and maybe that's because when I do it makes me want to scream. But like I said before *BIG BROTHER* isn't what we need to be right now.Unless it's concerning right here in this country for awhile.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Joseph Standridge - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 11:28 PM

The country taking on a "big brother role" is something that comes along with being the last remaining superpower. With our current state in the world, we can afford to and should try to help the world to better it. Some countries are in a worse off state and could really use help from a "big brother". Also, "directly concerning us" is a broad statement. The state of the world directly affects how our country prospers. Whether it be economic interests, or the possible rise in a dangerous power, any changes in the world will ripple until they hit us as well.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Mercedes Shutt - Friday, April 26, 2013, 5:33 PM

Can we really afford to? Are we really making the world better? or

pissing others off? I am all for helping countries in a "big brother" way but why do we have to use force? Is there really no other way and if so then maybe we should stay out of it. if they can not accept our help without force then maybe they dont want our help.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Veronica Wilkens - Friday, April 26, 2013, 8:01 PM

1. No I don't think we *can* afford to. There are a lot of things we cannot afford that we're doing/buying anyway. The question is, when will the government finally accept that we cannot afford it? I don't think we are a remaining superpower, and our financial situation is proof of that. As a nation we're living above our means, unfortunately.

2. Whether we're making the world better is a matter of opinion. I personally don't believe that we are. Maybe in some aspects, but then we always seem to take it too far. And that's where the "pissing others off" part comes into play, because we know we are.

3. This last point of yours I agree with wholeheartedly. I see to recall a little bunny saying "if you can't say anything nice, don't say anything at all", and we should live by that as a nation a little better. If we have to put our military in someone else's country then they clearly don't want our help and we shouldn't give it. How do you think Americans would react if, say, Russia decided we were running our country up to their standards and decided to *help* us "see the light"? We'd tell them no, and when they pushed we'd tell them to screw off. And when they didn't like that answer and occupied us, do you think we'd just bend over and take it? No, I don't think so.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Mercedes Shutt - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 9:33 PM

That is exactly how I feel! "when will the government finally accept that we cannot afford it" have they really not accepted this!! Seriously, the dollar is going down in value quickly!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split |
Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Karlee Andrew - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:29 PM

Yes amen to that Mercedez! I agree with you 100%!But unfortunatley i do not see the governemnt realizing we cannot afford all of this anytime soon.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit |
Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:12 PM

Often the US intevenes internationally as a means of protecting itself. If an abusive, despotic leader threatens to upset the stability of a region with threats of nuclear annihilation, you better believe that it's in the best interest of the US to do something to calm the situation. Our markets are so interconnected that not intevening would be potentially catastrophic.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split |
Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Robert Badewitz - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:02 PM

You can't remain a super power when you have no money, very true

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split |
Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Karlee Andrew - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:11 PM

"You can't remain a super power when you have no money, very true" Yes, this is one of the mot honest posts i have read on here!

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit |
Split | Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Karlee Andrew - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:07 PM

I also agree with you here. If we cannot help other countries without using force than maybe that means we should not help them out at all. Not all countries want our help, yet we are giving it to them anyway, not sure there are happy about that either like you said.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split |
Delete | Reply



Re: This is NOT isolationism!

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:09 PM

This is a pretty cynical view of our country's role in the world. Do you really think that our gov. has NEVER done anything with nobility of purpose? What are you using to qualify the idea that "we don't even own the country"? The US does spend a considerable chunk of its budget on the military-industrial complex, and it's reasonable to argue that a lot of that money could be put to good use on the homefront, but where do you think it should go?

The US is a champion of rights and pluralism--the freedom to practice religion, speech--the right to an education. We're an international power; there's no denying that. So does that mean that it's the job of the US to extend those basic rights to as many countries around the world as it can? I think that doing this would bankrupt our nation, but if spreading US ideals while maintaining a vital economy is feasible, why not?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



agreeing with paul

by Tyler Kennedy - Monday, April 22, 2013, 4:20 PM

I support most of the ideas that Ron Paul has. He made a great point about spreading the troops out so far and then having to bring them home. Since were not at a time of world war I don't think we need to have our troops stationed at different places around the world. And if something did happen we could get boots on the ground in those areas very quickly.

This idea seems to go against the idea of the League of Nations whose idea was the protect all the new countries that were formed in europe. Ron pauls idea would be to let the countries themselves handle the problem without us involvement. For

example in boarder disputes, those can be handled by the between the two countries and the U.S. doesn't need to be involved.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: agreeing with paul

by Mercedes Shutt - Friday, April 26, 2013, 5:36 PM

I agree with Paul too. I was not up to date with this election but watching these videos makes me surprised he didnt go further in elections. Maybe we are afraid of taking our people out of the countries because of the unkown of what would happen and if they would attack us.... just thinking.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: agreeing with paul

by Veronica Wilkens - Friday, April 26, 2013, 8:05 PM

I want to be surprised he didn't go further, but just listen in that last video. In his remarks you can clearly hear the booing in the crowd. Someone definitely did not agree with him. Then when McCain spoke up (and spoke some very ignorant words I might add), there were far too many cheers. I think that while Paul's beliefs are sound in our eyes, they might have seemed too radical, especially with a Republican crowd. I also think that humans in general like to feel justified. Going with Paul's approach would force us to admit that we might have been *wrong*, and no one wants that, I'm sure.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Nobody (aside from this forum) wants to side with Ron Paul

by Ruby Kalamas - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 5:18 PM

Veronica,

It's very un-American to not support the troops. Not many people want to stand in front of a camera and announce they don't support *What* the troops are doing, because apparently that's the same thing. So yeah, I also wasn't surprised that there was unrest in the crowd. You don't want to agree with a guy that comes off as "un-American". A little dangerous in the herd mentality that seems far too common these days.

I'm glad you picked up on that crowd in the background. Even the

interviewer(In the first video) has a distinct tone of disdain in his voice when asking his questions. He seems to be asking the questions with the tone of "can you effing believe this guy America? He's crazy!)

McCain in the last video trying to use emotional patriotic manipulation to make Ron Paul look bad was pretty amusing. Apparently, it onyl worked for a second. Ron Paul's comment about the \$ went well with the crowd.

To be completely honest, I have never paid much attention to Ron Paul's politics. I have for years heard people mocking him, probably because his ideas are radical compared to most other candidates, and he just won't go away. Until I watched these three videos, I thought he must have been some crack pot. But now I kinda like the guy. I thought he made some great points, and yeah, he is pretty radical. No wonder he makes people nervous. He's not riding the line between Dem. and Rep. like most candidates do these days.

And he's obviously intelligent! His remark about the difference between Isolationism and non-interference was SOOOO good! He was totally correct, and he burned McCain. I'm not even sure McCain realized it. Ouch.

Ron Paul certainly is good at ruffling feathers, but I do understand why he seemed to hold himself back. I mean, he wants people to listen to him, and he has to get the crowd warmed up a bit to lay down his more extreme politics.

Nice analysis Veronica!

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: agreeing with paul  

by Mercedes Shutt - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 9:27 PM

I listened again and heard the cheering when McCain started to talk. Which party was Ron paul? I agree with you, his ways seem somewhat radical and I REALLY agree with you "going with Paul's approach would force us to admit that we might be wrong, and no one wants that, I'm sure." I like what Ron Paul says but at the same time I worry about what would really happen if our troops were pulled.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



by Ryan Dixon - Monday, April 22, 2013, 4:54 PM

Non-Intervention as a Foreign Policy

I completely agree with what Ron Paul is saying and side with him on many topics. Why should the world need a "police man" country to come bust in the door and set things the "way they should be" according to that country's expectations. Even if you do think this should be the case, why does then America get the so called privilege to have this job? Is it because as Alan Keyes says in the video we were to watch related to this topic "we are a nation of nations, a people of many peoples"? If this is your point then to you I would say that we are still Americans right? Its not like our country calls itself The United States of AmericaChinaMexicoFranceJapanGermany...and so on. The people who are citizens of our country are American citizens. Its not our job to send troops over to another country to interfere with what said country is dealing with or tell them how to live. If America wasn't the "police man" country that its is and say China sent troops here to try and tell us what to do, how do you think that would turn out? I know Americans wouldn't like it and would fight back to a foreign country's rule. Now to say I am in support of isolationism would be incorrect. I like Ron Paul also agree that is is great and beneficial for America to trade, travel, and especially talk with other countries. This allows for democracy and a more peaceful way of solving world issues. But unless America is threatened or attacked we should pull our troops out of other country's and bring them back home.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



i agree with Ron Paul 100%  

by Karlee Andrew - Monday, April 22, 2013, 10:48 PM

Ron Pauls idea is that we need to let countries handle there problems themselves. We need to stop putting our money into military and war beore we fall into monetary crisis. Nothig good is going to happen with movng our forces into other countries for pointless reasons; things are only going to get worse. Yes we should have a defense and defend our country, but we should not have bases in othr countries. That is un-American. Why are we in Korea? Why are we in Japan? We've been there since World War two Why are we in Germany supporting there welfare state? Why are we in five wars in the middle east? THERE IS NO REASON OR ADVANTAGE FOR US TO BE INVOLVED OVER THERE! WE ARE GOING BROKE!The question we are facing today is, should we leave Afghanistan? I think the answer is very clear, and it's not complicated. Of course we should, as soon as we can. This suggests that we can leave by the end of the year. If we don't, we'll be there for another decade, would be my prediction.Some argue we have to be there because if we leave under these circumstances we'll lose RESPECT; it will look embarrassing to leave. So how many more men and women have to die, how many more dollars have to be spent to save REPECT???? That is one of the worst arguments possible.!!!!!!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: i agree with Ron Paul 100%

by Joseph Standridge - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:17 PM

"Pointless reasons" is a subjective term. What one person deems pointless could in fact be extremely important to someone else. Reasoning in actions is always a sort of gray area and changes with the times. As far as having bases in other countries being un-american, that's not correct. There have been many presidents, like roosevelt, who enjoy the idea of being a world power. Extending out powers in different places has had it's place in american history, and whether it's right or wrong, it is "american".

There are reasons for us being present in the middle east. The answer of us leaving is far from being completely clear and simple, there are many things to consider War is a complicated issue. Aside from the "respect" reason for staying there, there are things to consider about just leaving, such as the state the country will be in after being occupied for so long.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Non-Intervention and Ron Paul interview

by Matthew Thompson - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:21 AM

I must say, I can see both sides of this particular issue. While for the most part I completely agree with Ron Paul on just about every topic he addresses, if I put it in everyday context for me and the way I live, I can also see the opposing view. If I were to walk down the street and see a friend of mine or even a complete stranger getting beat up by a bully, I'm going to step in and try to arbitrate the situation.

I believe it is our 'civic duty' being one of the best-off countries in the world, to do so on a global scale. But like Pon Paul suggested, I believe it should be done without force. I do believe that we should get our troops out of other countries as soon as possible, but as soon as conflict arrises, we should try to mediate the situation by arbitration, rather than conflict. Then, and only then, should it come to violence, and only if it is nessecary to protect our nation's best interest, we should help whichever side we see as more just.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-Intervention and Ron Paul interview

by Jonathan Edwards - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 1:08 AM

Your words sit well with me. Don't get your hands dirty unless you absolutely need to. But then I started applying the concept to reality, and attempts at

diplomacy in the middle east.

In pre-war Iraq, the only thing that really kept the Sunnis and the Shiites from ripping each other's heads off was their cruel and unjust leader, Saddam. Once he was out of the picture, and no one was stepping up to police the nation, the two sides didn't want to talk, they wanted to restore order *their* way. This turned into violence quickly. Saddam Hussein practically bullied his own people into subordination, which is a strange sort of messed up 'peace'.

My question: how do you (or *can* you) sit the two sides down to talk about reconciling differences, and making changes to the country based on both of their slightly different, yet very much similar belief systems on how the government should be? Is it conceivably possible for the two sides of this conflict to live in harmony? Or would diplomacy deteriorate into skirmishes and push wars, until another dictator took the place of the former, and we're right back to where we were before? Can one mediate diplomatically with an angry people that hate you? Or is it better to let them duke it out on their own, even though many of their own people will die?

I guess it's a string of questions really...

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-Intervention and Ron Paul interview

by Matthew Thompson - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:08 PM

That is indeed the major problem. Unfortunately in our world, most people are selfish and greedy. They want things 'their way' and won't see it any other way. In a localized incident like I posed as the example above, it can usually be accomplished without violence, or at least I have found it to be so. But when you start talking about problems on a global scale, our animalistic territorial instincts kick in and we don't see the other side as human beings anymore, but rather as a rival encroaching on our territory.

The Crusades is a perfect example of this. Why did the Europeans invade the Middle East? to spread Christianity. If for just a little bit, people had stopped to think and evaluate the situation, they might have seen that the religion of these 'Moorish infidels' was so similar to Christianity it's almost ridiculous. If you compare the Bible and the Qur'an side by side, they share the same characters, the same stories, the same virtues and even the same God.

Sorry to draw a little religion into this, but I think it served my purpose. While it might be hard to accomplish passive negotiations, I do believe it is possible. People just have to see each other as fellow human beings rather than rivals or predators, and things would hopefully sort themselves out.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-Intervention and Ron Paul interview



by Mercedes Shutt - Friday, April 26, 2013, 5:39 PM

I agree with you as well. Its like watching those terrible commercials with the sad music and if you do a dollar a day... and then changing the channel. You feel this sadness inside. I agree with Ron Paul but the same time I want to help the hunger people have in other countries. Its a hard debate.

Sum of ratings: (1)

0

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I agree with Ron Paul



by Robert Badewitz - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 11:19 AM

I 100 percent agree with Ron Paul, the United States does not need to be getting into the buisness of other countries. We do not need to be sending our military to police the world. Spending money that we do not have to spend. These kinds of action will only hurt us as a country. Our country has its on problems that we need to focus on. Our occupation of other countries tends to just make them mad. Which does not do anything for our defense, just creating more tention and possiblity for violent action. This would be the case in counties of the middle east. If we make sure that we have a strong National defense and only attack and use our military force when truly justified. Perhaps we wouldn't be in much of the trouble we are today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-intervention; pull our troops or not?



by Morgan Martinka - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 5:41 PM

I think Ron Paul makes some valid points about pulling our troops from the world stage and focusing more on our own country. We should stabilize our own economy and fix our own problems before those of others. We can't afford financially or politically to continue as we have. We are spreading our military to thin, losing the respect of the world in many places, and increasing the chances for terrorism against our country and our interests. Keyes argued that we are "people of many peoples" that we need to "support and reinforce sense of local regional responsibilities". What about those responsibilities on our own soil? Why are we being the world's policeman? If any other country tried to tell us how to live we would not stand for it, yet we are forcefully spreading our ideals of good to these countries.

On the other hand, was McCain right when he said that pulling our troops is the kind of isolationism that caused WWII? If we don't intervene could we be facing another Hitler? And if that was the case what happens if ethnic cleansing, or genocide dominates all European countries? If we had not intervened in WWII wouldn't Hitler

eventually of turned his hatred towards Americans forcing us into war anyway, a war against an even bigger army where noone would be able or willing to come to our aid. As a nation i believe we need to end genocide where we can; it should not be an acceptable policy anywhere at anytime. Not only would it benefit our country in the long run if we ended it but personally I feel we should out of moral obligation.

As with any policy, putting our troops on foreign soil can be right and wrong.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Economy impact

by Kaylee Garman - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:40 PM

A lot of people on the forum have pointed out that America needs to stablize its own economy before dealing with countries overseas. If the United States brings back its military personnel from other countries we would have to pay less taxes towards the military. That would theoretically help our economy. But what about the American citizens that would be losing their jobs? The Vetfriends website cites the Department of Defense figures from December 31st, 2011 of about 1,414,000 military personnel stationed overseas. Bringing all of our troops home would have both positive and negative effects on our nation's economy.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Between Paul/Keyes view

by Kaylee Garman - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:52 PM

A key issue brought up in these interviews is military involvement overseas. It's my opinion that the United States should be very involved with other countries through diplomacy, but not so much militarily. Both Paul and Keyes were advocating diplomacy. Paul and Keyes seemed like they would be in favor of something like the League of Nations. From the videos it seems like my point of view is somewhere between Paul and Keyes. I don't really like the idea of using military force on other countries, but I also think there are times that military force is needed. Such as in WWI, I think the United States should have been involved militarily. In the case of Israel needing American weaponry to protect themselves from Arab countries, I think it is right for the United States to help out. If the United States didn't support Israel, it would be difficult for them to maintain their existence.

It seems that Paul would not have wanted to get America involved in WWI whereas McCain would have probably had us involved right away while Keyes might have been more like Wilson and waited until he thought it was totally necessary. I also think that America should have been involved with the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles. Based on what I saw in the videos I think that Paul, Keyes, and McCain would be in favor of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Non-intervention as a ...\)](#)

[\(Taxation by the Federa...\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Logout](#))

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

