



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Taxation by the Federa...)

(Non-intervention as a ...) 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



Re: Slight Intervention

by Brittney Nestle - Monday, April 22, 2013, 8:35 PM

I can understand where Ron Paul is coming from; as Americans today we have a tendency to insert ourselves into countries that, as he points out, probably don't want us there; and yes we should probably focus on issues here in our own country, but I have a hard time staying with an "it's not our problem," approach when it comes to things like Genocide (as in World War 2.) I would argue that as a people with the ability to stop injustice we might have a duty to protect others, especially if what we are protecting them from is a dictator/their own government (again, World War 2). That's not to say that we should go insert ourselves into every war, every country in the world decides to fight, but I think taking an extremely non-intervention stance might be a mistake.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Position on the spectrum

by Heather Groves - Monday, April 22, 2013, 10:39 PM

I agree with Ron Paul to a point. I do not believe that we should be forcing our way of living onto other people. We do not like it when people tried to force their way of living on us, like back when we where fighting for Indpendce from Britian. We wanted to live our way and not have some one tell us if it was right or not. So we should not do it to them, though we have many times through out our history.

But I do not agree with not intervening at all. In world war one we had packs with other countries, and helped them out in time of need, though we did not enter the war until almost the end. If we had not helped the Allies, our world today would have been a very different one. I believe in helping those we have made promises with, and to just sit back and not do anything until we are attacked seems wrong.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Some intervention might be required

by Gavin Bennett - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:41 PM

I agree with senator Paul for the most part. As of late, the US has been intervening in conflicts and problems of the world with military action in countries that probably don't want a US military occupation. Where I disagree with senator Paul is that he thinks military action should never be an option in foreign intervention and I think it should be the very last option in foreign intervention. These issues and questions relate to the aftermath of WWI in that after the war, the question arises should the US get more involved in global affairs like Wison wanted with his 14 points or should the US remain largely isolationist/non-interventionalist as was shown by the reluctance to even join the war and not ratifying joining the Leauge of Nations after the war. I think diplomatic approaches like the embargos we have with North Korea and Iran, for example are good places to start with foreign intervention and then after all non military options have been exhausted, consider a military option especially if the situation puts national security or the security of a top, strategic ally at risk. But in the case of military intervention, it should be swift, quell whatever the problem might be, and no occupation or military lingerning in whatever country the US has to intervene with the military in. This last point is probably most important because most of the time our military is not welcome in most places and it puts a huge strain on the budget whenever we act with the military and hang around for awhile and it spreads the US's defense somewhat thin if there were to ever be an attack on the homeland.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

Ron Paul isn't as much of a quack as he used to be, his inner Texan must be



shining through  

by Gregory Vandelune - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:55 PM

Congressman Paul brings up many valid points. I personally believe that the best solution is somewhere between his and Sen. McCain's position. A non-interventionist foreign policy would help the many aspects of diplomatic relations but this needs to be tempered with the need for military intervention when looking at the second and third order effects of an event, in respect to U.S. National Security. During the Clinton era, the U.S. did not need to have military intervention in Somalia, military aid to Rwanda, military intervention in the Balkans, etc. Genocide, while tragic to the parties on the receiving end, is a relatively common occurrence. The U.S. should not invest its monies or manpower to protect the less powerful, there will always be a weakling.

This idea of limited military intervention was a key stumbling block for the League of Nations. Article X gave the League the ability to exercise military might if other nations agreed to it. This would mean that the U.S. could be pulled into a war against its own national interest. (p. 790) Fortunately, it was not ratified. The very notion of international peace is ludicrous. It briefs well, makes people feel all warm and fuzzy inside, and has visually appealing bumper stickers but is too idealistic for anybody grounded in reality. The fear that the U.S. would be dragged into a conflict in which it had no interest was almost an inevitability.

While I have the utmost respect for Sen. McCain and his service to the U.S. I disagree that U.S. foreign policy following WW I led to WWII. I do believe that the Treaty of Versailles set the conditions for someone to seize power if they offered the German people hope. The onus was on Germany's European neighbors. Hitler first published *Mein Kampf* in 1925

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mein_Kampf#Publication_history) , fourteen years later WWII would begin with the invasion of Poland. After publishing his political views and hatred, Adolf Hitler rose to power. Those threatened by it should have stopped it. If Louis Farrakhan was rising through the American ranks, bells and whistles would be going off. That is not to say that I believe Farrakhan would advocate genocide, but I am fairly certain that the international community with a vested interest in U.S. politics would speak up, particularly Israel.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Position on the Spectrum by Hayley Demanett  

by Hayley Demanett - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:31 AM

I agree with Senator Paul but only up to a point. I agree with what he said in the first video when he made the comment about how would Americans feel if China invaded us and stationed troops here. We obviously wouldn't be happy about it and he said that he believes some people would fight. However, I don't agree with his opinion that America should pretty much stay out of problems other places in the world. I think that we can get involved in other countries but we don't have to use the

military every time that we do. I also like what Senator Keyes said, that America has always been a, "problem solver". I think that it is important for America to get involved or help other countries but not on every issue that they are having.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Reserved  

by Travis Jones - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:37 AM

When the topic of intervening in the rest of the world's issues its rather frustrating to have the US always be the world police, obviously during the isolationistic times around world war 1 and 2 it was a bit different because the closest allies we had, those being in Europe, were deep into war. Plus the fact that Germany tried to convince Mexico to attack the United States certainly seems a reason to break that cycle and intervene. As it relates to today however, I think the US is far too involved in the dealings of other countries within their own borders. The simple fact is people kill other people; it's a fact of the world and human nature. The US thinks it can go play world police and stop anyone from ever killing any of their own citizens. It is not our place to be such a nation and try to stop everything and I wish we were far more isolationist like we had been. Its seems cold to say such a thing, but its reality and its harsh. We need to mind our own business in such affairs sometimes unless directly provoked.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Great Empires  

by Brandon Wiskow - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:01 AM

I am pretty on board with most of Ron Paul's talking points. I believe that the US is becoming spread too thin and is becoming involved in more than it can handle while putting off dealing with some of the major crisis (bank failures, marriage equality) that are happening at home. To continue in such a way will only compound the problems until they become uncontrollable and that is how revolutions happen.

One of the major parallels I can see is how we got involved in the middle east is similar to how we got involved in WW1. We were just minding our own buisness (for the most part) until we got attacked. Then we saw to it that we went all in on war. This goes along with some of what Ron Paul was saying in the first clip. The outcomes and direction were not quite the same however.

The main difference between then and now is our relative position of power in the global world. During that time we were a relatively new world power in the prime of its growth and industrial capacity looking to try and stake a claim on the world. Now we are in a post-industrial phase trying to legitimize the stakes we made in the past.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Great Empires

by Travis Jones - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:31 PM

When you refer to the Middle East I assume you don't include Iraq in that comment? Via the fact the US only went into Afghanistan in post 9/11, the Iraq war wasn't for another two years. Also Operation Iraqi Freedom was a fully different "situation" itself. But never the less I would disagree with your comments on relating the US in WW1 and Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan), the US had a fairly recent history of intervening in a lot of foreign affairs pre 9/11 so to say that we were isolationistic is a bit of stretch, less than a decade prior we had already been in Iraq in the gulf war, and various conflicts post WW1 and WW2. There is yet to be a decade in the US post WW2 where we are not involved in an international conflict. To me that's clear cut the opposite of isolationism.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Thoughts on Ron Paul and foreign policy

by Ryan Unquera - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:50 AM

I really agree with a lot of Ron Pauls thoughts on foreign policy. I think its necessary for us to know what is going on all over the world but we need to protect our borders first like he says. He cares more about the actual state of our nation than how its perceived as a national power with a big military budget that isn't afraid to go to war.

That being said I don't like the idea of not intervening at all, we are the United States of America we can't sit back and wait for someone to attack us before we get involved.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Thoughts on Ron Paul and foreign policy

by Travis Jones - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 12:17 PM

Then what do you think the US should intervene in? I mean besides preventing mass genocide I really think the US needs to remain within its own borders. We should allow countries to govern themselves by their own standards, who are we to declare what is right and wrong? We are just another country in the world.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Action vs. Non-Action

by Sarah Lafferty - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 2:22 PM

After watching the Ron Paul, Alan Keyes and John McCain's video's on their positions of Foreign Policy; I have to stick with my internationalist stance of slight intervention in global affairs. Particularly in regards to the U.S participation in the U.N, on topics such as genocide in Rwanda, for example. Not that the U.S could have stopped the violence in Rwanda's civil war, per say, but we "could have cut it down...and I regret it" says President Clinton. Now the UN is not mandated to intervene in the internal politics of any country unless the crime of genocide is being committed, yet still the Security Council deemed this action "too risky" in the case of Rwanda, as I'm sure Ron Paul would agree. This was despite emphatic pleas for help from Rwanda's UNAMIR commanders. So what is right? Do nothing, or if you happen to be on the UN Security Council like the U.S is, do something about injustice, just hopefully diplomatically more so than militaristically. As Alan Keyes pointed out, international intervention doesn't have to mean military intervention, "America is a nation of nations, a people of many peoples"; we're not a homogeneous population, and in fact many of us have international ties to family abroad and so forth. Furthermore, given the United States intimate involvement in international trade relations and the U.N, I don't think it's possible for the U.S to not participate in international politics.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Robert Sappington - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 6:15 PM

I'm in the middle with Ron Paul. He does make a few good points about places the U.S. intervened, where the U.S. should have not. But then he takes it to the extreme and saying that the U.S. should not get involved in any other countries affairs until it affects us, because its "not likely" that it will. I think hes living in some fantasy world ignoring the last 100+ years of history.

Example: The Korean example, where he says we should not be involved with Korea because the south is 10 times as powerful. He ignores the fact that there are missiles and possibly nuclear ones, aimed at every major city in the South.

Keys makes one of the best points ever with this topic of Intervention. Because the United States is so diverse, there is practically no place in the world that if something bad happened, that would not directly or indirectly affect Americans. Either because of family relations, religious, or other various reasons.

I say Kudos to McCain for bringing up the WWII point. After WWI the U.S. did not get involved with European affairs after the dissatisfaction of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. Because the United States went back to Isolationism, we "allowed" Hitler to come to power, or at least according the to points in the video.

Looking for similarities back then and now are kinda funny. Not only are the scenarios different, but the technology and the people (society) are completely different. A similarity I see is that the U.S. does what the people support, this is

shown back then, as it is now. People got so made about the Treaty after WWI that they wanted no part in it, so we left Europe. The people wanted Americans out of Iraq, so we left.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Francisco Reyes - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:34 PM

I agree with Ron Paul saying that the USA shouldn't be trying to be the world's policeman. Sometimes trying to fix everything can have negative consequences. Like Ron Paul said about Saddam Hussein being an ally once upon a time and turning into an enemy. Sometimes we need to wait and see other's resolve their differences. That being said things like what happened in Germany's Hitler starting to get out of hand and starting to become a threat to us, are justifiable for us to intervene. Things like genocide and other horrible things that happen in the world should be taken care of, but it's not the US responsibility to intervene in such affairs. We need to take care of things here in the states; poverty not only happens in third world countries... it happens here in the states. Terrorism isn't just in Muslim countries; there are groups here in the US that causes problems for us. (KKK, Neo Nazis, etc) The government needs to focus on us as a country. We are not a perfect country, so we have no justification to intervene in others affairs because of the power that we believe that we possess. That being said if a private party here in the US wants to help others in other countries they can intervene, but with their own resources and not those of the government.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Taxation by the Federa...\)](#)

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

