



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, 11:03 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:

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



Looking at Foreign Policy realistically

by Megan Russell - Monday, April 22, 2013, 9:32 PM

Although Ron Paul can make some valid arguments, it's hard not to notice he's not thinking realistically about a lot of the issues he discusses. I can see where he is

coming from by leaving countries to their own business, I too believe it is wrong to invade a country and tell them how to live. I do not however agree that all issues over seas shouldn't pertain to America. As mentioned in the second video, Former Ambassador Alan Keys states, "I think a lot of the suggestions made in terms of how we get involved are good ones; we don't have to send troops, but we need to support and re-enforce the sense of local, regional responsibility, for both humanitarian and military order." He also says that someone in America will always grieve for those unfortunate over seas. It isn't our place to try and force our culture and way of life into another society, but it is our duty as people to take care of each other and our well-being.

The point of the League of Nations was to prevent any future wars; we can clearly see that history repeats itself. The league was disassembled before World War II after several countries withdrew their participation. Their attempt to negotiate problems between countries with words not war was proved incapable of preventing aggression from the Axis Alliance. Which then lead to Germany's uprising in WWII.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Looking at Foreign Policy realistically

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 4:01 PM

Megan-

I think that you make some really good points here. I also agree that to a point countries need to take care of themselves first and other nations second, if needed. I think that it is important that we help each other, definitely, but we all need to help ourselves first. I honestly do not think there is a right for a country to invade and take over another country. I believe that if a country needs help re-building, then help, but don't take the country and try to change it's people. So I agree with you there as well. You picked out some great pieces to bring to light, they are important factors!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



We do not NEED to be there

by Joshua Reay - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:12 AM

I feel like watching these videos has made me believe what Ron Paul is trying to say. We continually send aid and people to countries that are involved in boarder disputes and civil wars and try to American-ize them. We try to make them more like us because we believe that we are the perfect country. I don't really believe this. Our unemployment numbers and poverty levels are outrageous. Our national debt is more than any country should ever be allowed to have. We have bombs going off literally in our streets in broad daylight (obviously not every day and nothing close to what Lybia is going through).

Isolationism would completely cut us off from the rest of the world, that is not what Ron Paul is calling for. There is a difference between a little boarder war and when a dictator starts to take over the whole of Europe. Learning from WWII, I think we would know when to intervien.

Ron Paul doesn't want us completely cut off from the rest of the world. He still wants us to have talks and trades with foriegn countries, no travel restrictions, foriegn work forces. But the fact that we have bases and troops in so many different countries is what irritates Paul. We don't need them there, we could use them here in the United States more effectively.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Reality vs Idealism in Foreign Policy

by Thomas Comings - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:18 AM

War is expensive. American lives are lost, money is funneled into an already-powerful industry, and in a lot of cases it's hard to argue that it really leaves the world in a better position afterwards. It's messy all around. Imagine if the money, technology, and manpower that is the US Military was all rerouted to internal infrustructure building, education of the population, and helping those in need -- in that case our country may be far better off than in is today.

In reality, however, the US hasn't had the ability to be non-interventionalist for over 100 years. As our industrial power and political position status grew in the world, we were forced out of our shell and into new economic and politcal alliances as one of the new world powers.

Another factor that led to American often seeming like "the world's police force" is an ideal shift that happened along with the growing power of the US. A largely protestant nation that believed in helping those less fortunate, the public and many politicians (Including Woodrow Wilson) held that if there were problems around the world, American idealism, prosperity and might could right even the greatest wrong. With its new power and strong ideals, it became unrealistic to America to remain isolated and non-interventionist, no matter how economically reasonable it remains.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Reality vs Idealism in Foreign Policy

by Barry Sommer - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 7:09 AM

Jujst to address your point of America being the worlds policeman, it may have started out as a Protestant ideal to help everyone, it quickly turned into a daily patrol, looking for danger spots, and more imporotantly responding to a call for help. Today, when ever something untoward happens, the call goes out for the US to come and help. We respond quickly, sometimes we are the ONLY

response, and with the power we have we can, and do fix problems when asked. Just look at any natural disaster anywhere in the world and you will see American aid there. We don't say no, and that may be one of our follies today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Reality vs Idealism in Foreign Policy

by Chazz Milner - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 8:30 PM

It may be a folly of the US to respond so quickly to calls of help. We feel like terrible people if we say no to someone or some country in need. It would definitely turn heads if we started saying no. However, I understood Ron Paul to be against "helping" other countries when they haven't asked for help and it is therefore not our place to "help"(forcefully). Sending aid to natural disaster areas around the world is a different topic and one he didn't seem to be against. There is that saying "If you give a man a fish you feed him for a day, if you teach a man to fish he he can feed himself for the rest of his life." Other countries just might be capable of dealing with their stuff if we didn't step in the way.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The US can still promote it's values without intervention

by Francisco Gomez - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 10:44 PM

I can agree with Ron Paul about the government needs to bring our entire troops home and focus on our economy rather than be involved in a dispute or war. Why are we not heeding Mr. Paul's advice? We can still trade and sell others, but America needs to focus on it's own issues before we can be involved with foreign problems. I am equally sad that over Treaty of Versailles being outright rejected by many. Wilson's 14 points would have solved many of the problems the world has today. If Wilson would have just respected the people who were disagree with him, he would have gotten the support he needed to get the Treaty of Versailles ratified. The question is can the US listen to sound advice even if it's from the past?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The US can still promote it's values without intervention

by Leah Livesay - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:20 PM

I agree with you as well. I don't think that there is a major threat to anyone at this time and therefore we should bring our troops home. We don't have the finances to keep troops over there for no reason! If we don't start paying attention to ourselves and our economy, we are going to be the ones in need of

another nations help! If there was a serious reason for our troops to be there right now I would understand, but there isn't.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Diplomacy and military intervention are the tools of foreign policy

by Michael Maxey - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 9:28 PM

Ron Paul is right, diplomacy is best suited for dealing with foreign policies and letting the region where the trouble is occurring deal with the instigators. Of course he is wrong when it comes to using force, because it helps stabilize a region that our allies occupy, by means do it only by following moral and constitutional guidelines which also helps protect our interest's. I do agree that the United States shouldn't be the world's police, and doing so drains our resources and economy, however doing the right thing for humanitarian needs is justly compensated by using force. Ron Paul's remarks toward Senator McCain were insensitive considering that McCain spent 5 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam. Non-intervention does not work especially in today's world, where the world is connected economically, and I don't think Ron Paul could see that, and neither did our founding fathers or imagine it when they drafted up the U.S. Constitution.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



When Diplomacy Fails, Might Prevails.

by Michael Maxey - Friday, April 26, 2013, 10:35 AM

Non-intervention in foreign policies does not work in today's society as Ron Paul would like to think, because some people won't follow policies that were set up by the international community, and WWI is a great example of that. When the Germans started using submarine warfare and were sinking ships, policies were put into place to restrict such practice, but after several violations of these policies by the Germans an intervention had to be made. The Germans would have devastated Europe even more if the U.S. hadn't jumped into the fight against them. Ron Paul's reasoning for not intervening in foreign affairs makes some good points, but fails to note that not everyone will participate with diplomacy, because when diplomacy fails force becomes the next option. And that could be said the same about the situation that took place during WWI with the Germans. Mr. Paul's stand seems to be that of someone who supports isolationism and non-intervention of foreign affairs, which is impossible if we are to protect U.S. interest's and the moral obligation to our fellow human beings which as Alan Keyes would say whom we are universally connected to in more ways than one. Intervention in today's world is powered by economics and stabilization of regions militarily to keep foreign relations stable. The worst thing that was done after WWI was America isolating itself again, which by the time WWII starts becomes evidently clear isolationism is a problem and foreign

policies of intervention need to be put in place. The failure to ratify the treaty and not joining the League of Nations led to WWII in Germany once again violated multiple policies that eventually called for American intervention. Ron Paul is exactly like Woodrow Wilson when it comes to foreign relations, and that's not to get involved by being the world's police. I do agree with Ron Paul on one thing, and that is justification needs to be met before using force in intervening in foreign affairs. Germany definitely got what it deserved after WWI, but punishment could have been done differently to prevent the rise of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Regime only if American politicians had agreed to join the League of Nations or ratified a treaty with them. Of course today we have U.S. representatives in the United Nations Organization to help establish foreign policies for intervention and diplomacy. Again Keyes, was right we do need to stay involved in foreign affairs for economic and humanitarian reasons, even if the situation doesn't call for military action.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: When Diplomacy Fails, Might Prevails.

by Chazz Milner - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 8:49 PM

I also believe Alan Keyes made a very strong point on humanitarian issues around the world and that we all are universally connected. The line between being a protector against genocide and simply not agreeing with another country's beliefs, rituals, or religion and how they might choose to behave is the issue that should be addressed because we have gotten involved, forcefully, when it was not our place and not a matter of genocide before. I really liked Ron Paul's comment on how the United States was able to talk to the Soviets when they had nuclear missiles 90 miles off our shore but we talked with them, we didn't invade them to get rid of the missiles. We got rid of ours and they got rid of theirs. He said its the lack of diplomacy that is the problem, not the weapons themselves.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Zhongheng Wang - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:51 PM

After looking at the video, i agree with Paul's opinion. America should pay more attention on its own economy. Although America is strong and can trade with others, even help others. However, america has their own problem with economy now. They should pay more attention on their own economy. They can still trade with others, but not use most of tax to do that. And since the world economy is kind of terrible now, focus on own country economy is not a bad idea.

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



To Intervene, or to NOT Intervene?

by Leah Livesay - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:16 PM

I think that Ron Paul definitely made some very good points, although I cannot say I agree with everything he had to say. There are limits and boundaries when it comes to intervening in other nations business. Ron Paul talked about how the U.S. is going broke, which we are very much in debt. With that, we shouldn't really be going out to other countries spending money we don't have to put troops out there and basically force ourselves and our ways onto the people. We don't have a right to do that, nor does it say anywhere that it is our job or duty to run to every call of others. However, I do think that there are situations where someone does need to step in and do something. For example, Hitler, he needed to be taken out of power long before he was. I think that if there are inhumane happenings going on that they need to be stopped. No one has the right to kill, starve, degrade, etc. and as humans, we know that it is not alright, we know that something needs to be done. I don't think that bombing the middle east was necessary to find one man, or even one group. I think that there are more peaceful ways of going about any situation almost, innocent people should never have to die. This is such a tough idea because there are so many factors that make both sides seem right and yet wrong at the same time. If lives are at stake, if people are being tortured and starved, if there are serious threats, then there is a reason to be involved, but for smaller, insignificant situations, we need to just stay here and let other nations figure things out on their own.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Saving the rest of the world

by Laura Wood - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:18 PM

I think that America does pay more attention to other countries then to itself, we have so many other problems in our own country yet were always focused on if the next country is doing okay. I think that we should just focus on ourselves and not worry so much about everyone else. The amount of money that we spend on war and sending troops to other countries could be solving majority of the problems in America.

Sum of ratings:1 (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

