

HST 203: History of the United States Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238)

Home ► My courses ► Spring 2014 ► HST 203 Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238) ► April 21 - April 27

► Forum 2 ► Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy



Search forums

Forum 2

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 - Saturday, April 19, 2014, 5:52 PM

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

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your 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

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Who made us the "world police"?

by Michael Brown - Monday, April 21, 2014, 9:39 PM

I am not going to attempt to use any fancy terminology and isms to explain my point. I also don't believe that someone can make an educated opinion on these issues after reading a chapter and watching 3 videos. I did a tour in Iraq and did not witness any justifiable reason to be there. I have talked with a fellow veteran about his experience guarding oil fields in Iraq. He is also no longer in the U.S. military because he cannot justify what he did, nor can I. We went to war supposedly because of weapons of mass destruction. So, why are troops guarding oil fields in Iraq? Why are troops guarding poppy fields in Afghanistan? I could care less about politics and CNN bullshit. I do agree with Ron Paul.

Opium production in Afghanistan was at an all time low in 2001. It is currently at an all time high. I also know that Afghanistan produces most of the opium in the world. I know that there has been many deaths reported from heroin and a spike in heroin use in America since we invaded. I also know that banksters like Wells Fargo and Bank of America were involved in drug trafficking and Wells Fargo openly admitted it. Any nay sayers can do their

own research and find out for themselves. Coincidence, I think not.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Who made us the "world police"?



by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:27 PM

First of all I would like to thank you for your service to the United States. When It comes down to guarding oil and poppy fields its all about the United States protecting its interests. America is a mass consumer in all produces and we can't always produce enough of what we need for our own citizens. I have not been over there but it seems like a hostile place and support for having troops over there. I would also like to talk about your title on us being the world police. We didn't become that on purpose but with being the number one world power I feel that its good that we are intervening and bring U.S. peace vs some other countries peace. I have personally contemplated on joining our military to fight for what I believe a good cause that our government is trying to bring to the world. The only reason I see for joining is to fight for my country and in turn make sure my family has a same place to live and have their freedom. One reason I haven't joined though is because I personally wouldn't lay down my life for Obama because of some of his political views and personal family members that did serve. When he claimed that he killed Bin Laden I strongly disagreed because those troops risked their lives in taking a order from him. People on our military need to get more praise then any president who plays God with their lives but that is not always the case. Being on the ground and seeing things must be hard when the news deludes the truth to whats truly happening.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Isolationism is the Best Option



by Blake Allen - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 12:29 AM

The way I see it, the United States should not ever feel obligated to involve itself in the happenings of the rest of the world. Unfortunately, we just love to dip our proverbial spoon in everyone else's soup. I've never been able to grasp the obligation in our government's mind to assist other countries in poverty or at civil war. It is not our responsibility, we have far too many onshore problems to be worrying about offshore problems.

The kind of money the US doles out to other countries and it's just staggering to me. After reading this article <http://www.forbes.com/sites/brianwingfield/2011/01/29/making-sense-of-u-s-foreign-aid-to-egypt-and-elsewhere/> from Forbes, it frustrated me even more. He goes on to say at the end of the article that money spent on foreign aid is only about 2% of the federal budget, but I still think that's too much. Our government has a debt of \$17 trillion dollars, but still thinks it's a good idea to give money to other countries to promote "peace and security." Really? I say again, why is that our responsibility?

I get that people will claim we need to make alliances around the world, but if we don't get involved with the rest of the world's problems, why would we need those alliances? I have no problem with war, I just think it's idiotic to get involved in wars that aren't our fights, and

don't believe we should ever get involved in foreign issues unless we are directly attacked or affected.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



we have our own problems

by Jaalen Johnson - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 9:16 AM

I believe that we are not required to intervene in the worlds problems when the US can't control their own. We continually choose to step in to problems that aren't our own. Which in turn creates more problems for the United States.

The US also believes that we NEED to gain as many alliances as possible. Which I personally think makes us look desperate and some sort of stupid. I was always taught "don't get involved where you don't need to be involved", and the US certainly hasn't lived by that.

We also fork over tons of money just to build up a debt that has turned in to over a trillion dollars today. Which I think speaks for itself: IDIOTIC.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: we have our own problems

by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:41 PM

I disagree with pretty much everything you say. First intervening may stop other things from getting out of control. It becomes a snow ball effect if something is not done about it. Over in the war the Taliban uses U.S. morals to their advantage with using women and children as human body shields which makes me sick. Second when you state that we can't control our own problems I would like to know which ones your taking about. You state our national debt but are completely unaware of what that money is being spent on it seems. Third you state that we "NEED" to gain as many alliances as possible. I have never heard anything of that sort and would like to know your source. That might make us look desperate but also it can be a way to stop conflict. Also if we need to trade goods with another nation having good peace relations might help. I don't think you could back up anything you state.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Going out on a Limb

by Elizabeth Atkerson - Wednesday, April 23, 2014, 8:29 PM

"With great power comes great responsibility." Spider-man's uncle Ben May not be the most respected historian ever, but I think that his underlying message can apply to our foreign policy as well.

Recently, I took a group of seventh graders to listen to two holocaust survivors. It was with

tears in their eyes that they explained the responsibility we have to each other to resolve the evils of this world. Les Aigner started his speech by saying to the kids that he thanked them for the actions of their grandfathers and great grandfathers who liberated him from Hell.

It's stories like his that make me stand tall and declare that I will always stand for those who are being persecuted. I know that I live in a country with great wealth, great strength and great responsibility to do the same. Do I think that we should police every international tiff, no. Do I think that we have both a moral and political obligation to stand up for the weak, absolutely. Do I also respect the fact that we are fed what others want us to hear in order to play on the heart strings of folks like me, FOR SURE!

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A Strong Foundation is Key

by Roy Fernandez - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 5:05 PM

I agree with having a moral obligation to help others in need, such as weaker, struggling nations, while we are larger and more prosperous and generally better off. Where it becomes an issue though, is the fact that it costs us billions of dollars to fund our troops, which further increases our national debt. So although it is morally ideal to help those that are in desperate need, at the end of the day we have to worry about ourselves first to sustain a strong foundation, and to prevent our nation from collapsing from within. One of the reasons why the Roman Empire collapsed in the first place was due to overexpansion and military overspending. While all their funds were going toward the military, resources were also being expended rapidly and the nation's core needs were neglected, leading to its inevitable demise.

<http://www.cfr.org/defense-budget/trends-us-military-spending/p28855>

<http://www.history.com/news/history-lists/8-reasons-why-rome-fell>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Going out on a Limb

by Mitchell West - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:29 PM

Great quote. while i agree that we should help others in times of need such as haiti and japan i think we should focus at home, we are always thinking in terms of the world and not in terms of the state or city. there is hell on our streets, men starving and homeless, children being beaten. i know the homeless and poor will always be with us but what about those that wish to change but cant without help? what about the children? what happens when we offer help but find we have nothing to give? what would that say about our nation? i think we should take care of ourselves before we worry about other nations that are fairing fine without us but when a disaster strikes then we help

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



Re: Going out on a Limb



by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:53 PM

In high school I was forced to watch Schindler's List but was glad to have seen it. I believe if you haven't seen this movie you should. It pretty much proves, at least to me, that world involvement by the U.S. is key. The holocaust was a horrific event in history and I am truly sorry for all those victims. In Schindler's List and in Band of Brothers it points out how messed up those camps were but how even German citizens were in denial of what was truly happening. We are all in this world and we can be in denial of what is happening in our world. If you state that that a problem needs to be fixed by its own people I won't take you serious. We are sometimes blind to our own right in the U.S. and to other right that people have in other countries. People that are oppressed in these other countries can't help themselves and that were we come in to protect the weak.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Going out on a Limb



by Kevin Wright - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:45 PM

what about the horrible things Russia does to its own people or the people in the countries it invades/occupies. Or how we know the brutal dictatorship in North Korea but don't do anything about it. I think maybe if we get Spielberg to direct a movie about what is going on in those countries or what has happened in those countries in the past maybe we will go to war and right those wrongs we forgot to do in the past. What about what's going on with Ukraine and Russia. Do you think the US has any authority to get involved? Maybe someone will think we have something to do with it because of some crazy idea like the Olympics were held in Russia and since the United States is competing in the Olympics, and since we have Americans in Russia we have the authority to intervene with this Ukraine/ Russia border dispute. It seems like the countries with extreme radical ideas and can competently run a country enough to keep the leading economic countries from stopping them, maybe there is something else going on than the question of whether or not we need to be involved in international affairs. None of us know what goes on behind the scenes so none of us can really understand why the countries do the things they do these days.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Can't We Just All Get Along?



by Miranda Townsend - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 12:02 AM

There are parts of both sides of this issue that agree with. I do not personally agree with recent US involvement in foreign affairs, especially stationing our troops in places where we really have no business being. However, as raised in the American Exceptionalism forum

last week, I do believe our country does have a certain standard to strive to uphold.

The explosive nature of our nation's racial and economic issues were very intense after WWI. Our book's descriptions of race riots, lynchings, and mass strikes were some of the tumultuous things characterized by this time period.

In more recent times things have not been as extreme here in the US. But there are some similarities as in the racial tension and racism seen in our country towards middle eastern people after the 9/11 attack.

Many of the positions brought up in the Ron Paul interview vs. Alan Key's in the debate are both fairly extreme. Where Ron Paul called for bringing home most if not all of our troops, Key is at the complete other end of the spectrum. Key believes it is our American duty to uphold this "universal mission" and help those less fortunate.

While there are appealing merits to both positions I wish our government could make some kind of a compromise that would uphold some of the moral issues while not overstepping our boundaries and trying to become the world police.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Teamwork



by Jesse Flannery - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:56 AM

You're definitely right about Ron Paul, and Keyes being on opposite ends of the spectrum. It sounds like all three candidates are more about arguing their points than coming to any sort of agreement on any topics anymore. There seems to be this push for all for nothing, and no unification or teamwork. It would be nice if our government, and politicians would try working together to resolve issues a little more often. I understand that people will always disagree on issues, but a constant game of tug of will definitely get us nowhere.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Domestic Problems



by Michael Brown - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 7:55 PM

The United States has plenty of problems. Currently, our debt is over 17 trillion dollars(2) . The U.S. Has doled out money to various countries for various reasons. The healthcare system in America in desperate need of reform. Other countries are doing far better in that area than we are (1). Our education system is in desperate need of improvement (3). Many middle schools and high schools have been shut down nationwide due to budget cuts, but apparently we have money to give to other nations. Poverty levels in America are high(4). I think that our priorities are wrong. We need to take care of our own problems before running to save other countries and help them out. We have troops stationed all over the world ready to deploy. I appreciate the fact that I live in a country that is capable of handling their own when it comes to war, but I do not like poor healthcare sytems, poor education systems, and high poverty levels. We need more balance. I think it is time we start to get our priorities straight and taking care of our people here at home.

1. <http://www.commonwealthfund.org/News/News-Releases/2010/Jun/US-Ranks-Last-Among-Seven-Countries.aspx>.
2. <http://www.usdebtclock.org/>
3. <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/12/03/american-high-school-students-slip-in-global-education-rankings/>
4. <http://www.thenation.com/article/176242/americas-shameful-poverty-stats#>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Strive for more balance



by Miranda Townsend - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:24 PM

You have outlined five very compelling points to support your position. I agree with all of your points especially our country's high debt, high poverty rate, and poor education systems. These are all issues that directly affect us all.

I also really believe that there should be more balance when it comes to our foreign policy. There are so many inconsistencies in the way our government behaves when it comes to our military involvement in foreign countries that I am often confused.

While I do think there are certain situations where war has been warranted, some that Ron Paul talked about. However, in many cases I strongly agree that we should not attempt to be the world police.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Non-intervention or Isolationism?



by Paige Nibley - Friday, April 25, 2014, 1:05 PM

In his interview Ron Paul argues his view that the United States should follow a non-intervention policy, not an Isolationism policy. The difference being that the U.S. should enter war as necessary in defense of an attack. I agree with Ron Paul in that the U.S. should not get involved in conflicts between other countries in order to eliminate problems such a genocide and suffering, but rather focus on issues within our own country. The main reason for limiting United States occupation in other countries, in my opinion, is the cost. I also agree with Ron Paul when he says the U.S. should not take on the role as "world police" because of the great risk of unintended violence as a result of force. Whether or not a country needs our help, most often its citizens are only further angered and disrupted by the occupation of American troops. This resentment of people in other countries can lead to possible violence that we want to avoid. Unnecessary involvement of the United States in conflicts between other nations costs us American money and American lives. I have a hard time agreeing with Paul's order to pull our troops out everywhere; it is far more complicated than that. We must be careful when removing our troops as resulting disorder may cause unnecessary violence and complication.

As a world power we should reserve the right to choose when and what conflicts and wars we enter. This is the main reason that I placed myself under the Strong Reservationist view in regards to foreign policy following WWI. I think that Wilson's fourteen points with a League of Nations could work with a few ratifications. I do not think that the U.S. should require consent of council of other nations as we would no longer have the ability to protect U.S. interests, which is, first and foremost, our duty. Being forced to follow the directions of an international body would remove important functions of our nation's sovereignty. Having to follow directions of an international body would also remove America's ability to only enter a war upon defense, as Ron Paul says is the only justifiable reason. Despite his obvious opposition to Paul, the League of Nations would work against the foreign policy presented by John McCain as well. In order to act as a world police the United States could under no circumstances take orders from an international body. For different reasons, both Paul and McCain would oppose the League of Nations with out considerable adjustments. But could the league exist under American control? It seems to me that convincing an international body of the importance of American control would be impossible, especially during a period when European and Asian countries alike were fighting to become continental and world powers in their own right. Only Alan Keyes seems to agree to the ideals of the original league in his argument that the U.S. is "a people of many people's" and that we must reinforce the universal mission for humanitarianism and military order around the world.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Defining Help

by Jesse Flannery - Friday, April 25, 2014, 8:44 PM

I would have to say for the most part I agree with Ron Paul. I don't believe we should be using force to "help" other countries. I would say staying at home and focusing on our many problems would be a better use of our money. On the other hand though. I don't believe we should sit back and watch humans suffer. We don't teach our children to sit back and watch other kids be bullied. How can we justify watching a whole group of people be bullied and not step up. I would hate to support an invalid occupation of another country and I don't think we should be going in and overthrowing governments. Although I definitely don't feel right knowing other people are dying and we could do something to stop it. If a country asked for our help I would hope we wouldn't turn our back on them. There is definitely a difference between going to aid another country, and spreading democracy to "help" another country. This would be the only reason I would want to intervene in other countries affairs.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Defining Help

by Michael Brown - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 1:23 PM

It will be hard to determine what is really happening overseas in other countries when you have yellow journalism feeding you information on those topics prior to our

intervention or aid. If CNN, for example, tells us that there are people suffering in another country, I myself question the information and wonder if it is in fact the way that they say it is. I don't have any relatives or know anyone in any other countries to find out what is going on first hand, so the only way I can find out is from major media websites. I just don't know if I can trust them and if these issues are as bad as they are cracked up to be in order for me to support troops or other aid going in to help them. Historically speaking, we have used yellow journalism before and we still use it today.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Technology

by Jesse Flannery - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:06 PM

I agree that we shouldn't just be believing everything the major media sources are telling us. With all the available technology today I feel like we should be using it to get the real story for ourselves. I'm not saying we do regularly, but it is a possibility now. We need to take advantage of the new technologies available to us. We have the power to get the real story now. I am a firm believer in reading past just what the media portrays to us. Everyone is trying to sway our minds, but with the instantaneous communications we have we can and should have the ability to get information for ourselves. Part of getting the power back into the peoples hands is having the knowledge to use it positively.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Defining Help

by Alexis Adair - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:33 PM

I agree with a lot you are saying here. I feel that there is no need, in your words, to force "help." I as much as the next person would rather have a troops home instead of being somewhere where they are not needed. However, I do feel that if we are in a position to help than we should not feel obligated to take care of other countries, but responsible to give them the aid they need. Like Michael said though, we really don't know what's going on overseas it all comes down to yellow journalism and the story will stay and continue to stay in their hands.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Non-intervention vs. Isolationism

by Roy Fernandez - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 4:31 PM

Based on the video clips, and being on the right side of the spectrum myself, I agree with Ron Paul's views on non-intervention and withdrawing the US troops from other countries. I believe that we need to fortify our own people first before attempting to assist other nations by sending our troops overseas and expending our resources. Yes, we are a "people of

many peoples” as Alan Keyes stated, being so racially diverse, but we also need to keep in mind that we are our own separate entity and acknowledge that we have issues of our own that must be addressed first. Also, having the most powerful military and a strong government doesn’t necessarily give us the right to become the “world’s policemen.” As Paul mentions, not only will our intervention in foreign disputes cause those countries to react and possibly retaliate, but ultimately it will cost us valuable assets. I also approve of Ron Paul emphasizing his stand for non-intervention as a foreign policy and not being an Isolationist, as John McCain claimed he was. Paul’s views are similar to those of Lodge because of their Reservationist ideology. They acknowledged that the United States must have a strong foreign policy but they also stressed on keeping America independent and fortifying her as a nation first and foremost. The greatest difference between the two though would be Lodge’s belief of the United States having to establish its influence among other countries through a strong military and a large navy. He believed it was America’s role to become a world leader through superior leadership and militarism.

(So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History’s Villains? By Thomas Fleming)

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The League of Nations

by Kevin Wright - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:41 PM

I origionally thought I was a irreconcilable but the more I read I find myself changing my opinion. I think I am in the middle of a strong reservationalists to a mild reservationists.

The idea of a League of Nations or a United Nations doesn't work with The United Statese. I think that it works in Europe because of the close proximity of all the countries. Could there be a similar type of alliance on the other side of the Atlantic with Mexico and Canada as well as South America? I'm not sure if there is one now. I seems like the league of nations is a way for many countries to come together against all the other countries and deciding to go to war. However if the League of Nations was set up as a non-violent group like the red cross or other peace keeping entities and they only dealt with helping the people of the country. Would this be Green peace? The idea that the other countries I have a treaty that says I have to go to war if my ally does is not an easy one to have to understand let alone follow through with.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I agree with Ron Paul.....

by Kevin Wright - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:30 PM

I find myself a bit confused on my stance of the United States and their involvement with international affairs. I agree with what Ron Paul is saying and I understand why he is saying what he is saying. The Government has to keep the best intrests in mind and when we get involved with civil wars of other coutries our responsibilites get clouded. I don't know if I like what he said about the genocide. I do belive there should be exceptions to what we should get involved with. Although if I make this exception it opens up a whole world of possiblities the US government can do with that exception. I don't think Ron Paul is as hertless as he

sounded in the interview I do believe that his stance has to be firm on what he believes otherwise he won't be taken seriously. I think the only reason Ron Paul doesn't get as much applause for what he says is because they wanted to hear something that made them feel like we were doing the right thing in other countries. When McCain rebuttles he doesn't even say anything of substance that even touches Paul or Keyes.

Sum of ratings:1 (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)

[i Moodle Docs for this page](#)

