



Search forums

## Forum 2

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move



### Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, April 18, 2015, 10:57 AM

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


After studying the required materials, address the various questions. For purposes of encouraging discussion, you should group your responses into 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

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](#)



### Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy

by Delaney Crook - Sunday, April 19, 2015, 4:28 PM


After watching all three video clips regarding Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy, as well as having the information from chapter 23 in the text, it has come to my attention that each politician in the clips all presented valid arguments, and broadened my perspective of this issue.

Ron Paul presented the idea that we should not intervene in foreign policy. He is the only Republican that believes that we should not be at war. He claims that "it is our responsibility to help others as individual people, but not as a nation to spread out goodness." He says that "war is justifiable if we are attacked and in defense, but there is no moral reason to start a war." He then discusses the details of 9-11 and our role in the aftermath of the event. He further claims that many other wars are completely unjustified and we should not be involved. At first, I was appalled by the idea of not using our power and ability to help others around the world, no matter what the circumstance. It is my first inclination to help others and serve for others as an individual. However, the more information I gathered regarding the issue, I began to be persuaded by Paul's points. While I do still believe there are times when it is necessary and justified for us to assert ourselves in foreign policy, there are times when we, as a nation, like to use our power and abilities too much and too often, and it gets not only our nation in trouble, but other nations as well. I would not say that I am completely convinced by Paul's argument, but I do understand and agree with some of his points made.

Paul's point of view as well as the other arguments proposed by the other politicians relates to our study of World War I, the Treaty of Versailles, and the League of Nations. Our involvement in World War I would be considered completely unnecessary and unjustified according to Paul. He would claim that we had no reason to join the Triple Entente, because we were not attacked, nor in defense. While this is true, and it may have been uncertain at first if it was necessary for us to join, in hindsight bias, our involvement in the war, not only helped other countries, but it helped us as a nation. Reading on into chapter 24, prosperity and optimism shortly followed the end of the war for the United States. I would have to believe that our involvement in this particular was for the benefit of not only our nation, but others as well, however, I am not completely convinced that we need to be involved as much as we are with foreign policy.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



**Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy**


by [Adam Graves](#) - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 4:49 PM

Well worded as usual, good points. I can see you fall in the Humanity spectrum as a bit of a romantic, and find myself leaning that direction as well. I tend to think that helping people is the right thing to do, and tend to think that America’s intervention in foreign matters always as a price and for the government some sort of incentive. But unfortunately the only thing I see or hear about is the nation’s budget problems and how America has plenty of things that should be fixed before spending valuable money on other nations.

The one point you made about Paul thinking the U.S. involvement in WW1 was unjust, I feel might be inaccurate as America did lose American’s in the sinking of the Lusitania and that might be grounds to go after who were responsible. Ron Paul did vote for military intervention in Iraq to go after Saddam Hussein, although he disagreed with how things were handled once we got involved. I think Paul mainly wants America to take a larger look into why, when and how involved America should be in foreign affairs that don’t directly affect the U.S.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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




**Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy**

by [Benjamin Bross](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 4:37 PM

Personally, I believe Ron Paul is in the wrong in his belief of Non-intervention. While I see where he is coming from, I believe that it is part of the United State's duty as a world power to help in other countries. Paul would have being a very strong opponent to sending troops to the western front in WW1. However, when you look at what the United States did in the war, we helped our allies in the best way we could. While we may have not been attacked at home, the weakening of your allies is always a blow to a nation. Also, directly after the war America was actually becoming a better and better place economically until the Great Depression. While it may not be in the soldiers best interests to deploy troops to a war where the United States isn't in direct danger, it is in the countries best interest to do so. The more allies a country has, the better chance your country stands if it ever is attacked. One of the best ways to make allies is to help another country in a war and the United States was able to do that in WW1.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



**Non Intervention as a U.S. Foreign Policy**

by [Cody Souza](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 10:25 PM

I agree with the idea that we should help out our allies to the best of our abilities. However, I think that the help the U.S. offers should be carefully considered before being put into action. I also believe the U.S. should help in foreign affairs to help people, but refrain from pushing unwanted American beliefs or customs onto a people who do not wish to have them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: Non Intervention as a U.S. Foreign Policy**

by [Mariah Turner-Macy](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 3:49 PM

I definitely agree with you on some of what you have posted to this forum. I think pushing belief or customs onto people who do not wish to have them is cynical and is just a form of human interaction, whether they are in small or larger groups. People have an opinion that they consider a belief, and if challenged, then a debate tends to happen and each side tries to gather facts to prove why their view is "right/correct". Sometimes, even the truth gets lost with the desire to win and persuade an individual or groups of individuals why their beliefs are wrong. I think this example can be found in early history as well as present day experiences.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy**

by [Aj Glessner](#) - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 5:10 PM

While I see where you are coming from. And I agree that the US should use it's world power status to help troubled nations, I don't think armed soldiers and bombs are the best way to do that. It has been said many times in class that

economic warfare can be just as effective if not more effective than armed combat. I think that the US could do well to learn from that and I think it would have been an effective strategy in WWI as well.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)  [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy**

by [Yanshu Li](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 5:50 PM

I believe the United States has the responsibility to help other countries, because the military of USA is powerful. However, I don't believe it is fine to send army into other countries. Every country is independence in political and military, and it is immoral to get involved.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)  [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Make allies not war.**

by [James Haynes](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 9:12 PM

I would have to say I agree with Ron Paul's views The U.S. has no right to impose our beliefs on other countries. The United States should focus on taking care of their own people first. However, our policies of helping out our allies when they are in need of help is crucial to the survival of the United States. Helping other countries that want to be helped is a good thing because if we ever need help they will be there for us. I do not believe that removing our troops from other countries is a bad thing and I don't believe it is isolationism. I think that being in other countries and forcing our beliefs on them and the American way is what causes other countries to not like the United States. Therefore causing a war that has lasted way to long.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)  [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Re: Non-intervention as a Foreign Policy**

by [Tristan Ivie](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 9:39 PM

As much as I love Paul's ideas on domestic issues, I just can not get behind his foreign policy. I have listened to Paul and tried mightily but failed to agree with it. There are certain aspects I can get behind. In the videos. Paul talks about making defense stronger. A continued effort to keeping America's military defense strong is something always we should all get behind. Also, not as much military involvement around the world sounds refreshing. HOWEVER, I would feel ashamed if we never helped in the fight against Hitler across the pond. Right now, we need a clear plan to stop the killing, burning, and torment of eastern Christians by ISIS. If America does not intervene in the world, radical groups/leaders will spread evil and kill throughout the world at a greater rate.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)  [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Ron Paul's Take on Foreign Policy**

by [Kylee O'Connor](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 10:03 PM

After watching the video clips regarding Ron Paul and non-intervention as a foreign policy, I am still very torn on this issue. While at times what Paul says about not intervening sounds terrible, at other times I feel like it is best to have solid national security and use the United States' powers only for the Unites States. Essentially, non-intervention means that the U.S. is not taking advantage of its resources and allowing poor, ill-powered countries to fend for themselves and to me, that just seems wrong. On the other hand, why should it be the United State's job to sacrifice its troops and resources for another country? There are pros and cons to each side, but in the end I feel that it is the United States' moral obligation to help other, smaller nations in need.

During Paul's interview on ABC News, when asked about intervening during genocides or other mass murders, he stated, "I think it's a tragedy and we can have a moral statement, but you can't use force of arms to invade other countries to make them better people. Our job is to make us better people." After hearing that I had two very opposite reactions. First of all, I thought that his answer was rational and made sense. Yes, it would be good to show the United States' support and disapproval of genocide in a statement. Then we show what side we are on without sending our troops. On the other hand, I thought about the Rwandan Genocide and how awful that was. When learning about it in ninth grade, I couldn't believe that the U.S. hadn't intervened more to stop the extremely inhumane acts of manslaughter going on to the Tutsis by the Hutu people. How could the U.S., with all its vast resources and powerhouse military, not send troops to stop the killings? I guess

after seeing pictures, videos, and watching the movie *Hotel Rwanda*, it is very easy to support intervention. At the same time, it is very easy to stay home, in the perfect U.S., and pretend like nothing is happening-It's just morally wrong.

Ron Paul also mentioned that many wars that the U.S. has been in have been unjustifiable, that "if you're attacked, you have the right and obligation to defend out country...I do not believe that there is a moral justification to start a war." In relation to our current studies in chapter 23, WWI might be completely "unjustifiable" according to Senator Paul; however, there could have been some reasoning with the sinking of the Lusitania by the Germans and the interception of the Zimmerman note, but there was no real threat to homeland security that caused the U.S. to get involved in WWI. In hindsight, I think that it was good and necessary that the U.S. finally get involved in the war and help the Allied powers.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



**Reason with the unreasonable**

by [Samuel Black](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 11:03 PM

Ron Paul continues to make the claim that it is our lack of diplomacy that is our nations downfall. My question is how do you reason with unreasonable people? How do you have a logical conversation with someone who solemnly believes all Americans (or Jews or Christians or any other single group) should die just because, and are willing to commit suicide to do kill. While I believe we should let countries deal with their own problems. We cannot be Americans if we allow genocide to be nothing more to us than a "moral authority for individuals" only. It appalls me that Ron said that there is "no moral authority" to protect innocent civilians who are victims of genocide.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



**Re: Reason with the unreasonable**

by [Tristan Ivie](#) - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 2:26 PM

When listening to the video I remember Ron talking about this. "We need to just talk to them." I must of spaced this when making my first forum post, because you are absolutely right. There is nothing the US could say to the people that want us dead. They want us dead because of our religions and ideas. Doesn't it make you shake your head when Paul talks about not defending genocide victims? It should be everyone in the world's moral authority when people are killing people just because of their ethnicity.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: Reason with the unreasonable**

by [Mariah Turner-Macy](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 3:59 PM

Instead of asking the question, "how do you reason with unreasonable people?", you should ask, "why are beliefs solemnly a cause for reaction?". I think it is obvious why we cannot reason with unreasonable people, because they believe that their view is correct. I complete agree with your statement on genocide, but then again it's just a view that we find fitting for ourselves that I'm sure others would disagree with. I don't agree with Ron Paul when he says that we lack diplomacy and that's the downfall of our nation, but I think based on our biological, psyche, and social environments our belief/moral systems are all different from one another. Any outside influence to try and change our minds otherwise seems to result in some type of argument/debate.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**is foreign policy wrong?**

by [Katherine Potter](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 11:08 PM

After watching the videos and Ron Pauls argument. I would have to agree with Ron Paul on how we are only causing greater problems by spreading are good. If we want to help that is great but it should not take a complete army and killing innocent people to try and spread are politics and beliefs.

It is a good thing to help other country's but first we should focus on making are own nation and country a better place to live. We are trying to help other nations even though we are in a state of depression. Its not all about trying to be the greatest power its about showing that we are a great nation and can do good things within are homeland and within other country's without making the people of that nation to feel threatened.

We should never start a war the only time we should be at war is if we are invaded or after those who have caused wrong to us by attacking us.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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




**Re: is foreign policy wrong?**

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 4:56 PM

While I agree with your thoughts that it should not take a complete army and killing innocent people to try and speed our politics and beliefs, and help other countries, I do believe that we as a nation are much better off than many other nations around the world, even in our state of depression, and for that matter we should use our abilities and power to help those nations. I think it is a fine line and a fine balance between when and how much we should use our abilities to help other and spread foreign policy, but I do not think there we should never do so.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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




**Re: is foreign policy wrong?**

by [Katherine Potter](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 9:16 PM

Yes i agree we should help how we can but we should t try to change other nations. We are the strongest nation and as such we should set an example of what should be expected from other nations and not hold it over their heads for helping them. You are right there is a fine line between how and when we should help. My question is who gets to choose that fine line and how well it affect us.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: is foreign policy wrong?**

by [Tristan Ivie](#) - Wednesday, April 22, 2015, 1:27 PM

I am no military expert, but I do not think that the reason we send a "complete army" somewhere is to target innocent people. There is no doubt that innocent people have gotten killed, but I do not think most military operation's prime goal is to kill innocent people. In fact, most military operations try to limit civilian interaction and just focus on eliminating or capturing the people that have an intent to harm the soldiers and/or American civilians. I do agree that focusing on us first is the right thing to do.While a stronger military defense and more powerful economics can keep us out of a lot of disputes, however what gets me about Paul's ideas is that we could not come to the aid of genocide victims. People that are getting killed because of their ethnic group may be the most innocent people ever.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: Our Moral Obligation**

by [Kylee O'Connor](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 12:48 PM

I do agree with you that the United States' number one priority should be our homeland and making it a better place; however, with all of our great resources we cannot just stand by as innocent people in other countries are being murdered in mass numbers. Unlike what Paul said, I believe that it *is* our moral obligation to use all that our great country is fortunate enough to have to help those less fortunate and unable to fend for themselves. Yes, we must never start a war unless there is direct danger to the homeland, but we should join a war, if it is necessary and morally obligating to help a ailing country in need.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Ron Paul**

by [Mirna Becerra](#) - Monday, April 20, 2015, 11:30 PM

I have to say I agree with some of the ideas of Ron Paul. He makes a good point in saying that we should focus on our country first. But I also believe that we are a powerful country and that if we can help then we should. I also think that we should consider our options before we jump straight in to intervene. I think that being such a powerful country, we should help but not make matters worse, we need to evaluate what's worth our money and intervention. And I don't mean to say that one issue is greater than the next but I do think that we don't need to intervene in everything to prove that we are great

and powerful.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply




Re: Ron Paul

by Mariah Turner-Macy - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 4:07 PM

I completely agree, and many lives and family members during war are lost. Providing for a war is also hard on the United States economy. I think it is good to evaluate and make better judgment call before intervening, even though we have a strong military, it is still a dangerous and sometimes a prolonged mission.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Ron Paul

by Katherine Potter - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 11:50 PM

Exactly when I say innocent lives I mean the people that die that don't want to fight and war doesn't just affect the people fighting it affects the family's and friends also. It may not be are military's/army's intensions but we do end a lot of life'a but at the same time we save many. Yes it is right for us to intervene in cases of mass murder but we should try other tactics before war.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Foreign entanglements

by Adam Graves - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 4:25 PM

This is definitely one of those forum topics that I think that people will have strong feelings about. Foreign policy is a debate that is always going to have pros and cons.

Ron Paul makes seem clear points on his side of the debate. Does America need to be getting involved in affairs that aren't ours? I get helping out people that are in need and have no real means to either defend themselves or in a complete unjust situation. This doesn't give the American government the right to interfere with every matter because we have the means to do so. I'm not saying I'm not for military intervention if it's completely unavoidable or can't be settled with democratic diplomacy.

I think that Paul see's that we have a huge defense budget and thinks that we could better appropriate those funds to help America. That we're spreading ourselves too thin. His points about whether America would tolerate another nation's army on American soil for no real reason puts it into perspective. His point about the lack of diplomacy is the real problem. Just because it's morally the right thing to do, doesn't mean we should could get involved.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Foreign entanglements

by Yanshu Li - Thursday, April 23, 2015, 1:37 AM

I also think Paul's views are perspective. USA has enormous debts needs to pay back to other countries, has some incomplete systems need to be improved. The government need to pay more attention on own business instead of in charge with other nation's political affair. It is incorrect and immoral.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Ron Paul has Great Ideas

by Aj Glessner - Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 5:00 PM

I find myself agreeing with Ron Paul on most every issue he discusses. I don't think it's right to send armies into foreign countries and force them to adopt our way of life. When there are atrocities being committed I think it is the world's job to put a stop to that diplomatically if possible. I understand that it is not always possible, and I do believe war can be justified, if not worth the cost. I do not think that military occupation should be the go-to response to foreign issues.



**Re: Ron Paul has Great Ideas**  
by [Yanshu Li](#) - Thursday, April 23, 2015, 1:32 AM

I agreed with you. Military occupation is ridiculous and should not happened anymore. Because the purpose military occupation is obvious --- to start a war. It is incorrect to ask other nations follow USA's living style, and it is also wrong to protect a nation by sending armies into their land.



**It is immoral to involved Foreign Policy**  
by [Yanshu Li](#) - Thursday, April 23, 2015, 1:25 AM

I am totally agreed with Paul's view. It is immoral and unnecessary if America involve other nation's political affair or star a war. It is necessary if USA act as a world policeman, but the duty for the policeman is to ensure the security of the world, help other weak nation and hungry children instead of start a war or involved in other countries political business for own interest and benefit.



**Re: It is immoral to involved Foreign Policy**  
by [Samuel Black](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 11:44 PM

I agree, other countries should be left to run themselves. But I would like to point out, that dropping food on the graves of those "hungry children" will not make them any less hungry. There is a time at which it is no longer about any political benefit, but about the good of all mankind, and the maintaining of our nation's status as a protector of the weak and the oppressed. This is a little hard to compare to WWI because like Joe said in class, a real big reason for us to enter the war was due to our lack of trust in the diplomatic integrity of the Triple Alliance, where as WWII we will probably find to be a mixture of political and human rights motivations.



**Touchy Subject of Non-Intervention**  
by [Kendra Helgeson](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 8:39 PM

Non-intervention is a pretty touchy subject for some. Regarding the first video with the interview of Ron Paul, I agree with what he says to a point. I feel like the United States does do a little too much policing around the world and gets involved in things that shouldn't involve us in the first place, but some things just need to be solved with a little bit of direction. One thing that is very hard to make a decision on whether or not to get involved are border wars. If it's just two countries having a dispute, they can usually solve it on their own. But if it starts involving more than a few then there's obviously something that could be done. With a situation such as genocide, most people will agree that killing a group of people because of their religious beliefs and/or race is completely wrong. If that group of people is having a hard time fighting back and can't do much else, a higher power such as the United States should step in and help. What happened on 9/11 is a great example of deciding how and when to fight back after being attacked by a country. I'm sure no one thought we'd be at the point we are now with that war, but I honestly think there was no other choice at that moment in time. Although there are many times where it is hard for a country to decide if they want to intervene or not, there's no doubt about intervention and non-intervention being a very hard thing to talk about and deal with.



**Re: Touchy Subject of Non-Intervention**  
by [Samuel Black](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 11:30 PM

I agree with you that the topic of American intervention is a very touchy subject, and very hard to have an opinion on that doesn't seem weak or just a compromise. After all, I think most rational people would agree that we need to use diplomacy to solve problems, the issue is where do we draw the line for use of force. I like your commit about 9/11 and how that was an obvious choice if we should go to war or not. I would say that Benghazi was a similar circumstance and chance for force to be used. I think the reason it is such a "touchy" topic is that as a country we are so afraid to offend

anyone and be politically correct, despite whether that correctness is true or not.

I would say this is closely related to the American government after WWI and the Treaty of Versailles. Our government/nation has some sort of ideals that we swear to uphold (Wilson's 14 points) however when it comes time to take action (The Treaty of Versailles) we fall short of the ideals (not signing the treaty/turning our backs on Germany). This is all because somebody got offended, in this case Republican officials. Now they did have valid points about the flaws of this treaty, which we will see come to light in WWII with Germany's propaganda about Poland. But it is easy to see the comparison between what happened after WWI and what is happening to the Christians who ISIS is killing in an attempted genocide, yet I have not heard anything in the media or from our president about it. Or about the canceling of the American Sniper movie showings at multiple universities. We say we have freedom of speech yet we cancel a clearly patriotic movie from being viewed in places funded by our government. All because showing what actually happened might offend some Muslims.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



**When Foreign Intervention is Morally Acceptable**

by [Cody Souza](#) - Saturday, April 25, 2015, 10:39 PM

In viewing the videos I want to state that I agree with Ron Paul that the U.S. has no business policing and micro managing in foreign countries. The cost is expensive to keep troops in other countries and is sometimes unnecessary altogether. However I agree with Former Ambassador Alan Keyes in his statement that the U.S should help or support those being wronged or hurt across the globe. Not with military primarily, but in some form such as food, economic support or diplomatic reasoning. I agree with Keyes that the U.S shouldn't be a sort of "American Fortress". Further on, when Senator McCain states to Ron Paul that the troops said "Let us win", it conveyed a message, to me at least, that the U.S. just wanted to flex our military strength and win another "war" to prove American dominance to foreign countries. In our present time and place the world now has the United Nations, as well as laws and international treaties to prevent such extreme examples of the consequences of non-intervention such as Hitler, as McCain stated in the debate with Ron Paul.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[HST 203 Sp15 \(Escobar Meta\)](#)