

Trouble Some Child and its Problems (Word: 1197)

Some of the most significant problems in today's society is the usage of military intervention towards Third World Countries. Authorities such as the government, the president, and the military are currently finding ways to help the Third World Countries without causing disruptions. Military intervention has brought up heaves of problems to our world today and violated the rights of Third World Countries' societies. Even if the countries establish foreign policies and aids, military interventions will cause harm towards them without knowing.

One of the main reasons why military interventions does not solve the Third World countries' problem is because it promotes risky and violent behaviors. According to Paul M. Reagan, a professor in the Department of Political Science at Binghamton University, states that military invention will "increase political risks" (Reagan 94). In his research study, he focuses on how political risks are caused due to the exposure of "vulnerabilities and ineffective political risks" (Reagan 94). Reagan provides a thoughtful insight on how "bilateral trade" may offer an economic reward to countries who are in need, while taking the risk of U.S. military intervening (Reagan 94). Although, military intervention may help Third World Countries, Reagan provides an intellectual insight on how political party tended to start a "rather bloody conflict that [they] have struggled over whether to intervene" (Reagan 90). This study may be sort of valid because of the explanatory variables for risks and capabilities Reagan provides for his studies.

Military intervention in general can negatively affect the citizens who are currently living in the Third World Countries and the country itself. Cambodia, one of the Third World Countries has never been "forgotten" due to U.S. military interventions (Doyle 1). Kevin Doyle, a reporter and journalist from BBC News personally interviewed a survivor named Mr. Nhan, from the Cambodian Genocide on how the "failed" military has worsened Cambodia than before. Mr.

Nhan, who personally experienced the “ruins” caused by the U.S. military, provides an insight into the idea of poor military interventions. Since he personally experienced United States’ lack of support towards Cambodia, he is stating the facts- not lies. In Doyle’s journal, Nhan explains that “American soldiers thought they helped Vietnam,” but the country stayed the same (Doyle 1). Even if the U.S. military helped, this will not provide benefit for the country. Like Kevin Doyle, Mesrob George Vartavarian, a worker in the field of political science and military economics in UCLA, focuses on the military impact in Afghanistan and Iraq. In his article he uses historical anecdotes to reveal why the U.S. military intervention didn’t bring peace within the Third World Countries. Although, if the U.S military intervened these countries, there will be a huge change, because there will be conflicts due to the contribution “to the wide-ranging insurgency” (Vartavarian 1). This shows an uproar in how the U.S. interfering Iraq’s problems has not been aided them to break free from trouble, but has left the country in a fractious state.

Additionally, in a research conducted by Vartavarian, the U.S. military forces relied on “search and destroy” which made the country “more difficult to consolidate a central government” and “could not protect [others] because of the will to “pursue their own goal” (Vartavarian 1). Complementing with Vartavarian, Dursen Peksen, an associate Professor of Political Science mentions the effect of U.S. military interventions towards foreign countries. In his article, he explores that “supportive interventions increase the level of human rights abuses in target countries” (Peksen 560). The dreadful U.S. military intervention discussed by Doyle, Peksen, and Vartavarian provides an insight on how U.S. military interventions corrupts the country itself than aiding them to safety.

Due to the involvement of U.S. government who chose to support the Third World Countries has interrupted them even more. During in the 20th century, President John F. Kennedy

interfered the Third World Countries based on “American geopolitical interests” instead of having the thought of establishing peace in these countries (Vartavarian 1). According to Ivan Eland, a senior fellow and Director of the Center on Peace and Liberty, explores the topic of how the United States government is viewed as a threat by the Third World Countries (Eland 1). She uses casual analysis in order to display how the interventions controlled under the presidents has led to “destroying U.S. weapons” and “strengthening” the AQAP through “bombing campaigns” (Eland 1). She also adds Fareed Zakaria, a CNN’s foreign policy analyst on how supporting Third World Countries will lead them “to attack the U.S.” (Eland 1). U.S. military intervention has caused harms to itself and others and increased terrorist attacks toward these countries. Gareth Porter, an investigative historian and journalist, interviewed a 22-year old Congressman, Ron Paul who had experienced the support of U.S. military interventions. Paul points out that military interventions has brought an “opposite effect” and causing Taliban, a movement that causes threats to the Afghanistan’s government. The U.S. government mentions that they wanted to have a “major effect on Taliban” to take them “under control” but rather it gave them “greater support for the Taliban” (Porter 1). Given these points, Porter, Eland, and Vartavarian mentions the U.S. minor source of aid onto these countries by providing valid researches and an interview due to significant personal experiences and those who work in the field of political associated with the concept of military.

Moreover, the U.S. government interfering with the Third World Countries is actually putting danger onto themselves. Rejan Menon, a political scientist, mentions Steve Simon and Johnathan Stevenson who are both members of President Obama’s Nation Security that Obama has a “lacking [of] having a plan for Syria and that intervention don’t always avoid war” (Menon 1). According to Gary C. Jackson, a professor at political science at the university of California

in San Diego provides a historical analysis that fighting in Iraq has caused the uproar of terrorism (Jackson 586). He provides a description on how the situation in Iraq today has made them in a more serious risk than the past due to the U.S. military intervention. In like manner, he provides a significant data on how the U.S. "aided the terrorist attacks" and has altered its own country overall. Even though, the government and political officers may have the thought of intervening as their primary choice, violence had rose sharply in "Afghanistan in 2006, killing estimated 4000 people, the deadliest year since U.S. led coalition" (Alternative 1). Although, Menon and Jackson may only be working in political science fields, they are able to provide intellectual insights.

The more the U.S. military intervene within the Third World Countries, the more corruption and damage is done to both U.S. and the Third World Countries. In order for this to be diminished, United States' political figures should limit their interventions these countries. The U.S. government should understand the fact that they are increasing violence and destruction towards the people and the country itself. This would expand the thoughts for a successful military intervention. If this were to happen, the Third World Countries will restore their political unity and making their country a substantial place for their people to live in and may have been able to gain support through military intervention.

Work Cited

Amir Handjani, Bharath Gopaldaswamy, Christopher A. Preble, Jiri Valenta, Leni Friedman

Valenta, and Menon, Rajan. "American Military Intervention Can't Save

Syria." *The National Interest*. *The New York Time*, 7 Oct 2016. Web. 1 Jan.

2017. <<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/theskeptics/american-military-intervention-cant-save-syria-17971>>.

Doyle, Kevin. "Vietnam's Forgotten Cambodian War." *BBC News*. BBC, 14 Sept. 2014. Web. 1

Jan. 2017. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-29106034>>.

Eland, Ivan. "Yemen: Another Failed U.S. Military Intervention." *The Huffington Post*.

TheHuffingtonPost.com, 13 June 2015. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ivan-eland/yemen-another-failed-us-m_b_7053522.html>.

"Failures U.S. Foreign Policy." U.S. Foreign Policy Failures. Alternative Insight, July 2016.

Web. 25

Jacobson, Gary C. "A Tale of Two Wars: Public Opinion on the U.S. Military

Interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 4,

2010, pp. 585–610. www.jstor.org/stable/23044842.

Regan, Patrick M. "Substituting Policies during U.S. Interventions in Internal Conflicts: A Little

of This, a Little of That." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2000, pp. 90–

106. www.jstor.org/stable/174623.

Porter, Gareth. "'From Vietnam to Afghanistan, US Military Intervention Has Failed to

Deliver'." *RT International*. RT, 15 Feb. 2016. Web. 21 Dec. 2016.

<<http://www.rt.com/opedge/332490-un-report-causailites-afghanistan/>>.

Van Der Kroef, Justus M. "The United States and Cambodia: The Limits of Compromise and Intervention." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1986, pp. 251–267.

www.jstor.org/stable/25797867

Vartavarian, Mesrob George. "U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan." *U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan*. UCLA International Institute, 18 May 2015. Web.

1 Jan. 2017. <<http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu/Institute/article/153245>>.