

# HST 203: ONLINE U.S.History Sp19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp19 \(Escobar Meta 44752 44789\)](#) / [ONLINE Week 4](#) / [Forum 2](#)  
/ [The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)



Search forums

## Forum 2

### The Role of the U.S. in the World

 [Subscribe](#)

 [Taxation](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



**The Role of the U.S. in the World**  
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 8:43 AM

This thread is for discussions on the The Role of the U.S. in the World topic.

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, which clearly describes the part number, the source, or the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Role of the U.S. in the World

Sum of ratings: [\\_](#) [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Ron Paul Foreign Policy**  
by [Connor Antich](#) - Tuesday, April 23, 2019, 1:31 PM

It is very hard for me to pick one presidential candidates foreign policy that I absolutely agree with the most. Each candidate in the videos and articles above makes good points. There isn't one candidate I agree with on everything, but the one candidate I think I relate the most with when it comes to foreign policy is Ron Paul. I agree with a lot of his foreign policies more than so other candidates, but I also disagree with him on a lot of matters. For example, I agree with him on the matter surrounding the First Iraq War. At mark 6:59 of the Ron Paul Interview video, Paul talks about how we should of let Israel and Saudi Arabia deal with the Iraq invasion of Kuwait. This is something I majorly agree with. This was a border dispute. We shouldn't sacrifice money, resources and most importantly american lives to defend peoples of the earth. If we didn't act so fast I agree with Paul that Saudi Arabia and Israel would have crushed Iraq. That is there region and there war. Saudi Arabia and Israel especially are two nations very capable of defending themselves. They have strong militaries. Let them fight their own battles. We fought there war for them. I agree with Paul also on the fact that the invasion of Kuwait and permanent deployment of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia cemented hate from the neighboring muslim countries and peoples towards the U.S. I agree that the deployment of troops in Saudi Arabia and bombing of Iraq created more radical enemies rather than lowering or defeating U.S. enemies (7:51 mark Ron Paul video). Bin Laden himself said one of the reasons for executing 9/11 was because U.S. troops were stationed in the muslim holy land (8:04 mark Ron Paul Video). Our military campaigns in the middle east have painted a target on our backs and have gave reasons for radical groups or even countries to take up arms against us. An argument people may have against this, is by comparing our intervention in the Iraq War to our non intervention when Hitler started invading Europe and started World War 2. Senator McCain made this argument against Paul (0:24 mark McCain vs Paul video). The argument I make against this is that in my eyes Hussein's Regime and Hitler's Regime aren't comparable when trying to justify a reason to go to war. Germany's military capabilities at that time compared to its enemies was much more capable of anything Iraq ever was. We should of intervened because Britain and France were to weak at that time to defeat Germany. But in the

case of Iraq invading Kuwait, Israel and Saudi Arabia could of defeated Iraq easily. And like Ryan said I am not an isolationist, I would have Saudi Arabia and Israel fight the war while politically supporting them and sending them weapons, technology, intelligence, etc. The U.S. should remained involved in foreign affairs but should not be forcing the ways of democracy upon others using force. This will only bring America more enemies.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

1

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



**Israel Military Success**  
by [Connor Antich](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 11:58 AM

Too prove Israel is a capable military country, here are some key military accomplishments in the countries history. In 1967 they won the Six-Day War against Egypt, Jordan and Syria which also had aid from many other Arab countries. Israel also won the Yom Kippur War in 1973 against Egypt, Syria and other Arab states. Also in both of these wars the Soviet Union was supporting the Arab nations. Israel in its history has proven many times that they can defeat and defend themselves from multiple Arab nations even when the odds are against them. So shouldn't Israel be able to fight and protect other nations in its own region instead of the U.S.?

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

1

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



**Ron Paul Foreign Policy, U.S. Military Foreign Bases**  
by [Connor Antich](#) - Thursday, April 25, 2019, 3:28 PM

I want to express that I do disagree with Paul on some matters as well, but I relate and I agree with most his policies more than any other candidate. Where I don't relate or see eye to eye with Paul is when he says, he would pull all U.S. foreign troops stationed abroad back home (5:08 Ron Paul video). The only part I agree with him on this statement, is the part concerning U.S. troops stationed in Saudi Arabia (muslim holy land) and throughout the Middle East. Our troops occupying and being stationed in Middle East countries have given reasons for radicals to make an enemy of the U.S. By doing this we have only created more enemies and wasted money, resources and american lives. Countries and our allies in the Middle East like Israel, Saudi Arabia and Jordan should fight their own battles in the region. I understand we can't trust and want to counter influence from countries like Iran, Syria and Pakistan. But we should find other ways to do this instead of occupying countries like Iraq and Afghanistan. Stick to air operations, intelligence gathering and if necessary small special operation forces. We should push our Middle East allies to do way more. But on the other hand, I believe U.S. troops should remain in European countries like Germany, United Kingdom and others. They should stay because these countries are our allies. It is important to conduct military drills with them and share intelligence. It is important to have troops there as well incase our European allies come under attack. U.S. military presence in Europe has not angered anyone or caused problems, unlike the Middle East. Also troops in Japan and South Korea should stay. Unfortunately, are participation in the Korean War has cemented permanent hate against us from North Korea. North Korea has proven to be very aggressive in nuclear tests and military drills. If war were to break out on the Korean Peninsula, we would need to be there to support the South and shut down the North's nuclear weapons. Our participation in the Korean War created this situation, if I could go back in the past and I was president, I would of chosen not to intervene in the Korean War. Also our naval bases throughout the world should remain. If world war were to break out, we would be at a major advantage with our strategic naval and air bases positioned around the globe. These bases though should only be used at the most necessary time for national security. We should also use them to protect trade. We should not use these bases to carry out operations of force to impose democracy upon foreign peoples.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

0

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



**Re: Ron Paul Foreign Policy, U.S. Military Foreign Bases**  
by [Connor Antich](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 1:31 PM

We simply cannot pull all of our troops home abroad and go into isolationism. We play a huge roll in protecting trade around the world. By just keeping our bases abroad and not using them to act unless absolutely necessary is the strategy I support. By keeping these bases around the globe we keep countries like Russia, Iran and North Korea under check. Russia has annexed Crimea recently. If we were to pull all of our troops out of Europe, I gaurantee they would look to expand more. It is important we keep a presence abroad. But we should not use these bases to fight in other countries regional, border and civil wars unless it is absolutely necessary. By actively participating in these wars we have made Americas list of enemies greater.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



**The Importance of the U.S. leadership in the World**

by [Jamie Atkins](#) - Tuesday, April 23, 2019, 4:15 PM

My thoughts on the League of Nations originally were the same as those of the Irreconcilables, I thought it was entirely too optimistic to expect the European Imperialists to do anything but what they had done before, war with each other for more power and resources. However, the U.S. was far past remaining an isolated nation at this time, so there were two choices, try to improve the situation or just stand by and let things play out as they may. Wilson was inclined to the first choice, and so were the Reservationists largely, as long as American interests and sovereignty were protected. There should have been a compromise. In Wilson's defense, he had a stroke and historians believe that is why he abandoned his cause (Murrin text p. 768). I would have asked him to consider the importance of American leadership in the League of Nations, to consider how unavoidable it was for the U.S. to enter into WWI, and how this might be amplified in the future. I would ask him to take the partisan politics of Lodge and the Republicans with a grain of salt and move forward at any cost. I would remind him that diplomacy requires compromise, and without diplomacy there is war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



**Re: The Importance of the U.S. leadership in the World**

by [Devon Olsen](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 9:50 AM

Hi Jamie

I agree with you on the optimism front. Although it may be hard to understand their reasoning sometimes, the European Imperialists did have a habit of going to war with the littlest provocation. This type of habitual behavior goes back to even the time of the Romans, as they expanded their empire across much of Europe, amassing unheard of wealth and prosperity. Eventually this mentality of take, take, take will come back to haunt them. It started in 313 B.C. when the Roman emperor Constantine acknowledged christianity as an accepted religion and outlawed the persecution of Romans who chose to practice christianity. As such this lead to civil unrest and civil war (USHistory.org, The Fall of the Roman Empire) again exhibiting the same aforementioned habits. Emperor Constantine let his ego get to him and created a second city within the Roman empire and named it Constantinople, after himself. This split the extremely strong Roman empire into two halves, the Western centered by Rome and the Eastern centered by Constantinople. This separation led to weakening Rome, and eventually a major part of its fall to the Visigoths in 410 C.E (US history.org, The Fall of the Roman Empire). The problem with this type of mentality is even though it seems that the League of Nations, or the two halves of Rome in this metaphor, had the same mentalities of peace, and cordiality among the nations, or halves.

As for the US involvement, I agree with you about the US being far too removed from the league at this time. The mentality of Wilson, often was to try and make things better, but he often wasn't the most tactful about his approach, nor was he known for following through. Your point of what you would have asked Wilson to do, is a good one. I think that you are spot on with suggesting that the involvement of US in the league was unavoidable. Also, leading up to WWI, with the scope and size of that war, there is no way that the United States could remain idol. I believe Wilsons thought with the proposal of the League of Nations was a good one, however the Europeans self-interest, displayed by England and France at the peace conference proved that the Europeans were incapable of decent behavior in international matters (Murrin text, p. 633). This made it more difficult for the US to join the league, and it was against Wilson's administration to get immediately involved, rather it was smarter to see how things played out, and re-evaluate.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



**One Track Wilson and his Costly Mistake**

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Tuesday, April 23, 2019, 4:40 PM

Woodrow Wilson saw the League of Nations as the Supreme Court of the world. This was going to be a committee which would hear the arguments of disputing nations and make determinations as to the just course of action to take in order to uphold justice and avoid war. The problem was Wilson's unwavering dedication to this thing which he helped create. Wilson was so obsessed with the idea of the League that he was unwilling to compromise on it with people like Henry Cabot Lodge. With the Republicans holding a majority in the

Senate, Wilson had to either convince them that his vision was for the best, or compromise. I believe that Wilson was incorrect in his thinking as well as his approach. No one could have foreseen the rise of Adolph Hitler and the amount of devastation which would be unleashed on Europe in a second world war, but Wilson understood that without a place for nations to bring their grievances, war was the likely outcome. I believe that if Wilson had been willing to compromise on the issue of American sovereignty regarding declarations of war, he likely could have seen his League become a reality. I also believe that an amended League could have helped negotiate a better reparations deal for Germany following World War One, perhaps avoiding a lot of their frustration and desperation which led them to rebuild their military and start a second world war. This is of course speculation, and the world will never know what might have happened had things gone differently.

If I were an adviser to President Wilson in the months leading up to the ratification vote of the Treaty of Versailles, I believe I would have cautioned the President against drawing a hard line and becoming unwilling to compromise. Despite how attractive the idea of a world governing body might be, the American people are never going to consent to joining a war they don't believe in simply because other nations tell them to do it. I would agree with Wilson that this type of league is perhaps the best chance to maintain world peace but remind him that the League will never become anything unless he can get it ratified.

I thought the connection made by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr regarding his grandfather's vision and the modern United Nations was very appropriate. The younger Lodge claimed that "the United Nations of today falls squarely within the limits of that [Lodge] proposition. The representatives of nations at the United Nations are ambassadors, and for the very reason that the sovereignty of their country is not compromised," (Article, *So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?*, *eleventh paragraph*). I agree with the younger Lodge that the United Nations is a close relative to the proposed League of Nations, and I again speculate that such an organization following the First World War could have helped prevent the Second World War. With no "world governing body" to keep them in check, the German people rallied behind a madman who promised to right all the injustices which the Germans believed had befallen them, leading to the worst war in world history. Had Wilson been willing to compromise on his League, perhaps things would have happened differently. Instead of focusing on the world stage and how America could help lead the world to peace, he needed to look back at the people he was elected to lead and realize that they were never going to accept an agreement which put them at the mercy of other nations.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



**Post Great War Foreign Policy**  
by [McKay Luke](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 4:15 PM

The events postdating the Great War in the late teens of the 20th century seemed, at the time, to separate the United States in different factions regarding foreign policy and foreign affairs. This separation resulted in the majority of political representatives falling into three categories: internationalists, reservationists, and irreconcilables (*The Role of the U.S. in the World* document, page 1). Woodrow Wilson's ambition for world peace was manifested through his Fourteen Points, which "...reaffirmed America's commitment to an international system governed by laws rather than by might" (*Liberty, Equality, Power*, page 753) and included the formation of the League of Nations and caused this partition. Many who were previously affiliated with the progressive movement found themselves with the irreconcilables, not in support of Wilson's proposal, and not having been supportive of US involvement in the war in the first place. Others found themselves siding with Republican senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who believed the national associations would be permissible if amended in order to retain freedom for the United States to act as needed on a national level without approval from allied nations. Lastly, the third faction consisted of loyal supporters to President Wilson, albeit many may have been supportive of slight amendments in contrast to the President, who believed in the proposal in its entirety.

Each of these three factions has arguable reasons for support; Internationalists envisioned world peace and strong international ties, Reservationist held strong to the notion that America must retain its independence in order to remain a strong and safe nation, and the Irreconcilables held true to progressive values, avoiding war and remaining free of European affairs. For these reasons, I find the ability to support each faction to a degree. However, upon projecting myself to this time of division, I would find my own personal values most in line with Reservationists. I believe the character of Henry Cabot Lodge is somewhat defamed through the textbook, stating that he and several other Republicans were "as interested in humiliating Wilson as they were in developing an alternative approach to foreign policy" (*Liberty, Equality, Power*, page 766). The means by which they allegedly aimed to humiliate Wilson was by comparing his regimes to socialism and voicing their frustration for not having been included in the Treaty of Versailles. The book continues on to state that Wilson claimed they were bitter for the 1918 election when he argued that a Republican victory would "embarrass the nation abroad" (*Liberty, Equality, Power*, page 766).

I would not state that I know Lodge's character perfectly, nor do I depict him as a perfectly honest or stalwart individual, but I understand and support his reasons for opposing the proposal. I believe in limited government and that any person, or organization, when given too much power, will eventually be corrupted. Lodge and his supporters saw the danger of a collective international authority that had the ability to infringe upon what many Americans at the time believed to be God-given, inalienable rights. I support Lodge's vision of an "America that is

prepared to work with the international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations but retains the freedom to act independently when necessary" (*So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?* paragraph 12). Given the opportunity to advise President Wilson in regard to this matter, I would have strongly encouraged Wilson to accept a reform of his proposal. In a perfect world where leaders are honest and act accordingly with one another, the Fourteen Points and the League of Nations would have been entirely successful. Unfortunately, corruption and manipulation are prevalent in political regimes and the limitations are necessary for the good of the people.

Sum of ratings:[3](#) (1)

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



**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World**  
by [Quinn Hodges](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 8:22 PM

I think that Wilson's ideas may be received by our government today, because at this point in time, all nations are not at each others throats, like they were in Wilson's. But unfortunately not all members of the government are true Wilsonian. They only use a few of the aspects.

There are some presidents that have some Wilsonian aspects. Senator McConnell stated that he though Obama was like Woodrow Wilson " he believed congress was too powerful and believed in unlimited executive power (1:15 McConnell: Obama's Executive actions "Wilsonian")

Most students answered that today's government is mild Reservatonist. It does reflect the largest group in 1918 (Reservationists).

I would like to think that I am an internationalist, because I like the thought of all nations coming together as one, but that is not reality, or entirely possible without conflict.

I think the world is most like how the woman in the "Wilson and Bush" video said that there are "2 type of governments the heir of Wilson the liberal internationalist or the neo-conservative that believe in human rights and democracy but use the military as its primary tool" ( 6:10 Wilson\_Bush) I think that is how our government is today (neo-conservative)

there is always a risk of war, losing trade, etc. when dealing with other nations Also the Constitution has changed with added amendments since Wilson's time. I think everyone maybe scared to step on each other toes

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

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



**Re: compromise is key**  
by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 9:45 PM

If I was Wilson's advisor at the time I would've encouraged him to be open to compromise with the Reservationists. As noted through this week's readings and materials the majority of the U.S Senate belonged to this middle group. The Reservationists supported the Treaty of Versailles and the proposed League of Nations but thought more could be done within this treaty to protect American interests. Although the treaty didn't satisfy everyone, by 1919 the ratification of the treaty was supported by Americans overwhelmingly. On top of this, 32 state legislatures had expressed support and passed resolutions that favored the treaty. Despite the support the U.S Senate did not pass the bill.

If Wilson would've compromised with the Reservationists he could've had a greater chance of passing the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles through the senate. If he had he would've had the support of the Internationalists and the Reservationists. Overall, I do not think it was smart of Wilson to not budge at all from his position on the treaty as it ended up working against him.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

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



**Re: compromise is key**  
by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 9:15 PM

Adding on to my original post that regards what I would advise Wilson to do if I were in his position.

Like I stated before, I think it was a mistake for Wilson to not want to compromise with the Reservationists. At this point, one of the biggest faces of the Reservationists faction of congress was Henry Cabot Lodge who, as the article "So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?" says Cabot had supported Wilson in the past. In this passage Thomas Fleming, the writer, makes this connection clear:

"When Theodore Roosevelt became president in 1901, Lodge enthusiastically supported his internationalism. He backed the creation of the Panama Canal and Roosevelt's role as a mediator in the Russian-Japanese War. He was equally enthusiastic about insisting on an "Open Door" policy in China. He exulted when Roosevelt sent America's "great white fleet" around the world."

This leads me to conclude that Wilson came into a Congress that was capable of compromise and of coming together across the aisle for a common goal. Despite this, Wilson still refused to meet his opponents halfway; which I will reiterate, I do not think it was smart. However, despite how, in my opinion, the main reason the ratification of this treaty didn't go through is because of Wilson's refusal to compromise, history doesn't fault him for it. As the article mentions that "...Wilson's backers managed to demonize Lodge so thoroughly, he barely won reelection to the Senate in 1922. The demonization grew apace in the decades after Lodge's death in 1924" ( So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?).

Even our textbook had moment where they blamed the failure of the treaty on Cabot; specifically a grudge that he supposedly had on Wilson. And while, I do believe there are two sides to every story and that there may well have been a fair amount of disagreement between the two I don't think this was the main reason the ratification didn't pass.

If the U.S had entered the League of Nations, with some of the guidelines set by the Reservationists, I wonder if it would've sparked a change in policy in the League for other countries. Further, would this have boosted membership? I wonder if we would've been closer to having a UN-like organization that would've, at the very least, made WWII less of the event it was. Maybe not prevent it completely, but it perhaps would've been a smaller war.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**Woodrow Wilson's Tenure**

by [Devon Olsen](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 9:46 PM

The role of the US today, in the global spectrum is a variable one. There are many that still consider us the strongest nation, and the world power to be afraid of, and yet, there are those that believe that the US is misguided and misconstrued with regards to being a world power. I think that the problems we saw in 1919 with the foreign policies and involvement of the league of nations, or lack there of is applicable still today. The ideals that the nations were coming up with as a result of their terror from the losses suffered during the great war, we not in fact the answer. "The question of this hour therefore is not whether a beautifully phrased and perfect document has been written, but whether it is the best hope we have." (The role of US in the world, Page 2, Paragraph 1). It is in that line, that I have understood the similarities between now and back then. The nation was just trying to figure out the next step, and not just draft up a document that brushes the issue at hand under the rug, distracting us the citizens with a number of clever quips, and the perfect phrasing.

The terminology used in the background information to the forum is definitely making me re-assess my position on the spectrum. The terminology used in each of the explanations on the foreign policy positions (internationalist, reservationist, isolationist) has made me re-evaluate. I find that the explanations fitting, and also distracting to the internal gut feeling I have. If I were one of Wilson's advisers I would suggest he keep good relationships in the International front because of the problems that are to come in the not so distant future. Were I not able to know the general history that is to come between Wilson's time and present day, I would maybe be slightly more cautious. I would still lean toward being involved internationally, but also look out for the home front more. By this I mean continue the ideals and trends of the "people's capitalism." In the book "virtually all Americans could participate. Everyone could own part of corporate America and afford amenities" (Ch. 24, pg. 645). This mentality came to the forefront more after Wilson's time in office, but his administration did allow for it to begin being more common among Americans. I believe where Wilson failed, was in the League of Nations.

Wilson proposed the idea as part of his 14 points plan for an equitable peace in Europe, however his own country never became part of the League (Office of the Historian, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1914-1920/league>). Perhaps joining the League of Nations could have been a vital part to world peace, and peace among Americans. In Wilson's tenure he brought about many aspects of his fourteen point plan, but failed to convince the US to join the allied countries in the European quarter of the world, and as such left office having failed to deliver on the plan

(Office of Historian, Milestones 1914-1920). In this regard, I do believe that Wilson may have failed the country. I say this because not too far after his departure from office, tensions in the European countries rose, and World War II occurred shortly after (Office of the Historian, Milestones 1914-1920). Had the Treaty of Versailles not failed, and the League of Nations been properly formed with US involvement the second great war may have been avoided.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**Re: Woodrow Wilson's Tenure**  
by [McKay Luke](#) - Thursday, April 25, 2019, 11:01 AM

I can side with your claims regarding Wilson’s failure to the United States, but I would not say that it was due to the inability to receive the support from the American people for the League of Nations. We know that many of those who would fall into the Reservationist faction (which was the largest faction) were accepting and supportive of this heightened alliance, but only upon amending some of its precepts to allow the US to retain its sovereignty and independence. The issue hinged on Wilson’s determination (or stubbornness) to not comply with Lodge and his supporters. In our textbook, it states that “Wilson could have salvaged the treaty and, along with it, U.S. participation in the League of Nations, but he refused to compromise with the Republicans and announced that he would carry his case directly to the American people instead” (Murrin textbook, p. 768). However, most Americans were already in favor of the treaty, so long as it contained said aforementioned conditions.

I believe Woodrow Wilson was, for the most part, a good an honest president with a vision of a safe and successful America. But I also believe, however, that he was far too hopeful. Wilson began his campaign with peace on his mind. From the textbook, we read that "Wilson embraced the portrait of himself as the ‘peace president’ and rode the slogan ‘He kept us out of war’ to victory over Republican Charles Evans Hughes in the 1916 presidential race” (Murrin textbook, p. 751). This aim for peace, which was Wilson’s goal from the beginning, led to his continual push for what he believed was best for America, rather than what the people thought what was best for their country. Wilson’s inability to accept revision led to the demise of the US being a part of a united national conglomerate, and as you said, may have contributed to the events leading up to World War II.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**John McCain had it right**  
by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Thursday, April 25, 2019, 5:34 PM

After watching the video clips featuring John McCain and Ron Paul, I agree most with the opinions of Senator McCain. Based on these video clips, I think Senator McCain had a similar vision to Henry Cabot Lodge. Our text tells us that Lodge and his allies had a “vision of a world controlled by a few great nations, each militarily strong, secure in its sphere of influence, and determined to avoid war through a carefully negotiated balance of power,” (Murrin textbook, page 766). While it might seem odd to suggest that McCain was determined to avoid war given his unwillingness to bring all of the troops home during this time, I think he saw the bigger picture and realized that if America simply abandoned its mission and went home, the enemy would simply use this as a propaganda tool to justify their actions and continue recruiting for more attacks. The end goal for McCain was peace, although he understood that we were already committed to war in order to bring that peace about.

Ron Paul claimed that it is our constitutional duty to go to war when we are attacked, as we were on 9/11. He claims that America was wrong to overthrow the Taliban in Afghanistan instead of focusing on finding Osama Bin Laden. The piece of the puzzle which I believe he is missing is that in order to pursue Osama Bin Laden and his coconspirators, America needed a government in power in Afghanistan which would be willing to work with us to achieve those goals. The Taliban was never going to allow America to come into their country to pursue Bin Laden, and they certainly were not going to capture him and turn him over to the U.S. The Taliban government gave Bin Laden the sanctuary he needed in order to create the destruction which he unleashed on America. Of course, Bin Laden spent a good deal of time in Pakistan working on his organization, a country which only half-heartedly cooperated with America in the region, leading to Bin Laden finding sanctuary in that country for at least the last several years of his life.

The last point that Ron Paul made that really stuck with me is his claim that he received more funding from active duty military personnel than any other candidate. I have not studied the campaign finances, and this may very well be true, but I can speak from personal experience. I was in Iraq in 2008 when Senator McCain lost the presidential election to Barack Obama, and I cannot recall coming across a single servicemember who was happy with this result. The reason for this was not because of political camps, it was because Obama had pledged to pull all the American troops out of Iraq. Everyone I came across who was serving in Iraq at that time, including myself, felt that this was the ultimate insult to the sacrifices which so many American men and women had made in that country with one goal in

mind: victory. As McCain said, the only thing we were concerned with was a President who would “let us win.” America was attacked on 9/11 and decided we needed to protect ourselves by fighting terrorism at its sources. This is not an internationalist attitude; it is one of self-defense and a desire to protect American lives at home by fighting abroad.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



**Re: John McCain had it right**  
by [Devon Olsen](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 11:46 AM

Hi Clifford,

First and foremost, thank you for your service. I have not been a service member in terms of international defense, and armed services, however I am an EMT and have been serving various communities in both California and Oregon over the last 5.5 years, as a first responder with the 9-1-1 systems there. I serve as a way to give back to my fellow man/woman. I love to take care of those that need some extra help, for preservation of life and property. I have seen some things that many people would never expect to see, as I am sure you have as well. I have also done many things that I would have never expected I'd be doing back while I was a youth.

Now for the part of the assignment you responded to, that really struck me the most. You quoted the book and Lodges vision, "a vision of a world controlled by a few great nations, each militarily strong, secure in its sphere of influence, and determined to avoid war through a carefully negotiated balance of power." Although I agree with this vision, I also feel like there is an understood compromise more closely related to Wilson's proposed ideal, with international relations being the anchor of the agreement. Although I find it to be faulted in a few ways, it really is an enticing proposal with a few minor tweaks of course. I also find myself in agreement with McCain allowing the "let us win" mentality. I also can resonate Ron Paul, as far as bringing our troops home. I do think that there needs to be some sort of agreement among the differing mentalities. I think it is important that we let other countries govern themselves, but it needs to be done in a way that promotes democracy, and eliminates the radical beliefs that are present in Sri Lanka for example. I think that you are right that McCain was stubborn about removing the troops, and I am sure you have a much deeper perspective than I do, actually being there with boots on the ground. But my gut feeling is that there has to be a compromise between the interventionism and non-interventionism ideals that both Lodges and McCain proposed, and conversely what Ron Paul and Wilson proposed. I really liked what you said in your second paragraph, and hadn't seen it that way before. Admittedly I probably could have read into the happenings more at that time, but I had just started college and was moderately distracted. After I graduated in 2012 (the first time around) I was much more involved in current affairs and trying to keep up with the plethora of information pouring in over the following years. But I digress, you talked about the need for partnership with local governments and cooperation within different governing bodies to accomplish our goals overseas. Those being to take down the person that struck us at our core, and to protect the American people from future such attacks after 9/11. With the help of local governments we have been able to reprimand and punish both Sadam Hussein, and Osama Bin Laden.

In your response you brought up some very fresh perspectives, those of a person who was actually there at the source. I have read hundreds of articles and news headlines that don't share the whole truth with the American people. However they do a nice job of causing more of a "take action" approach nationally. There are things that Wilson proposed that often get echoed in different ways in our current political affairs, and also things that Lodges shared that are still applicable today as well. I believe there is merit to both of these mens' points, and I also believe that Senator McCain and Congressman Paul had valid points. Is there a way to compromise? I am sure there is, but we have yet to find it. Thank you for your sentiments, service and perspective.

-Devon

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**Re: John McCain had it right**  
by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 1:47 PM

Hi Devon, I appreciate your input as well as your chosen profession. In your last paragraph you asked if there is a way to compromise between the “let us win” mentality of McCain and the “bring them home” mentality Paul, I would like to expand on this some. First, I understand that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost this country far too much, and therefore I too look forward to the day when we can end the conflict and bring people home. The difficult thing with war is that once you commit to it, you are making an investment, and your only two options are to see it through to some degree of victory, or eventually give up, cut your losses, and move on. Where it becomes even more convoluted is that the enemy gets to vote when the war is over

as well. The fear of the U.S. Government in the middle east is that if we simply stop fighting, we will leave the region open to revert to what it was before we got there, as we saw in Iraq with the rise of ISIS. It also becomes very difficult to put an end date on a war like this, as it gives the enemy a light at the end of a tunnel, a reason to reduce hostilities until that predetermined date in the hope that America will simply pack up and leave. This is something that Al Qaeda and the Taliban understand all too well, as many of the aging members of their organizations were in fact Mujahideen fighting the Soviet government in Afghanistan (with U.S. support) from 1979-1989. These warriors came to understand that if they simply held out long enough, the Soviets would run out of money and leave, a strategy which they are currently using against the U.S. in the region. All these factors contribute to a bloody mess which many Americans have grown tired of. The debates between McCain and Paul took place eleven years ago, and even at that time there were many people in America calling for an end to the war. There are of course many people who believe that the war in Iraq was a huge mistake and only lead to further radicalization of Muslim Extremists around the world. In his book *Hunting in the Shadows: The Pursuit of Al Qa'ida Since 9/11*, author Seth Jones argues that "For senior U.S. policymakers, Iraq was a mess. U.S. intelligence reported that the 'Iraq conflict has become a 'cause celebre' for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of U.S. involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement," (Jones 242). He goes on to say that "Virtually every major terrorist plot in the United States and Europe involved someone who had been radicalized because of the Iraq war," (Jones, page 242). The question then becomes how far do we take it? At what point are we doing more harm than good? When can we say we have accomplished our goals in the region, and we can leave with a feeling of security for our nation? These are some of the nuances of a very complicated argument between groups of people who all believe they are trying to do what is right for the American people. McCain and Paul both believed that they were speaking out for the best interests of our nation, and in this way they both had good intentions. I believe that the only real way to compromise their two viewpoints is by staying the course which America has been pursuing for the last several years: training local military and police in the region to combat these threats in their own country and having them take more of a leading role in the fight while America reduces its troop levels. It is not a process which can happen overnight, as we have seen, but rather a slow transfer of responsibility which we hope will eventually lead to total U.S. withdrawal.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**Re: John McCain had it right**  
by [Devon Olsen](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 11:26 PM

Hi Clifford,

Thank you for the shout out. I really appreciate the acknowledgment.

I think your perspective is totally fair, and I agree with much of what you said. In your response you echo and clarify what I think you meant in your original post, and for this I am thankful and agree with you. I think this particular situation is not one that has an easy answer, and I agree with you when you say we are committed once we are there. I think for all intents and purposes, I think this is correct to see it through. Where the line for me gets a little blurry is when the job has been accomplished. While I agree with you that the ISIS and remainder of the taliban could be playing a game of opossum, I do however feel strongly that there is a fine line between covering our 6 in a manor of speaking and yet not overthrowing the countries own governing bodies, that are creating a sort of democracy in their respective countries. Where I think the League of nations was correct was in the negotiations to avoid any sort of militaristic conflict, but I also know that we are human, and need to guard our own interest. I believe there is a way to keep an eye on the posible hostile countries or groups, but at the same time one has to ask at what cost? I think that the statistics can speak to this a bit. In total, as of current statistics, there have been 219,088 civilian deaths in the last 16 years, and 288,000 total violent deaths including combatants (iraqbodycount.org). This is a lot of life lost, and this doesn't include undocumented deaths, deaths from PTSD and deaths from disease incurred from being overseas. These numbers speak to the bloody mess of a war this has been. It is unfortunate, because the deaths reported are deaths that couldn't necessarily be avoided either. The US had no choice but to invade after the devastating 9/11 attacks. This some what echoes what Ron Paul said in his interview from the video links. He felt that the attack on pearl harbor warranted an invasion on Japan, which lead to the second world war (Ron Paul interview, about 5:00 mark). This said, he stands by the US involvement being justified in the Iraq war, as a response to the 9/11 attack, however in the debate video he seems to waiver back and forth about the thoughts he has on the issue. I will echo what I said earlier, that both of these men have valid points, but both of these men wouldn't concede. In the campaign trail of 2008, these politicians stood their ground on their beliefs, McCain's "let them win." Paul's "pull them out" mentality, both with their shortcomings,

and both with their validities. All in all, I agree with you that we should stay the course, but I also think that at some point it does seem like enough is enough, however that runs the risk of a re-incursion of what was thought to be an extinguished belief resurfacing, as you referenced with ISIS and the Mujahideen examples. Thank you for your sentiments, and I appreciate your perspective.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



**Re: John McCain had it right**  
by [Connor Antich](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 8:24 PM

I agree with you when you say that Ron Paul was wrong for saying we shouldn't have fought the Taliban in Afghanistan. I too have more of an attitude of self-defense when it comes to the Middle East. Bin-Laden was our enemy because of his 9/11 attacks. I agree that we should have fought him, Al-Qaeda and any enemies who shelter him (Taliban). I believe the U.S. was in its right to fight these enemies. I do not believe the U.S. was in its right though to invade Iraq in 2003. Iraqs regime at the time did not have any "weapons of mass destruction" and they weren't sheltering, harboring or supporting Al-Qaeda or the Taliban. Because of this, to me the invasion of Iraq wasn't necessary or justified in my eyes. What is your opinion on the matter? By the way I am not trying to insult or critisize you in any way by saying this. It is just my opinion on the topic is all. Thank you so much for your service. This country is forever in your debt.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



**The Role of the U.S. in the World discussion**  
by [Taylor Hunter-Rogers](#) - Friday, April 26, 2019, 10:27 PM

Part 1:

Question 1. Knowing what you know today, what advise would you have given President Wilson if you were one of his advisors in 1918?

Answer 1. Knowing what I do today I would have told president Wilson that he needed to make more reasonable remarks and agreements in the League of Nations, he promised so much and when push came to shove, he wasn't exactly there to hold up his end of the bargain the way he said that he would.

Part 2:

Question 1. History does not repeat itself, but do you see any similarities or differences between the time Woodrow Wilson was President and the past few presidents of our own time?

Answer 1. I do see some similarity with Woodrow Wilson and Barack Obama, they both faced a economic crisis in their times of presidency and they both tries to change their public and private powers during that time as well.

Question 2. Would Wilson's ideas concerning foreign affairs and his strong support of internationalism be better received today than by the Reservationists and Irreconcilables during his own time?

Answer 2. Honestly, I don't know whether or not Wilson would do better now rather than his own time or not. I want to say he would but I just don't know. I had originally placed my vote as Irreconcilable, but if I could change my vote to Reservationist I would because they are more realistic, they know what needs to be done and sent that forth, they don't take realistic things and blow them into a very unrealistic proportions.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



**Re: Could there be peace without victory?**  
by [Autumn Pitzer](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 11:35 AM

If I was one of Wilsons advisers I would have advised him to keep up good relations with Germany regarding our exports just as he did with Great Britain and maybe this would have kept the U.S. out of the war and he could have maintained his stance on neutrality.

President Wilson believed in a peaceful resolution where nations were to be governed by negotiation rather than war. He also believed that in order to attain this there could be no winner or loser of the war. "Peace without Victory". It appeared that the world was in just as much a mess or more so after the world war. The only thing that made headway was the women's suffragists gaining the right to vote although they did not receive equal rights. As stated in chapter 23," But even 1920s affluence would fail to dissolve the class, ethnic, and racial tensions that the war had exposed. And the failure of the peace process added to Europe's problems, delayed the emergence of the United States as a leader in world affairs, and created the preconditions for another world war".

Liberty, Equality, and Power Pg 750 and 775

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: Could there be peace without victory?**  
by [Taylor Hunter-Rogers](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 8:37 PM

Autumn,

I agree with you when you said that Wilson should've kept good relations as he did with Great Britain to retain the sense on neutrality. I think you have great insight of what they are explaining in chapter 23, that there could be no winner or loser of the war and the only thing gaining way was Women's suffrage at the time and them gaining the right to vote.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



**Hindsight in the 1920s**  
by [Declan Jensen](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 6:05 PM

If I had been one of Woodrow Wilson's advisors in 1918, I likely would have advised Wilson to enter World War I sooner rather than later: to end the conflict quickly and perhaps avoid some of the repercussions brought about by the Treaty of Versailles. Should he ignore me, I would have advised him to oppose the harsher points of the Treaty of Versailles, as it was a massive failure and a large reason for the beginning of World War II. Finally, I would have likely advised to be a little more lenient on the League of Nations demands because a refusal to compromise is something Americans always despise; a league like this would be extremely helpful to avoid unnecessary conflict as shown by the United Nations.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**History and Repitition**  
by [Declan Jensen](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 6:50 PM

Like the early 1900s, we are seeing a rapid rise in fascism and other extreme right wing ideologies. Nationalism is at an all-time high and the racists are no longer afraid. Likewise, consumerism is also increasing and our economy is booming after a massive recession--we might even see another "Roaring Twenties" because of this. Where foreign policy is concerned, I would think that Wilsonian foreign policy is probably more widely accepted than it was back in his day, considering the problem people have with Sharia law how we voted in the person who promised to "bomb the hell out of ISIS." However, looking at our class poll, most of us chose the middle-of-the-road option: Mild Reservationists. I think that's probably because many of us are confident that we aren't confident in knowing the right answer to our world's problems. I'm part of this group because I look at yesterday's conflicts vs. today's conflicts and see very few similarities: while they're both on a global scale, we have the ability to wipe out entire nations with one bomb, we use drones in place of pilots to distance ourselves from our fights and desensitize us to the horrors of war, our weapons are far more efficient and break far less often. Our current version of the "League of Nations" seems absolutely worthless because when there is a gross violation of human rights, they say "Don't act, it'll piss them off." Any action we take could lead to the end of the world, our "best hope" (the United Nations) won't act, and we're so used to failing spectacularly when we try anything, we choose to do nothing instead.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World**  
by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 10:39 PM

I think there is no one perfect politician with who I agree with. In this case I am most likely to side with a combination of the Ron Paul and Alan Keys. I agree with Paul in that I do not believe it is the duty of the US to spread democracy to the world. At the 5:05 mark in the Paul video he states that he doesn't believe it is the U.S's responsibility to spread its goodness and democracy with the world. The reason I agree with his is because I think that as a country we cannot just assume that we know better — our way isn't always the best way. Especially when this help comes with violence' as Pauls said "To spread out goodness over seas it usually requires force" (5:12). I believe we need to believe in other country's ability to defend and negotiate themselves without U.S intervention. Like Paul, I believe that — much like the case in Iraq — spreading American goodness and democracy often means spreading war. In the process of trying to do good, the U.S caused pain and suffering to a country in a way that perhaps could've been avoided had it stayed out of the conflict.

Where I don't agree with Paul is where he states that even in cases of humanitarian crisis or as the journalist states "...genocide, terrible suffering..." the U.S has no place (Time stamp 7:20). This is where I begin to agree with what Alan Keys said regarding Darfur. I think simply having a "moral statement" as Paul said in minute 7:28 is not enough. This is a way to help countries who are suffering and are requesting or needing aid without sending a military intervention. In the Alan Keys video he said that as a country "We don't need to send troops but we need to support and reinforce the sense of local regional responsibility for both humanitarian and military order" (Timestamp 1:08). I agree.

I think that much like Paul's stance that war is only acceptable if the U.S is attacked first, Keys' argument of sending support to others is an acceptable form of intervention as long as the people/government of these countries are asking for this aid. By following this, we avoid coming into countries and imposing what we view as right or correct on them.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



**Foreign Policy within the United States**

by [Christina Dukes](#) - Sunday, April 28, 2019, 11:50 PM

Woodrow Wilson is a highly spoken subject within conversation concerning foreign affairs and the history of foreign affairs within the United States history. More so, I believe that he is a highly discussed topic of discussion only because his ideals were so wildly mocked at during his time, but then just shortly after his presidential service the world became more aware of the reality of the concepts he was trying to instill. One reason I believe for this, is because there simply was not any remaining place on planet earth for people to explore and conquer. Each subsequent mission to try and control one territory over another, eventually led to the final resting place (with a few minor exceptions of governmental control and ruling laws) of a commanding country. There simply was nothing left to take over. All of the islands and major bodies of land were controlled by some massive military or governmental force that did not think fighting over already owned land was worth the detriment to their military. Generally, if a country or location is ruled by any of the major military forces around the world - and not the islands own small governmental force - it took a great deal of consensus and power to try and over rule their already standing authority. Once the world realized that the age of imperialism was sort of at a loss, they started shifting their morals and their views about how the world should be conceived. It was only then that the ideals of diplomacy proposed by Wilson during his political involvement were realized and widely becoming accepted. Yet, during his time most of the world was focused on power and acquiring territory to be the most powerful, and they completely disregarded Wilson's theories.

I believe that since Wilson was active in such an opportunistic time of imperial influence, his impact on the world during his presidency is laughed at. Many people believe that he failed as a president because he wasn't able to really make a significant or lasting change on the world during his active presidential rule. Again, it was not till long after his death did people start to listen to his theories and sort of implement them. To me, I believe that Wilson had a good heart and had a good motive behind what he was doing, but was just the wrong president at the wrong time. I feel like had he been president say in current time today, he might have made more of an immediate impact, but this is all just hypothetical.

Yet, I feel conflicted to argue against myself, because I would also be able to say that Wilson was the perfect president during this time, because in a time of such horror and brutality of war, it is a president such as Wilson that America needed at the time. He was a good influence towards not sparking a fuse that was America, just waiting for a reason to become triggered and catch up in flames. His passive aggressive attitude towards respecting all of those individuals to their own governmental power, most likely led to a more calm early 1920's, than say a war hungry politician in power. "Wilson listed the crucial principles of a lasting peace: freedom of the seas; disarmament; and the right of every people to self-determination, democratic self-government, and security against aggression. Wilson was proposing to allow all of the world's peoples, regardless of their country's size or strength,

to achieve political independence and to participate as equals in world affairs. These views, rarely expressed by the leader of a world power, stirred the masses of Europe and elsewhere caught in a deadly conflict." (Textbook pg. 751).

I believe that many people at the time were just astonished that someone could be so forgiving and mellow towards enemy military and their associated countries. Not only this, but no one at this time was wanting or willing to give up in the race for full world power. In the survey this week the class noted that about half of us fit into the category of "limited internationalist/mild reservationist" which is basically the class consensus that half of us agree (myself included) that the world peace organizations we have that are active today are a necessity in preventing unnecessary loss and damage to either side of the conflict. Now, this is the ideal that Wilson proposed long ago, but most people that lived during his leadership were completely opposing of his views with more of a desire on power and their one nation ruling in advancements than others.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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

◀ [Taxation](#)

◀ [Foreign Policy Opinion Poll](#)

[CLICK HERE for Forum 2 Materials & Questions](#) ▶

 Moodle Docs for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)  
HST 203 Sp19 (Escobar Meta 44752 44789)  
[Get the mobile app](#)